

# EXHIBIT 1

City of McMinnville  
Landscape Review Committee  
Regular Meeting

December 21, 2016, 12:00 p.m.  
Community Development Center  
McMinnville, Oregon

## MINUTES

Members Present: Chair Rob Stephenson, Committee Members Sharon Gunter, and Tim McDaniel

Members Absent: Committee Members RoseMarie Caughran and Josh Kearns

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell (Associate Planner)

Others Present: None

### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Stephenson called the meeting to order at 12:05 PM.

### **2. Approval of Minutes:**

Chair Stephenson asked the committee whether there were any suggested revisions to the October meeting minutes. Chair Stephenson stated that there was one correction required on Page 2, changing a statement that a landscape plan should not be required to a statement that an irrigation plan should not be required. Associate Planner Darnell stated that staff would make the correction. Hearing no other comments, Committee Member Gunter moved that the minutes from the November 16, 2016 regular meeting be approved. Committee Member McDaniel seconded. With no further discussion, the Landscape Review Committee members voted to approve the revised minutes unanimously.

### **3. Action Items**

#### **L 33-16**

Associate Planner Darnell introduced the application, which is a street tree removal request for the property at 738 NW Thomas Court. The removal request was generated in response to the applicant being required to repair a damaged sidewalk adjacent to their property and finding that the damage had been caused by tree roots. Staff explained that the applicant had provided an arborist's report, which identified the roots that had caused the sidewalk damage.

***Planning Department***

PHONE (503) 434-7311 FAX (503) 474-4955

and determined that trimming of the roots would cause significant damage to the tree. The arborist's report had recommended that the trees be removed and replaced.

Staff also stated that Public Works staff had completed an inspection, and agreed with the arborist's recommendation. However, due to poor original planting locations and conflicts with underground utilities, Public Works staff were recommending that only one of the trees be replaced.

Chair Stephenson asked about the process for sidewalk repair and how the tree removal works when the City required that the sidewalk be prepared. Staff stated that the adjacent property owner is still responsible for the tree removal. Chair Stephenson and Committee member Gunter expressed some concern with the fact that property owners would be responsible for both the sidewalk and the trees. Committee member Gunter stated that now that we have standards for planting, it shouldn't create an issue in the future, but it is still unfortunate that the owner would carry the full responsibility. Staff stated that the various departments were working together to be flexible with property owners when these types of situations arise, and that they have been providing adequate time for the owners to complete the necessary repairs. The committee discussed the possibilities of making funds available for these types of repairs, and staff stated that the ideas would be brought up the next time the discussion occurred between departments.

Committee Member Gunter moved that the request to remove the two street trees be approved. Committee Member McDaniel seconded. With no further discussion, the Landscape Review Committee members voted to approve the removal request, with the conditions as suggested by staff.

### **L 36-16**

Associate Planner Darnell suggested that the Street Tree Improvement Plan for the Barclay Heights Subdivision be moved up in the agenda, as it is related to the tree removal request that was just discussed and approved. The Committee agreed to move the agenda item up.

Associate Planner Darnell described the Street Tree Improvement Plan for the Barclay Heights Subdivision. The main issues that have been encountered in this subdivision are trees impacting surrounding infrastructure. In many locations within the subdivision, the street trees are very shallow rooted which has caused surface roots and large buttress roots to be located immediately under or adjacent to sidewalks, driveways, and streets. This has led to a number of street tree removal requests, including one reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee this month, as well as the City removing one tree recently due to its impact on ADA compliant sidewalk infrastructure at an intersection.

Staff stated that this had led Public Works staff to developing the draft Street Tree Improvement Plan for the subdivision, which would allow for street tree removal requests to be approved administratively. Chair Stephenson asked if replacement trees would still be required, and staff stated that that would be their intention. Associate Planner Darnell referenced the staff report and the photos of the street, which show a robust tree canopy throughout the subdivision. Chair Stephenson stated that the robust tree canopy created a

nice character in the neighborhood. Staff stated that it would be a priority to have any removed tree replaced.

Chair Stephenson asked if the property owner would still be responsible for all costs of removal. Staff stated that conditions of approval of the street tree improvement plan include that all street trees approved to be removed would follow the same street tree standards as all other street tree removal requests. The conditions of approval also include statements regarding the street tree standards that would be followed when replacement trees are required.

Chair Stephenson stated that some locations may not be good locations for tree replacement, which is why the trees are needing to be removed in the first place. Staff suggested that a condition of approval could be added stating that in the event there is a conflict with utilities, the replacement trees could be moved to a more suitable location. Chair Stephenson stated that it may not be reasonable to expect 100 percent replacement. Committee member Gunter agreed, stating that there might be locations where trees just should not have been planted, due to distances from utilities or driveways.

Committee Member Gunter stated that some common sense should be allowed during the tree removal and replacement, as some developers may have not planted trees in appropriate locations in the first place.

The committee discussed the street tree species that would be allowed, and didn't have any suggested changes from what was recommended by staff.

Committee Member Gunter moved that the street tree improvement plan request be approved as recommended by staff. Chair Stephenson seconded. With no further discussion, the Landscape Review Committee members voted to approve the tree removal request unanimously.

#### **L 34-16**

Associate Planner Darnell introduced the application and plan, which is a landscape plan for a new maintenance building to be constructed on the Hillside Manor property at 300 NW Hillside Parkway. Staff explained that the subject property is zoned R-4 PD Multiple Family Residential Planned Development, and that the planned development that is in place on the property was approved in July 1999, and a landscape plan for the property was subsequently approved by the Landscape Review Committee in December 1999. The original master plan for the area had shown a new community barn building in the open field area, with other features such as community garden areas that would be available for residents to use. The owners are now proposing to construct a pole building to function as the property's maintenance facility, instead of the community barn facility that was shown on the previously approved master plan.

