



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

May 21, 2020
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm
Zoom Online Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Commissioners: Robert Banagay, Erin Butler, Susan Dirks, Gary Langenwaller, Roger Lizut, Amanda Perron, Beth Rankin, and Lori Schanche

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director and Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Schanche called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

- **January 16, 2020 – Work Session**

Commissioner Langenwaller moved to approve the January 16, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banagay and passed unanimously.

3. Action Item

- **Minor Partition (MP 1-17) Extension Request**

Senior Planner Darnell said this was a request to extend a previously approved partition on the corner of Hembree and Grandhaven Streets. The partition was approved in 2017 and had been extended last year by the Planning Commission. The applicant had issues completing the partition and would like one more year. The original owner of the property had passed away and there was difficulty selling some of the land to finance the required public improvements. Staff thought the same conditions of approval would still apply and recommended approval. The extension would be to April 5, 2021. Staff thought this should be the last extension.

Chair Hall arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Commissioner Dirks asked if they could give the applicant a longer extension than one year. Senior Planner Darnell said there was no code requirement that limited them to one year.

Commissioner Dirks thought because of this uncertain economic time, they should give the applicant a longer period of time.

Commissioner Butler asked if this was their final extension, would they not be able to divide the property if they did not make the deadline. Senior Planner Darnell clarified if they did not make the deadline they would have to reapply.

Planning Director Richards said it was unusual to get more than a one year extension on a partition. The reason they did not want to keep extending it was that code requirements changed over time and they did not want to set a precedent. Her concern was they had not done anything in three years and the steps did not require a significant financial outlay. She suggested rather than give them two years, to approve the one year and if they did not get it done they could apply for another extension and explain why they did not get it done.

Commissioner Rankin asked if the property did not sell, it would remain a complete parcel and lot 4 would not be landlocked. Senior Planner Darnell said lot 4 was already a separate legal parcel and had rights to an access utility easement that went to the south.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought the one year extension would hold their feet to the fire more than a two year and hopefully they would finish. If they were close and needed another extension, he would support that. He wanted to see progress.

Commissioner Perron said if they made this their last extension and the applicant wanted to reapply, would that give the Planning Department more room to make other requirements. Planning Director Richards said the partition requirements were straightforward and objective.

Commissioner Perron moved to approve MP 1-17. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Langenwaller and passed 9-0.

- **2020-2024 Planning Commission Work Plan**

Planning Director Richards said this was the Work Plan the Commission reviewed in January. The items were in two year blocks because they took more than one year to achieve. Most of the items in 2019-2020 were either completed or already underway. As they got into 2021-2022 and 2023-2024, they would start to make the items more comprehensive. This was the work that could be done with existing staff and budget for the next five years.

Commissioner Dirks asked which 2019-2020 items had been completed. Planning Director Richards gave the status of each item.

Commissioner Lizut asked about the impact of Covid on the budget. Planning Director Richards did not know what the impact would be. In November/December the property tax receipts came in and staff would relook at the budget. The 2019-2020 items were already funded. They had not seen a decrease in permitting activity other than what they anticipated because of land constraints.

Commissioner Dirks moved to adopt the 2020-2024 Planning Commission Work Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Langenwaller and passed 9-0.

4. Work Session: Residential Site and Design Review: Design & Development Standards

Senior Planner Darnell said the Commission had a Work Session on this item in February. The focus of tonight's Work Session was the Universal Design Standards. He gave a background on HB 2001 which was approved in 2019 and required cities of certain sizes to allow "middle housing" in areas and properties that allowed for the development of detached single-family

