



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

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

**June 18, 2020**  
**Planning Commission**  
**Regular Meeting**

**6:30 pm**  
**Zoom Online Meeting**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

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

**Members Absent:** Amanda Perron

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

---

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

- **February 20, 2020 – Work Session**

Commissioner Langenwalter moved to approve the February 20, 2020 Work Session minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schanche and passed 8-0.

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

Senior Planner Darnell continued the presentation on the proposed residential development and design standards that was started at the last Commission work session. This document was drafted with a focus on the Great Neighborhood Principles, compatibility with existing neighborhoods, building form, and format that was user friendly. As part of the 2020 work plan, the Planning Commission was to evaluate residential zones and explore a potential diverse housing zone, flexibility in existing zones for infill housing, a higher density residential zone, and subdivision standards to require lot/housing variety. The work would need to be coordinated with the implementation of the development and design standards for housing types. The development and design standards were meant to be integrated with the base development standards for lot size, width, and setbacks. Housing type and design would drive lot size. Last month the Commission went through the Universal Design Standards in more detail. This month they were going to discuss the base development standards. The housing types included in the document included: tiny houses, cottage clusters, plexes, townhouses, single dwellings, ADUs, and apartments. The structure of the development standards was that each housing type had an overview with the definition/concept, guiding principles, and photo examples. Each housing type would also have a basic development standards table with lot dimensions, lot sizes, setbacks, building height, and parking requirements. Each table would have basic development standards for three scenarios: infill development, new development with an alley, and new development without an alley. Each housing type would be subject to applicable Universal Design Standards. One standard was the usable side yard standard which was an option for

tiny houses, single dwellings, and plexes. It allowed one side yard to have a 3 foot setback and the other side yard was required to have a larger setback. The 3 foot setback was not allowed adjacent to typical lots or on corners. The usable side yard standards required planning for these setbacks on groups of lots at the time of recording. The current proposal required recording house locations. Staff suggested changing it to just show setbacks on the plat instead of the house locations. He asked if the distance proposed was enough for a usable side yard area as it would result with 12 feet of space on one side and 3 feet on the other on each individual private lot.

Commissioner Rankin did not want the 12 foot side yard on a north facing side. It needed to get sun so people could have gardens. She asked if there was a way to suggest it include feasibility for sustainable living uses.

Senior Planner Darnell thought it could be added as a guiding principle.

Commissioner Schanche asked about putting the larger side yard areas together to allow for more sun exposure and not be blocked by buildings. Senior Planner Darnell said that might make the buildings too close together.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought putting the greenspaces together was a good idea as well. There would be more space for kids to play and it allowed for more privacy. Planning Director Richards said these were minimums, and the side yards could be larger. She thought there would be a concern about only a six foot separation between homes, especially in regard to fire safety. There had been some developments with an eight foot separation.

Commissioner Langenwaller did not think the buildings should all be oriented the same way. A builder should be able to have the option to flip them. He thought they could make a 4 foot minimum setback for one side yard and a larger one on the other side yard.

There was consensus for staff to look into allowing a 4 foot minimum setback for one side yard as an option.

Commissioner Dirks thought they should also allow the 3 foot setback for denser developments.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought staff should ask the Fire Department what the minimum was that they would be comfortable with. The goal was to be able to combine two larger side yards next to each other.

Staff would bring back more information on this option.

Senior Planner Darnell then reviewed the proposed single dwellings standards. These would be units on their own lots and larger than 400 square feet. He discussed the concept, guiding principles, and standards table.

Commissioner Rankin said she talked to someone who had a home with an alley and they told her that the driveway length for units with alleys was not long enough for most cars and the streets were loaded with larger vehicles and it was difficult to drive down the street.

Senior Planner Darnell said in that development the garages were only allowed to be ten feet from the property line. That was not being proposed in these standards. They were requiring off street parking be provided on each lot. They would allow a garage to be up to the property line

if it was adjacent to an alley. It was not required that it be 20 feet and someone could construct a shorter driveway as long as the garage met the off street parking standards.

Commissioner Rankin said the problem was people did not park in their garages.

Planning Director Richards thought it was something they should flag because going through the state right now was discussion on not allowing cities to require more than one off street parking per dwelling unit with the assumption that people would use on street parking for their needs. They could look at a driveway minimum standard so the driveway could accommodate a car.

Senior Planner Darnell said for single dwellings, the difference between with and without alleys was the lot dimensions were smaller when accessed by an alley. The infill was proposed for lot width, depth, and size to match the existing zone, subdivision, or planned development overlay district.

