



City of McMinnville
Planning Department
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

November 18, 2020
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

12:00 pm
ZOOM Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Sharon Gunter, John Hall, Josh Kearns, and Rob Stephenson
Members Absent: Tim McDaniel
Staff Present: Jamie Fleckenstein - Associate Planner
Guests Present: Zach Geary – City Councilor,

1. Call to Order

Chair Stephenson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Action/Docket Item (repeat if necessary)

A. L 32-20 – Landscape Plan Review - 1575 NE Colvin Court - Casteel Custom Bottling

Associate Planner Fleckenstein presented the Landscape Plan for a new industrial development on Colvin Court. The proposal was for an approximately 23,000 square foot building located in the southeast corner of the parcel. The remainder of the site was paved for access. Colvin Court was to the east of the property and there was a larger landscape area along that street frontage. There was parking at the front of the building and additional parking on the north side of the property along with the trash enclosure. There was perimeter landscaping around the property as well. The landscaping focused on the front of the building and along Colvin Court. There would be trees planted along Colvin in a large landscape area. Between the parking lot and building there would be a planting area with Italian Cypress trees, Vine Maples, evergreen shrubs, and ground cover. On the southeast corner there was a large planting area with a wide variety of ornamental grasses, deciduous and evergreen shrubs, and a Forest Pansy Redbud tree. This would be visible from the right-of-way. All along the south property line there would be a stormwater collections swale that led to a detention pond. The detention pond would be planted with a native wetland grass. The applicant was required

to provide 7% landscaping and they had provided 17.2%. The project was compatible with the surrounding uses. There would be an arborvitae hedge along the north side to provide screening from the adjacent property. There would be an evergreen hedge on the west side for screening as well. There was a condition for the trash enclosure to be screened on three sides. No existing trees or features were on the site. There were plantings around the parking area with shade trees. The additional parking would be screened by the arborvitae hedge. No street trees were required because there was only a three foot wide planter strip, however the row of Columnar Norway Maple was acting as the street tree canopy over the sidewalk. An automatic irrigation system was proposed. There was a condition that clearances would need to be maintained in the southeast area for electrical and water facilities.

Chair Stephenson suggested adding trees to the west property line. Committee Member Kearns noted the adjacent property to the west was a big, empty field.

Committee Member Hall asked if turf was the best solution for the planter strip along Colvin. Associate Planner Fleckenstein said neighboring properties also had turf in the planter strip area.

Committee Member Gunter moved to approve L 32-20 with the recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Hall and passed 3-0-1 with Committee Member Kearns abstaining.

B. L 35-20 – Street Tree Removal - 3752 NE Harvest Court

Associate Planner Fleckenstein reviewed the street tree removal request on NE Harvest Court. The applicant would like to remove three trees on the south side of the property. One was a Maple variety that had extreme sun scald and was in significant decline. The second was a pear tree with large limb failures within the canopy and had shallow roots with a significant lean. The last was also a Maple variety with nothing wrong, however the applicant would like to remove it and replace it so all three trees were matching. The first two trees met the criteria, but the third did not since it was in good condition. Staff recommended removal and replacement of the first two trees, but did not recommend removal of the third tree.

Committee Member Gunter suggested the applicant replace the two trees with the same type of tree as the third tree. Associate Planner Fleckenstein said there was no street tree plan for this subdivision and no required tree species to be planted. The applicant could match the tree.

Committee Member Kearns was in favor of removing all three trees so that root barrier could be installed.

Chair Stephenson agreed and it would allow for continuity of the trees.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein discussed the review criteria for tree removal. He thought removing the tree for the purpose of putting in root barrier to protect the infrastructure could be justification for approval.

Chair Stephenson said if the property owner was willing to replace the tree, he thought they could make an exception to allow it.

Committee Member Gunter thought it should be allowed so root barrier could be put down to prevent future damage to the sidewalk.

Committee Member Hall was concerned about setting a precedent and unintended consequences.

There was discussion regarding whether or not future conflict and protecting sidewalks met the criteria for removal.

Committee Member Kearns said two of the three trees met the criteria and there was no root barrier. This tree was part of a grouping and it made sense that the grouping looked the same. It was also an opportunity to prevent a future problem. He thought they could make an exception and not create a precedent.

Committee Member Hall suggested they change the code to allow for more flexibility.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein thought removing the third tree would meet the purpose and intent of the Tree Chapter, if not the criteria.

Committee Member Kearns said it would beautify the corner and helped with long term maintenance.

Committee Member Kearns moved to approve L 35-20, removing and replacing all three street trees. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Gunter and passed 4-0.

5. Discussion Items

A. McMinnville Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.58 (Trees) Review

Associate Planner Fleckenstein discussed the Tree Chapter in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Stephenson said for the Brookshire Estates, three varieties of trees were approved but none were available locally. There needed to be flexibility to change the tree if there was no availability.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said if there were suggested substitutions for the trees that were not available, those could be approved by staff. If they were major changes, then it would have to come back before the LRC.

Committee Member Kearns discussed the size requirement. When the economy was good, it was hard to find two inch caliper trees of any variety. He thought there should be flexibility in the size requirement, such as going down an inch and a half but nothing under an inch and a quarter.

Committee Member Kearns wanted to clarify what to do in places where street trees were impossible due to utilities. Associate Planner Fleckenstein thought they could address where street trees were required in the code.

Committee Member Kearns noted with the narrow streets, large trucks were damaging trees.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said they could create a Street Tree Improvement Plan to replace problem trees in an area with a more suitable variety.

Committee Member Kearns suggested requiring columnar varieties for certain street widths.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein reviewed the Applicability requirements for tree removal. He asked for guidance on whether or not to continue to require tree removals on private property that were damaging public infrastructure to get LRC approval and pay a fee. Staff thought there were other processes in place for the repair of the damaged infrastructure by a private tree and oversight was not necessary.

There was consensus to delete this requirement.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein asked if the Committee thought there should be tree protection standards for larger, mature trees and stands of mature trees.

Committee Member Kearns said there was a difference between a property owner taking trees down off his property and requiring a developer to preserve trees in the development.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein noted there was no definition of significant or historic trees.

There was consensus to add definitions for these trees with certain species and size. Staff would look at how other cities addressed this issue and bring the information back to the Committee.

6. Old/New Business

None

7. Committee Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

None

9. Adjournment

Chair Stephenson adjourned the meeting at 1:02 p.m.