dwelling. Middle housing was defined as including duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes (fourplexes), cottage clusters, and townhouses. The bill would go into effect in 2022 and code amendments needed to be done to allow for these housing types. This work also aligned with the Housing Strategy, Great Neighborhood Principles, and Planning Commission Work Plan. The draft standards focused on the Great Neighborhood Principles and compatibility with the existing neighborhoods. They also focused on building form and in a format that was user friendly. The Planning Commission would be looking at an evaluation of the City's residential zones and discussing the creation of a diverse housing zone, flexibility in the current zones, creating a stand-alone higher density residential zone, and subdivision standards. The residential development and design standards were developed with a holistic approach that focused on a combination of site design, building form, and architectural features. Basic development standards were proposed for each housing type, including basic site standards such as lot size, lot width, lot depth, building setbacks, and building height. In addition to these basic development standards, more detailed design standards were proposed to be applied to all of the housing types, which were referred to as Universal Design Standards.

Senior Planner Darnell then gave an overview of the Universal Design Standards. Included in the standards were tiny homes, cottage clusters, plexes, townhomes, single dwellings, accessory dwelling units, and apartments. The document described apartments in a range of smaller scale courtyard apartment that was one to two stories to a walk up apartment to a block apartment. He noted this section needed to be fleshed out more and staff would bring back more details in the future. Each housing type had its own section, beginning with a summary page that provided a definition or concept of the housing type. The section would also provide guiding principles and photo examples. Each housing type had development standards. Staff proposed three sets of standards, one for in fill, one for new development with an alley, and one for new development without an alley. Each housing type would be subject to Universal Design Standards as well. The Universal Design Standards had an overview page, reference to the Great Neighborhood Principles, design guidelines and guiding principles, photo examples, and fundamental requirements. The first Universal Design Standard was façade which had to do with the building's relationship to public space and human scale design.

Commissioner Butler asked about the photo example of a garage that looked like it was more than 50% of the front. Senior Planner Darnell said it might be right at 50%, but it could be edited.

Commissioner Dirks agreed that was not the best example and staff should find a different one.

There was discussion regarding whether this guiding principle was appropriate, to recess the garage from entrances to make the entrance more prominent.

Commissioner Butler thought the principle might be too strict.

Commissioner Schanche suggested saying garages should be on a different plane from entrances.

Planning Director Richards would note this concern and the Commission could discuss it at a later time.

Senior Planner Darnell said the second Universal Design Standard was street frontage. The intent was to have the tree line and street canopy along the pedestrian space. They wanted to maximize the planters for trees and landscaping, maintain the pedestrian space, maximize on street parking, promote alleys for access, and spacing and pairing of driveways. There were three different types of frontage proposed, front-loaded parking, front loaded parking with paired

driveways, and alley-loaded parking. For front-loaded, the maximum driveway width would be 40% of the frontage and the minimum distance between driveways would be 24 feet. For the front-loaded with paired driveways, staff was still doing the analysis for the maximum driveway width. The minimum distance between driveways would be 30 feet. For alley-loaded, the minimum street frontage width would be determined by the development standards of the housing type.

Commissioner Rankin noted that shared driveways were difficult to maintain.

Commissioner Dirks asked where the 40% of the frontage came from for front-loaded parking. Senior Planner Darnell said that was the current standard. He could research the industry standards and comparable cities.

Commissioner Dirks said for front-loaded with paired driveways, she thought the maximum driveway width needed to be less than 40% for each. She noted a lot of photos demonstrated what they wanted and a lot that demonstrated what they did not want, but the captions underneath did not make it glaringly obvious that one was correct and the other was incorrect.

Senior Planner Darnell said the third Universal Design Standard was front yard. The intent was to provide a transition between the public space and private space on individual lots. The emphasis was on scaling and layering between public and private space and entrance to the dwelling. The neighborhood front yard type had three zones, gateway, front yard, forecourt, or dooryard, and porch, stoop, or terrace. In the gateway zone, the requirement would be low fence or low plantings. In the front yard, forecourt, or dooryard zone, the requirements were a minimum of five feet distance between inside edge of gateway and edge of porch, stoop, or terrace, a paved walkway between the sidewalk and entrance, and one of the following or a combination: pedestrian-oriented hardscaped outdoor space, lawn or planted area, or alternative option that met the intent and purpose. In the porch, stoop, or terrace zone, the requirements were that the porch, stoop, or terrace must be at least 36 square feet in area and have minimum dimensions of 6 feet by 6 feet and the porch must have a solid roof. They also must have one of the following: ornamental fencing or balustrade or columns demarcating perimeter or supporting the roof.