Commissioner Butler thought all of the standards should match the existing neighborhood, such as the rear setbacks.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought they should include a requirement that the dwelling be a certain percentage of the lot. Senior Planner Darnell said staff had asked that same question about whether the standards allowed for the types of structures they were looking for in terms of compatibility with neighborhood and private yard space. The consultant did an analysis and had provided some numbers. Staff planned to bring it back to the Commission for a future discussion. One thing they recommended was a lot coverage maximum.

Senior Planner Darnell said for lots with alleys, the minimum lot width would be 35 feet and lot depth would be 65 feet which resulted in a minimum lot size of 2,300 square feet. The setbacks would be 15 feet in the front, 7.5 feet on the sides unless they followed the 3 feet on one side and larger on the other option, and 20 feet for the rear without a garage or 0 feet with a garage. The building height would be a maximum of 35 feet. If there was an alley, the parking was required to be adjacent to the alley and if there was no alley, the parking would follow the Universal Design Standards for parking.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought the parking would be an issue with people parking on the streets if people did not use their garages for parking. Senior Planner Darnell said currently the code required the garages to count as parking and they did not have a way to enforce it except through Code Enforcement. It was a problem throughout the City.

Commissioner Langenwaller suggested requiring a rear setback of 20 feet even if they did have a garage so they could park on the driveway. Planning Director Richards noted these lots could potentially have no backyard either. Senior Planner Darnell said a builder would build something that a buyer would want to buy, and these would be less yard maintenance.

Planning Director Richards thought the Commission should be mindful of equity and creating a supply that buyers did not want, but those who were living in these types of units did not have the financial means to make a choice.

Senior Planner Darnell said the standards for lots without alleys were a wider minimum width which resulted in a slightly larger minimum lot size of 3,000 square feet. He reviewed the diagrams that coincided with the development standards tables.

Commissioner Butler thought the infill standards might be difficult to achieve, especially in older neighborhoods. Senior Planner Darnell said the infill standards were intended to apply everywhere. The intent was to allow new development to be in the same form as what currently existed. Some historic neighborhoods did not have a clear district with consistent setbacks on every lot and in that case where there was not specific development plans in place, the infill would have to meet the underlying zoning requirements. If there was a planned development overlay district, they would have to meet those requirements.

Planning Director Richards noted that in two years per state law every lot in a single family residential zone would need to allow plexes, cottage clusters, and townhomes.

Senior Planner Darnell continued to the next housing type, tiny houses, which were permanent detached units that were no more than 400 square feet. He discussed the concept, guiding principles, and standards for these housing units. For units with an alley, the lot width would be 25 feet, lot depth would be 55 feet, and would result in a minimum 1,400 square foot lot. The setbacks would be smaller as well. For units without an alley, the lot width would be 35 feet, lot depth would be 60 feet, and it would result in a minimum 2,100 square foot lot. The parking required that for alleys, the parking would be in the rear. The infill would match the existing zone, subdivision, or planned development overlay district. He reviewed the diagrams that coincided with the development standards tables.

Commissioner Dirks discussed the need for places to park other than garages, especially for tiny homes. Putting no parking signs on the streets did not prevent people from parking on the streets.

Senior Planner Darnell moved to the next housing type, townhouses, which were attached units but each had its own private lot. He discussed the concept, guiding principles, and standards for these housing units.

Commissioner Butler questioned the requirement for a shared roof form. Senior Planner Darnell suggested removing that requirement.

Planning Director Richards asked what the value was for a shared roof form. Senior Planner Darnell said the intent was to be more compatible with the single family houses. He thought there were other ways to do that. One of the Universal Design Standards allowed developers to choose the roof form.

Commissioner Butler thought the concept of what was desired should be specific, but how to do it should not be so prescribed.

There was consensus to remove that requirement.

Senior Planner Darnell said there were not many differences in the design standards between units with alleys and those without alleys. The minimum lot width would be 20 or 22 feet, the side yard setbacks were zero where they were attached at the common walls and 7.5 feet would apply to the end units. The number of allowed adjoining units in a row would be different depending on where they were located and how they were accessed. If there was an alley, there could be a maximum of 8 in a row and without an alley there could be a maximum of 4 in one group and then a separation. For infill, the maximum would be 3.

There was discussion regarding the maximum for infill and making it dependent on a lot coverage ratio.

Senior Planner Darnell displayed the graphics that went along with the standards.

There was further discussion regarding how townhouses did not require common open space.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the next housing type, plexes which included duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes all on their own lots. He discussed the concept, guiding principles, and standards for these housing units.