Associate Planner Darnell stated that the Planning Department is treating the proposed request to construct the maintenance building with a new design and in a new location as a minor change to the master plan. Staff also stated that the Planning Department would only

consider the proposed changes to the master plan as minor if the landscaping from the 1999 landscape plan was also installed. Based on that, the landscape plan that the Landscape Review Committee is reviewing now is only for the perimeter plantings being proposed around the new maintenance building.

The committee reviewed the landscape plan from 1999, and was comfortable with the landscaping that was shown on the original plan. Staff stated that the original plan was very robust and provided for screening of the property from adjacent properties.

Committee member Gunter stated that many people use the walking path and it will be visible from that path and from the adjacent residential properties.

Associate Planner Darnell described the perimeter planting that is proposed around the new maintenance building. Chair Stephenson stated that the plan was somewhat vague, in that it did not specify the type of ornamental grass that is going to be planted. Staff stated that the applicant's intent was to plant ornamental grasses of a species consistent with the landscaping on the surrounding buildings. Committee member Gunter stated that she was comfortable with the planting of ornamental grasses, considering that the additional landscaping from the 1999 would also be installed to provide screening.

Chair Stephenson moved that the landscape plan be approved with the conditions as recommended by staff, along with a condition that will require the ornamental grasses to be consistent with the species of grasses used in landscaping on other portions of the site. Committee member Gunter seconded. With no further discussion, the Landscape Review Committee members voted to approve the landscape plan unanimously.

### **L 35-16**

Associate Planner Darnell introduced the application and plan, which is a landscape plan for the development of a wireless communication tower at 2050 NE Lafayette Avenue on the Yamhill County Fairgrounds property. Staff explained that there are two tests in the McMinnville Zoning Ordinance for landscaping around a wireless facility installation which include the standard Landscaping chapter requirements, but also include the Wireless Communication Facilities chapter landscaping requirements.

Associate Planner Darnell stated that the applicant is proposing to install a six foot sight-obscuring fence that is required by Section 17.55.050 (B) around the site. On the north side of the site, there are existing arborvitae and deciduous trees that are mature and about 25 feet in height currently provide screening. The applicant is proposing to retain those plantings, which meets the requirements of providing a 10 foot landscaped area and evergreen or similar type landscaping on the north side.

Chair Stephenson asked what the existing use was to the north of the wireless tower site. Staff stated that the property to the north is zoned commercial, but is actually a residential use, so screening of that site is important.

Associate Planner Darnell explained that the applicant is not providing landscaping on the south side of the site, as most of the south side is immediately adjacent to a building and the remaining portion of the south side must remain clear to allow for access into the site for maintenance. The applicant is arguing that the required 10 foot landscape buffer is not possible on the west and east sides of the site, due to the Wisser Horticulture Pavilion being located on the east side and a transformer being installed on the west side.

Associate Planner Darnell stated that staff did determine that a smaller clearance is allowed for landscaping around transformers, so staff has suggested that a condition of approval be added to require additional arborvitae on the west side of the site. Chair Stephenson stated that the additional arborvitae on the west side should be planted starting 3 feet north of the transformer, then planted 3 feet on center to the north until the arborvitae meet the existing arborvitae wall. Committee member McDaniel stated that that spacing would be necessary to create a full screening wall. Staff stated that the condition of approval could be amended to state that.

Associate Planner Darnell also explained that the east side of the site, while constrained, could accommodate a small amount of landscaping to provide screening of the fence and wireless communications infrastructure. Committee member Gunter stated that the Master Gardeners will be using the horticulture building to the east quite frequently, so the public will be in close proximity to the site. Staff stated that they had discussed this with the applicant, and that the applicant has proposed that an ivy wall, using Boston Ivy, could be added to the east side of the site. This ivy wall would be constructed with wire paneling to provide support for the ivy, and would create the screening effect that the Zoning Ordinance intends for while taking up less physical space.

Committee member Gunter stated that there may be concerns with ivy being planted in this area. Chair Stephenson stated that he liked the Boston Ivy, as long as it was maintained. Committee member Gunter stated that the condition of approval should state that the applicant will be responsible for maintaining the ivy to discourage spreading. Committee member McDaniel stated that based on the constraints of the site, the ivy wall may be the best treatment to meet the intent of the ordinance. He also stated that the Boston Ivy will provide for full screening and will provide for a great presentation of color in the fall. Staff has suggested that a condition of approval be added to require the ivy wall on the east side of the site.

Associate Planner Darnell explained that Section 17.55.050 (B) allows for the Planning Director to require "the addition of a proportional landscape area that will enhance the subject site either at a building perimeter, parking lot, or street frontage, adjacent to or within the subject site" when the applicant cannot provide the required 10 foot landscaped buffer. Staff stated that, based on the amount of landscaping being provided, a total of 1,245 additional square feet of landscaped area could be provided to provide the proportional landscape area. Staff has suggested that a condition of approval be added to require this proportional landscape area to be approved by the Planning Director. Committee member Gunter stated that she was comfortable with staff approving that additional landscaped area, as they can make a determination while they are out on the site completing inspections.

Chair Stephenson moved that the landscape plan be approved with the conditions as recommended by staff, along with a condition that will require the ivy wall to be maintained by the applicant. Committee member Gunter seconded. With no further discussion, the Landscape Review Committee members voted to approve the landscape plan unanimously.

**4. Discussion Items:**

There were no discussion items on the agenda.

**5. Citizen Comments**

There were no citizen comments.

**6. Committee Member Comments**

There were no committee member comments.

**7. Staff Comments**

There were no staff comments.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:54 PM.