Commissioner Langenwalter asked who owned the space between the property line and where the cars were parked. Senior Planner Darnell clarified it was public right-of-way which included the sidewalk and planter strip.

The other front yard type was urban type. For the gateway zone there had to be one of the following: low wall or fence, change in paving material, low fence, or low plantings. For the front yard, forecourt, and dooryard zone, a minimum of ten feet in depth was required and one of the following: ornamental fencing or balustrade, columns demarcating perimeter or supporting the roof, planted area, or wood decking. For the porch, stoop, or terrace zone, a minimum of ten feet in depth was required and one of the following: ornamental fencing or balustrade, columns demarcating perimeter or supporting the roof, recessed area, overhanging balcony, or canopy.

Senior Planner Darnell said the fourth Universal Design Standard was alleys. Alleys were encouraged for providing rear access to the buildings to provide more frontage and human scale design elements. Alleys also allowed more flexibility in housing types and sizes, consistent street frontage, parking spaces, and walk layout. The options for alleys were type 1 where the travel width was 14 feet and a low landscape buffer was 7.25 feet on each side, and type 2 where the travel width was 20 feet minimum.

Commissioner Butler said if there was an alleyway, did it preclude housing types from having a driveway and front garage. Senior Planner Darnell said yes, if there was an alley the access would be provided on the alley and there would be no front driveway or garage.

Commissioner Dirks asked what would be the incentive for type 1. She thought it would be a more attractive option. Planning Director Richards said they were trying to provide developers a choice. Type 1 reduced the backyard and for some neighborhoods they might want to preserve as much backyard as possible, but for others it might be the aesthetics of the alleyway that would be important.

Senior Planner Darnell said the rear yard setbacks that were proposed for the housing types would allow for a zero setback for a garage from an alley.

The fifth Universal Design Standard was parking. This standard focused on the garage and orientation of the garage to the public right-of-way. The intent was that the garages did not dominate the front façades of the buildings and there was more of a focus on other building and architecture features. It was a requirement for all housing types that the garage wall facing the street could be up to 50% of the length of the street facing building façade. Also the garage wall facing the street would be no closer to the street lot line than the longest street facing wall of the dwelling unit. There needed to be a minimum setback of 20 feet between the garage door opening and the property line adjacent to the street. An exception to the garage setback was to allow for a garage wall to be in front of the longest street facing building line as long as it was less than 40 percent of the façade and there was a porch at the main entrance. There was also an exception for sideways facing garage walls that they be allowed if the garage faced out into the paved driveway court area, but the exterior wall that faced the street had to meet the Universal Design Standards for the front facing building façade. If the garage was adjacent to the alley it would not be subject to the 20 foot setback requirement. There were also requirements for medium and large surface parking lots which were proposed to be applied to all housing types that had a parking lot for 9 or more parking spaces. One requirement was a pedestrian connection through the parking lot. There were standard widths for the walkways and planted areas were required along the walkways. There were requirements for a minimum amount of landscaped area around the parking lot based on its size, that there be interior landscaping and tree plantings, dimensions for how much separation should be provided between the plantings, and perimeter landscaping and setbacks between the parking lot and any building or housing structure.

Commissioner Schanche thought parking lines should be included in the graphic so they knew where the cars should go.

Commissioner Rankin asked if lighting was addressed in the standards. Senior Planner Darnell said at this point it was not included, but was something they intended to develop.

Commissioner Dirks said the location of the parking lot on the lot was not addressed in the standards. She did not think they should be located on the street, but should be behind so it made the street more human oriented. Planning Director Richards said that could be added.

