



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

February 15, 2018
Planning Commission
Work Session Meeting

5:30 pm
McMinnville Civic Hall, 200 NE 2nd Street
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Vice-Chair Zack Geary, Commissioners: Erin Butler, Susan Dirks, Gary Langenwalter, Roger Lizut, and Lori Schanche

Members Absent: Martin Chroust-Masin and Erica Thomas

Staff Present: David Koch – City Attorney, Chuck Darnell – Associate Planner, and Heather Richards – Planning Director

1. Call to Order

Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Discussion Items:

- **Historic Single Family Homes in General Commercial Zone**

Associate Planner Darnell said this topic was brought to the City's attention by a homeowner who lived south of downtown who owned a single family home that was zoned General Commercial. There were other single family homes in this zone that were considered non-conforming uses. The use could change from single family to General Commercial, but it was not allowed to go back to single family. There were some houses that had been sitting on the market for extended periods of time because of that. Most of the areas around downtown were zoned General Commercial, however there was an Office Residential zone that allowed for residential and commercial uses. The purpose of the Office Residential zone was to provide a transition and buffer area between commercial and residential areas and to provide an incentive for the preservation of old and historic structures. It allowed for all residential uses, single family, duplexes, and multi-family, and allowed for some limited commercial use that would not have much impact, such as professional offices. It had been used well for these purposes on the south side of town and had been used more sparingly on the north side of town. He then showed examples from both areas. This had been discussed with the Historic Landmarks Committee regarding preservation of historic resources. The Committee was supportive of using this zone to preserve historic structures. An inventory was done of the area around downtown of properties that either looked to be used as single family homes or still retained all of the characteristics of single family homes. He then showed examples of these homes and how some were used as offices and ones which had historical designations. He had looked at additional areas with the HLC and had identified an area north of downtown between Baker and Davis and there was another full block on the south side of town that had these structures. He asked whether staff should continue looking into the issue. The next step would be identifying specific properties to

consider and looking at other areas for possible rezoning where it would create a buffer between commercial and residential. There would also need to be outreach to property owners and to look at existing uses to make sure they made sense with the zone.

There was discussion regarding the process to make this zoning change.

Planning Director Richards said it could be viewed as a down zoning and there would be notices sent and a public hearing held before any changes were made. This gave the City the opportunity to be thoughtful about how this would work. There were currently situations where properties were not able to be utilized for their original use and were historic resources that the community did not want to be torn down.

JW Millegan, McMinnville resident, had been a land use planner and had helped approve McMinnville's Comprehensive Plan 40 years ago. The thought at that time was the downtown commercial area would expand into the surrounding area and no one wanted to live downtown. Things had changed and he had moved into his house on NE 2nd illegally as he was using it as a residence. It was a 1911 historic home, and since moving there he had moved his business there as well and it was now legal. His son tried to buy the historic house next door and it needed to be remodeled, but because of the zoning the bank would not lend on it. His son would have to use commercial terms, which was 20-30% down and a 20 year amortization. They thought about buying the historic house behind it, which was a 1890s house, but they could not get financing for it because it was in terrible condition and he could not get any residential loans on it and they had to do owner carry. People were moving back into this area near downtown. These historic homes could not be restored because there were no loans available, and eventually they would have to be torn down. He thought the zoning should be changed to Office Residential.

Carol White, McMinnville resident, lived on NE 1st and had a second lot that had not been built on. She would like to build a house there for her children, but with the current zoning that was not an option. She planned to continue to live in her house as she thought it was a nice area. She was excited about this proposal.

Planning Director Richards said staff could bring this back to the Commission in two months to allow time for staff to do an evaluation of properties.

There was discussion regarding any unintended consequences with this change.

There was consensus to proceed with changing the zoning in the downtown transitional areas as a test case.

- **Downtown/NE Gateway Parking**

Commissioner Geary disclosed he was working on a project that could be impacted by this discussion. It was a potential conflict of interest.

Planning Director Richards said there had recently been some parking issues in the NE Gateway District and downtown. She explained the location of the Gateway District. The vision for the area had changed into more of a mixed use, craftsman, industrial area that had higher intensity in terms of pedestrian and residential uses. She explained the mixed use zoning on Alpine Avenue and how there was an Urban Renewal District that had been applied to it and tax increment financing to help make the projects happen. There was an intention that a festival district would be there as well and with it the opportunity to bring a lot of vitality and people. There was renewed interest in development on Alpine, however parking was an issue. There

were a lot of existing large industrial users who were served by long freight trucks and promises had been made that there would be truck turning movements placed on the streets. Two streets were not included in that promise, 9th Avenue between Alpine and Lafayette and 11th Way between Alpine and Lafayette. There were two vacant properties that were on the market for potential redevelopment and there was interest in both of them. Some of the parking waivers for this area included: the first 3,000 square feet of any non-residential use did not require parking, shared parking and off-site parking within 500 linear feet was allowed, parking could be waived or reduced if there was a demonstrated need, lots that were less than 20,000 square feet that had a change in use or redevelopment that did not increase the size of the building did not require parking, and if the property was within 500 linear feet of an off-site parking lot a shared parking agreement could be done. She had taken the current regulations to the Urban Renewal Agency Committee to get an understanding of why they were created the way they were. The message back from them was that it was not specific to any property, but that they had thought these were good tools to apply to the district. The problems that the two vacant properties were encountering were that the lots were small and land was a premium to be able to do high density residential or mixed use commercial that achieved the vision of this area. These lots did not fit the less than 20,000 square feet provision and the current residential requirements were 1.5 parking spaces per unit in a multi-family product. Typically in a tighter urban environment it was 1 parking space per unit. There was a project that had been proposed for 36 apartment units that would have been a market rate apartment project that catered to the millennial employee population. They could not make it pencil out due to the amount of parking required. There was another project currently under contract, however it had a zero property line setback and unless they took down part of the existing historic building they would have no place for parking. She recommended to change the 20,000 square feet redevelopment provision to 25,000 square feet and to change the residential parking requirements to one per unit for multi-family in this area. The City was also working on how to bring additional public parking to the area. They could look at 9th and 11th Way, which were not truck turning streets, for perpendicular parking. To make it work, the property owner would have to dedicate 10 additional feet, but it would bring parking to their project.

There was discussion regarding the size of the truck turning streets and where people would park if the parking requirement was waived. Planning Director Richards discussed the option of shared parking agreements with the larger commercial developments on Lafayette. The Urban Renewal Plan had money set aside for improvements along Lafayette to create pedestrian crossings.

There was consensus to move forward with the recommendations of staff.

Planning Director Richards discussed the parking issues downtown. She explained the areas where there were reduced parking requirements, and some areas where parking was not required. There were no reductions south of 3rd Street, although there was no difference in zoning or conditions. She then reviewed a parking study that had been done for downtown, which showed the parking congestion on 3rd Street and in the downtown core. In those areas there was already no parking required. There was the ability to do a reduced parking program south of 3rd Street. She recommended looking at a half parking zone that was currently placed on the northern side of downtown and consider placing it on the southern side as well.

There was consensus to move forward as staff recommended.

Commissioner Schanche discussed the problems behind Toyota where people were parking their RVs. She asked if there was somewhere in town that an RV area could be set up.

Planning Director Richards said on February 21 the City Council would discuss the issue of RVs in the right-of-way and if there was a place that could be designated for this particular use. There was an RV park in McMinnville that had open spots, but you had to pay for them. There was also the issue of people who could not pay for a spot and needed temporary help. The Homelessness Subcommittee was looking into a vehicular camping program to address that issue.

3. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 6:28 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary