

MINUTES

Members Present: Chair Stassens; Vice Chair Morgan; Commissioners Butler, Hillestad, Pietz, Thomas, Tiedge

Members Absent: Commissioners Hall and Chroust-Masin

Staff Present: Mr. Pomeroy, Ms. Haines, Ms. Morrison

1. Call to Order:

Chair Stassens called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Chair Stassens noted that the sound system was compromised and an alternative digital recording method would be used. Meeting commenced at 6:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: April 16, 2015

Chair Stassens called for action on the Planning Commission minutes from the April 16, 2015, meeting. Commissioner Butler offered a clarification to the minutes on page five regarding handicapped parking requirements that it was Ron Pomeroy who stated that Ms. Weatherman's building was built in the 1960's prior to the current parking regulations. Additional corrections were requested by Commissioner Morgan at the bottom of page five to clarify that it was Mr. Morgan who had asked questions about responding to Mr. Millegans' questions. On page eight, the dialogue in reference to driveway capacity should read that Commissioner Morgan, not commissioner Hall initiated the question. Commissioner Butler MOVED to APPROVE the minutes as amended; SECONDED by Commissioner Morgan. Motion PASSED unanimously.

3. Public Hearing (Quasi Judicial)

◆ Docket VR 1-15

Request: Approval of a variance to Section 17.60.060(A)(4) (Spaces-Number Required) of the McMinnville Zoning Ordinance to permit a reduction in the number of required vehicle parking spaces for a proposed eight-unit residential complex (from 12 to seven spaces).

Location: 433 NE 17th Street and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 06500, Section 16CB, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., W.M.

Applicant: Troy Haworth

Chair Stassens recognized the recent written submittals from Ms. Weatherman and Mr. Haworth and then closed the public hearing at 6:35 p.m. as there were no further comments from staff and moved to deliberation. Chair Stassens asked the commission to discuss the application.

Commissioner Tiedge commented that he listened to all testimony, including testimony regarding the future tenants of the property, and does not give weight to that testimony since contracts and owners change. Commissioner Tiedge noted that the ordinance involved is fairly simply stated that it does not distinguish between one or two bedrooms in reference to the number of parking spaces needed, nor does it take into account the accessibility to public transportation. Commissioner Tiedge felt that this is not a defect in the ordinance, and that this is an example of why the variance process exists; Commissioner Tiedge stated that he supports the variance.

Commissioner Butler commented that he would like to see at least one parking space for each apartment.

Commissioner Morgan asked the Planning Department if this were another apartment complex, how many spaces would be required. Mr. Pomeroy responded that there would need to be twelve -1 ½ spaces per apartment that has two bedrooms or less. Mr. Pomeroy also noted that with this proposal the applicant has asked for a specific number of parking spaces for a specific number of units and a particular purpose of use. The nature of this application effectively called for a thumbs up or thumbs down vote on the request rather than looking for a modification of the request.

Commissioner Morgan asked Commissioner Butler if the handicapped parking ratio request was seven to one.

Commissioner Butler answered that it was and that regardless of the use or intended use that the Planning Commission needed to plan for parking.

Commissioner Pietz stated that she recognized that on-street parking is a challenge in the area and that parking may not be adequate. Commissioner Pietz stated that the percentages of drivers reported by the applicant is accurate and would be adequate. Commissioner Pietz would consider approval for current use and recognized that it may be inadequate for future uses.

Chair Stassens stated that there is a strong precedence that less parking is required for this population. Chair Stassens states that the Commission needs to look at the application as it is presented. Chair Stassens stated that the application submitted meets the criteria for approval.

Commissioner Morgan asked staff if the Committee were to approve the application, could the committee add the condition that parking spaces would be only approved for the use as submitted. Ms. Haines responded that if the property use changed they may need to put in additional parking and referred Commissioner Morgan's question to Mr. Pomeroy. Mr. Pomeroy agreed with Ms. Haines and responded that he did not feel that the committee had the authority to encumber future uses of the property in that manner. In addition, Mr. Pomeroy stated that should the proposed apartment convert to general rent apartments in the future that they would most likely function similarly to residential units much as the units in the historic downtown area, which have no parking requirements at all. Mr. Pomeroy noted that there were other examples of this in the staff report.

Commissioner Hillestad noted that there was another way that the applicant could have approached the variance which was by shifting the building back and giving up some yard space, allowing for at least a few more parking spots. Commissioner Hillestad stated that he agreed with Commissioner Butler that the request was asking for too much of a variance and that he would like to accommodate

them if the applicant came back with a different approach. Commissioners Hillestad and Butler felt that the request was too much of a burden on the neighborhood.

Chair Stassens called for a motion.

Commissioner Morgan MOVED, based on the findings of fact and conclusionary findings for approval, and material submitted by the applicant and staff, that the Planning Commission recommends that VR 1-15 be APPROVED; Commissioner Tiedge SECONDED the motion. Motion PASSED by a majority vote, with five commissioners voting in FAVOR of the motion; Two Commissioners voting in OPPOSITION (Butler and Hillestad). Chair Stassens closed the hearing at 6:49 p.m.

4. Public Hearing (Quasi Judicial)

◆ Docket ZC 2-15

Request: Approval to amend Planned Development Ordinance No. 4978 to allow a reduction in the front yard setback from 15 to 10 feet, a reduction in the exterior side yard setback from 20 feet to 15 feet for all proposed lots, and a reduction in the interior side yard setback from six feet to zero feet for all garages proposed for construction for the remaining phases of this development.

Location: NE Grandhaven Street and east of NE Hembree Street

Applicant: Alan Ruden Inc.

Chair Stassens called the second agenda item to order at 6:51 p.m. and requested disclosures, abstentions, or objections to jurisdiction. Commissioner Morgan commented that most of the members of the Planning Committee knew Mr. Ruden from his past service with the Planning Commission.

Chair Stassens asked if any commissioners needed to declare any contact prior to this hearing with any of the applicants or any other party involved in this hearing or any other information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing and asked if any of the commissioners had visited the site. No further disclosures were made and three commissioners had visited the site but offered no comment.

Chair Stassens asked for staff to give a brief description of the application.

Mr. Pomeroy addressed the commission and reviewed the staff report. Mr. Pomeroy noted that the applicant's request was a duplication of setbacks to most of the properties in the first two phases of the Bungalows at Chegwin Village, but also included a setback reduction request for all street sides of the multiple family lot. The design concept for the multiple-family portion of the development is for all of the units to be outward facing and closer to the street, just as all of the single family homes in this neighborhood are close to the street. This would maintain a consistent street appearance and allow for symmetry in the neighborhood to continue. Parking would be on the interior portion of the lots behind all of the units and would be served by an alleyway design. The apartment block would effectively have four fronts. Mr. Pomeroy referenced item "F" on page two of the May 21, 2015, memo noting that all setbacks for multiple family lots are ten feet and garages would be on the interior of the block and not

affected by setbacks. This would allow the front yards to match the other phases of the Bungalows at Chegwin Village. Mr. Pomeroy recommended approval of the planned development amendment subject to the two conditions noted in the May 21, 2015, staff memorandum.

Further discussion ensued regarding the orientation of the proposed multiple-family units and garages.

Chair Stassens and Commissioner Morgan asked about setbacks between driveways and the face of the garages. Mr. Pomeroy responded that there would have to be a twenty foot parking stall length to accommodate a vehicle in addition to vehicle space in each garage. There would also need to be a two-way driving aisle with a minimum width of 24-feet. Mr. Pomeroy further noted that a subdivision review is also currently in process. As the proposed subdivision contains fewer than ten lots this is a Planning Director review and would not be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is only reviewing the setback amendment request.

Chair Stassens asked for commissioner questions for staff and there were none.

Chair Stassens asked the applicant to come forward.

Applicant Alan Ruden introduced himself and spoke to the committee about his request. Mr. Ruden stated that he concurred with staff's recommendation and that he would like to answer any questions that the commissioners had as he recognized that this request was a bit different.

Commissioner Morgan asked for confirmation from Mr. Ruden that there were zero setbacks for garages.

Mr. Ruden responded that the proposed subdivision has two bungalow lots similar to the last two phases and that the remaining lots are multi-family and a duplex. Mr. Ruden clarified the setbacks for Commissioner Morgan and noted that the overall project has a good design with an effort to keep a similar design and structure as the previous bungalows. There are 51 units in the process of being built, finished or to be built and Mr. Ruden would like to carry the previous design forward through the whole project.

Commissioner Tiedge asked if all garages are positioned behind the houses with zero setbacks. Mr. Ruden replied that most were and commented that there is a road near a park in the back of the houses. Some of the lots have front facing garages because of the park behind them rather than an alleyway. Commissioner Tiedge asked if it would make a difference with the zero setback for garages if the garage was up towards the front or behind the houses. Mr. Ruden replied that the garage setback for those units would be at least 20 feet from front yard property lines and are usually about 30 feet.

Commissioner Hillestad asked what the setback was on the side street, noting that the latest memo stated ten feet on all sides for multiple-family units, but the exterior side yard setbacks for single-family residences would still be 15 feet. Mr. Ruden replied that this was correct. Mr. Pomeroy confirmed that this was correct. Commissioner Hillestad stated he just wanted to make sure this was not a change.

Chair Stassens asked if there were any other questions and there were none.

Chair Stassens asked if anyone else had any questions that they would like to pose to the Chair to be addressed by the applicant or to any person that spoke in favor of the application. There were none.

Chair Stassens asked for any opposition, there was none.

Chair Stassens asked for any public agency testimony.

Mr. Pomeroy responded that all public agency comments were included in the first staff report.

Chair Stassens asked for any other comments and there were none.

The applicant waived the seven-day time period allowed to submit final written arguments in support of the application, and Chair Stassens closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Chair Stassens asked the committee if they wished to discuss the matter any further. Commissioner Morgan stated that the Commission had already approved similar requests to prior phases of this development and that he had no concerns. Chair Stassens called for a Motion. Commissioner Butler MOVED, based on the findings of fact and conclusionary findings for approval, and material submitted by the applicant and staff, that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve ZC 2-15 subject to the conditions noted in the staff report. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Hillestad; Motion APPROVED unanimously. Chair Stassens noted that the decision may be appealed to the City Council by filing notice with the Planning Department within fifteen days of the date that the decision is mailed to those who participated in the hearing.


The public hearing was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

5. Old/New Business

- Mr. Pomeroy stated that there was no old business to discuss and that there is no hearing scheduled for the June Planning Commission meeting.
- Chair Stassens asked about ordinances and Mr. Pomeroy stated that there were none.

6. Adjournment

Chair Stassens MOVED to adjourn the meeting; Motion PASSED unanimously and the meeting was ADJOURNED at 7:11 p.m.



Doug Montgomery
Secretary