The sixth Universal Design Standard was common open space. This would be required for cottage clusters and apartments. The intent was to provide open space for the benefit of the residents. There was language related to connectivity and orientation of the common open space on the site and its relationship to the buildings on the site. The requirements included the space to be centrally located and designed with a clear function that enhanced the livability of the residents. These functions would include passive and active uses and they would be

accessible to all residents and if possible be fronted by clearly defined unit entrances. They would serve as the focus of surrounding buildings and entries and windows would face the common open space to provide informal surveillance.

Commissioner Rankin asked who would maintain the open space and who would pay for the maintenance. Senior Planner Darnell said if it was in private ownership, it would require some form of private maintenance agreement through a potential HOA or other entity. If it was a rental situation, the property owner or management company would be responsible.

Commissioner Dirks asked about the definition of passive and active. She thought they should be specifically spelled out.

Senior Planner Darnell said the standards for the common open space would include that the open space be a minimum of 12.5% of the site, when vehicular areas were located between dwellings and common open space, clearly defined pathways would be provided to enhance pedestrian safety, the common space would have a minimum width or depth of 20 feet, and walkways were required between dwellings and the common open space. There was a menu of options for the features that would be included in the open space and a development would have to meet four of the items on the list.

There was discussion regarding the definition of passive and active open space.

The seventh Universal Design Standard was private open space. This would be required for plexes, townhouses, and apartments that might have limited private yard space or backyards. The requirements included: all units would have a minimum of 36 square feet of private open space for each dwelling unit, 50% of upper units would have a balcony that was accessible from the interior of the unit that was a minimum of 60 square feet with no dimension less than 6 feet, and private outdoor space at the ground level must meet the front yard Universal Standard requirements.

Commissioner Rankin asked why 50% would be required to have a balcony. Was it a financial consideration where the units without a balcony were less expensive? She thought it was important that all units have outdoor space. Senior Planner Darnell said the intent was that it be a minimum of 50%. Planning Director Richards said staff would look into best practices for that component.

The eighth Universal Design Standard was compatibility. It was focused on architecture and building form and the intent was to ensure there were components on these housing types that would allow them to blend into the existing neighborhood and built form. There were standards specific to siting, massing, and human scale details. The requirements for siting included buildings with similar design must be separated by at least two lots and may not be directly across from one another, on a site with multiple buildings of varying scales providing a gradual transition between scales, arranging building volumes and setbacks in a way that reflected neighborhood patterns along street frontages and contributed to the desired character, and arranging courtyard apartments so that end units reflected a neighborhood context of detached units along the street frontage. There was a menu of options for massing and projects had to meet at least three of the options, such as variation of roof form, vertical wall off-sets, upper floor setbacks, physical transitions marking a distinction between floors, horizontal elements along the entire width of the front façade, limiting the length of ridgelines and eaves, and stepping down taller buildings next to smaller buildings. There was also a menu of options for human scale detail. These were for front and public facing building facades. The requirements included providing vertical offsets, projections, or recesses to break up the building façade, elevations

would include horizontal elements the width of the façade, a minimum of two types of building materials would be used on the front elevations, and trim with a minimum size of three inches on all windows. In addition the project would have to provide four of the following options: windows, gables, dormers, architectural bays, awnings, change in wall planes, ground floor wall lights/sconces, transom windows, balconies or decks, and columns or pilasters.

There was discussion regarding how this was a good document and easy to understand. The Commission's comments would be passed on to the consultants.

5. Commissioner Comments

There was discussion regarding meeting in Civic Hall as opposed to a Zoom meeting. Planning Director Richards thought they would still be in a Zoom meeting format for the June meeting. She explained the advantages of the Zoom meetings.

6. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards said they were performing at 100% program delivery even though 80% of staff was in a remote position. All of the programs had been set up to do electronic plan review and they could accept credit card payments.

7. Adjournment

Vice Chair Schanche adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary