



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

October 20, 2021
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

12:00 pm
ZOOM Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Carlton Davidson, John Hall, Patty Sorensen, and Rob Stephenson
Members Absent: Josh Kearns
Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director and Amy Dixon – Contract Planner
Guests Present: Zack Geary – City Councilor

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Action Item

- L 18-21 – Landscape Plan Review – 915 NE Lafayette Avenue

Contract Planner Dixon reviewed the landscape plan for a proposed pediatric dentist office at 915 NE Lafayette Avenue. She described the subject site, which was in the NE Gateway District. Public Works had sent in comments about the location of the trees in the right-of-way. McMinnville Water & Light had also commented about protecting the clearance from the utilities. She then discussed the site plan. The applicant proposed 8.1% of the property to be landscaped. There was landscaping around the trash enclosure and screening of the parking lot. Street trees were proposed along 9th and Lafayette. There was no buffer from the adjacent residential dwelling and staff recommended a site obscuring fence there. Staff was concerned about the spacing and vision clearance of the street trees along Lafayette. The height of those trees would be limited due to the power lines. Staff was recommending a spacing of 20 feet separation and one less tree for the vision clearance.

Committee Member Davidson suggested not putting in any street trees. The trees proposed were not appropriate for Lafayette. Planning Director Richards said there was an adopted plan for Lafayette to include street trees, however that was in conflict with the City's standards for these types of streets.

Committee Member Stephenson said the plan submitted did not include a scale and the plants were not drawn to scale on the plan. He did not think the Vinca major should be used to screen the trash enclosure because it did not get very tall. He also questioned the size of the boulders proposed.

Committee Member Sorensen agreed the plants around the trash enclosure were a ground cover and would not screen it. A lot of grass was proposed, which did not provide seasonal color.

Committee Member Davidson said what was proposed did not fit with landscaping in the rest of the area and there should be uniformity.

Sarah Post, applicant, said the trees matched the business on 9th Street next door. If they wanted a different tree along Lafayette, she was happy to change it. She was also open to suggestions for the trash enclosure. They needed this to be approved to move forward with the building permit.

Planning Director Richards said the Committee did not design projects, only reviewed what was submitted. What was submitted did not meet the code criteria. They could move forward with the building permit without the landscaping plan being approved, understanding there was some risk of it affecting the property buildout.

Committee Member Stephenson moved to continue L 18-21 for the applicant to make revisions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Sorensen and passed 4-0.

- L 22-21 – Landscape Plan Review - 855 NE Marsh Lane

Contract Planner Dixon reviewed the landscape plan for the McMinnville Water & Light facility on 855 NE Marsh Lane. They were adding a fueling station to the property. She described the subject site. The proposed landscaping was focused on the new driveway and additional plantings within the right-of-way. Public Works indicated most of the trees along the right-of-way were existing and well established. The applicant had proposed arborvitae in the planter strip, however they were not an approved street tree and staff recommended not allowing them. The landscaping was 7.9% of the site. The applicant needed to add buffering along the right-of-way with site obscuring landscaping along with the proposed fencing.

Committee Member Davidson agreed about the arborvitae due to the Maple trees shading them out.

Committee Member Sorensen said they were also proposing English laurel and should not dig around well-established tree roots and add material. She suggested removing that as well. She also questioned rhododendron and laurel being planted together because they required different soils.

Committee Member Stephenson thought there needed to be more shade for the rhododendrons.

Sam Justice, applicant, and Mike Williams, landscape architect, said the rhododendrons were an option. The mature Maple trees would shade the rhododendrons. The intent was to provide additional screening between the existing trees. He agreed the arborvitae should not be in the planter strip, but it could be used to for screening along the chain link fence on the property line.

Committee Member Davidson did not think the rhododendrons were necessary. There would be enough screening from the arborvitae against the chain link fence.

Mr. Williams asked if there should be additional screening at the entrance. He could continue the arborvitae along that fence as well. Planning Director Richards thought additional screening was required.

There was discussion regarding the plantings at the entrance and the mature height of the plants.

There was consensus to continue the application for the applicant to make revisions.

- L 23-21 – Street Tree Removal Request - 369 SE College Avenue

Contract Planner Dixon discussed the request to remove one Cherry tree from the property at 369 SE College Avenue. Staff recommended removal and replacement of the tree.

Committee Member Sorensen noted other nearby trees looked like they should be removed. She thought the replacement trees should be uniform in this area when those applications came in. She did not recommend replacing them with more Cherry trees.

Committee Member Sorensen moved to approve L 23-21 and that the replacement tree be from the approved street tree list. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Stephenson and passed 4-0.

4. Discussion Items

- Development Code Revisions

Contract Planner Dixon suggested holding special meetings to work on the code amendments. There was consensus to hold extra meetings.

There was discussion regarding other cities that had good landscaping codes.

5. Committee Comments

None

6. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards introduced new Associate Planner Adam Tate.

7. Adjournment

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