Commissioner Butler asked about the differences between ADUs and plexes. Planning Director Richards said an ADU was defined by size relative to the primary unit, but if someone wanted to convert their home into three apartment units, they could do that now because of HB 2001 and do it as a triplex. Right now there could only be one ADU per single family dwelling unit. ADUs did not count towards density and was a way to get more housing. However, with HB 2001 they could get more units on lots. The state was working on the relationship between ADUs to all the other products. Right now triplexes were not allowed in the R-1 zone in McMinnville and if they allowed a single dwelling unit to have 2 ADUs people would say they were allowing too much density. The House Bill eliminated that discussion because it was saying the City had to allow up to fourplexes in single family dwelling unit zones. The State was now trying to define ADUs in that dialogue.

Commissioner Butler thought they should allow the same number of ADUs as plexes.

Planning Director Richards gave an example of Oak Ridge Meadows and how neighbors were concerned about the impact of 108 dwelling units due to transportation and quality of life. Now the state was saying they could allow fourplexes on each of those lots and if they also allowed four ADUs, there would be 8 dwelling units on one lot where previously people thought there would just be one. It would be a huge leap.

Commissioner Rankin thought the lot coverage ratio would be important in that scenario.

Senior Planner Darnell said the code was written that ADUs were only allowed as accessory to a single family dwelling, but that would get murky if they allowed plexes to be detached and the difference between two detached units as a duplex and a house and an ADU.

Planning Director Richards said that was the discussion taking place at the state level.

Commissioner Langenwaller asked about the difference between a detached fourplex and a cottage cluster.

Planning Director Richards said they were developed differently, but that had come up in the discussions as well. The difference between detached duplexes and a single family and ADU was there were two similarly sized units on the lot.

There was discussion regarding the intent for corner lot entrances to be on both streets and how that would not work for fourplexes.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed the last housing type, Accessory Dwelling Units. The language being proposed was the language currently in the code and no amendments or changes were being proposed. ADUs were described as being secondary to a single family dwelling unit. This might need to be updated based on HB 2001. The ADU would have its own kitchen, bathroom, sleeping area, and entrance. They could be located within, attached to, or detached from the primary dwelling.

Planning Director Richards said there had not been any issues with these standards in terms of barriers.

Senior Planner Darnell said the standards had been updated a few years ago. The ADU size was limited to 50% of the primary dwelling or 1,000 square feet, whichever was less. They used to be on their own separate utilities, but now they could share utilities with the primary dwelling. The building height had also been changed to a maximum of 25 feet or the height of the primary dwelling, whichever was less.

Commissioner Dirks asked how many ADUs were already built in the City. Planning Director Richards said it was less than a dozen.

Commissioner Dirks asked if the standards provided sufficient incentive or if people weren't that interested. Planning Director Richards said there had not been much interest. Where they had seen people putting in ADUs they were for vacation home rentals.

Commissioner Dirks asked if there needed to be looser standards for ADUs if it was a goal to encourage these. Planning Director Richards said they were not having conversations about barriers and did not think the standards needed to be changed. Stafford development had built some ADUs on their lots, but they were being sold for vacation home rentals.

Commissioner Langenwaller thought manufactured homes should be allowed to be ADUs. He thought they should be removed from the excluded category.

There was discussion regarding tiny homes being considered ADUs as long as they met the standards.

Senior Planner Darnell showed photos of different types of ADUs.

Commissioner Schanche suggested every photo have a caption under it.

Senior Planner Darnell said at the next work session the Commission would review the subdivision standards and development standards for cottage clusters and apartments.

There was discussion regarding the next steps.

Commissioner Dirks thought the document would be easy for people to understand and use. Planning Director Richards did not think it would be an easy dialogue for this community due to the density being introduced.

Commissioner Lizut thought pages 53 to 82 did a good job of pulling everything together. He suggested providing a visual that combined the Great Neighborhood Principles and design standards. It would show the complexity level and the relationship between the principles and standards.

#### **4. Commissioner Comments**

None

#### **5. Staff Comments**

Planning Director Richards suggested reviewing the City's planning codes and processes with the lens of if it was creating barriers for equity and inclusion. Staff could bring back options to a future meeting for paths to move forward.

There was consensus for staff to bring back options as suggested.

Planning Director Richards reviewed the items on next month's agenda which would be a Zoom public hearing. She said staff was working on a response to the remand of the Urban Growth Boundary discussion. It would not come to the Planning Commission, but would be a City Council decision. However the Commission could join the meetings.

## **6. Adjournment**

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.

---

Heather Richards  
Secretary