

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION**

DATE & TIME: Thursday, March 20, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Council Chambers, 486 Third Street, Lafayette, OR 97127

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. FLAG SALUTE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**
- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. January 16, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.....1*
 - b. February 20, 2025 Special Joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting Minutes...4*
- 6. WORK SESSION**
 - a. Parks Master Plan.....7*
- 7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- 8. NEXT MEETING**
 - a. April 17, 2025*
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Council Chambers is accessible. If you need an accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or wish to participate remotely, please notify the City at (503) 864-2451 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

City of Lafayette
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday January 16, at 6:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Kerr called to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE: Chair Kerr lead flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL: Chair Kerr called the Roll:

Present: Chair Ron Kerr, Stephen Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb

City Staff Present: Jim Jacks, City Planner; Nicole Laudisio, City Development Clerk

Not Present: David Rogers, Sheila Neuman

Others: Russell Burrows

4. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

None.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a. November 21, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Adamson made a motion to approve the November 21, 2024, Minutes and Commissioner Meola seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

b. December 19, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Belding made a motion to approve the December 19, 2024, Minutes and Commissioner Adamson seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

6. PUBLIC HEARING:

a. Housing Amendments (LA 2024-01)

City Planner Jim Jacks began the public hearing on Housing Amendments (LA 2024-01). Russell Burrows inquired if the name “LA 2024-01” is correct since this is being discussed in 2025, and Jim Jacks clarified that these amendments began in 2024. Chair Kerr recommended starting on page 24 of City Planner Jim Jacks Housing Amendments staff report and Jim Jacks mentioned that there is an addendum for the minimum of townhouse attachment lengths to be four feet that was included after the staff report was distributed. City Planner Jim Jacks discussed a change in language due to recent housing bills that aim to move away from focusing on a family unit. Commissioner

Adamson asked about the final single-room occupancy square footage regulations that were decided upon in the previous meeting and City Planner Jim Jacks clarified that in the R-1 district it is 7,000 square feet for the first four units and 2,000 square feet for each additional unit and in the R-2 it is 5,000 square feet for the first four units and 1,500 square feet for each additional unit. City Planner Jim Jacks went over Senate Bill 1537 which changes land use decision types- property line adjustments, partition replats, subdivision and subdivision replat, and extension, alteration, or expansion of a nonconforming use are now Limited Land Use Type I-C actions that will be decided by City staff. Chair Kerr asked for comments from proponents of the housing amendments, none were offered; he then asked for any comments in opposition to the housing amendments, none were offered. Chair Kerr makes a motion to approve the Housing Amendments (LA 2024-01), and Commissioner Meola seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

b. Floodplain Overlay District (FPO) Amendments (LA2024-02)

Chair Kerr began the public hearing and City Planner started on page 3 of his Floodplain Overlay District Amendments Staff Report. The City Council had discussed which of the FEMA pre-implementation compliance measures the city would select and decided on the model ordinance on November 14th, 2024. City Planner Jim Jacks continued to page 4 of his FPO District Amendments Staff Report with language deletion, changes to the nomenclature, and additions to the definitions. City Planner Jim Jacks explained AE Flood Zones are where the flood information study from 1988 established the height for the 100-year flood. Commissioner Webb asked if there is a requirement of a licensed surveyor if future land being developed is added to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) that was originally outside the scope of the 1988 study. City Planner Jim Jacks explained that to build in the floodplain an elevation certification is required and that can only be done by a state licensed surveyor. City Planner Jim Jack's continued to page 26 of the FPO District Amendments Staff Report to the regulations for garages, the home itself must be one foot above the 100-year flood height but that does not apply to garages attached or detached. City Planner Jim Jacks proceeded to page 33 of the FPO District Amendment Staff Report to the standards for protecting a special flood hazard area floodplain function and that included new language to be added about no net loss standards and undeveloped space. Commissioner Adamson asked about developments that occur outside of the UGB that may be incorporated into

the UGB and what floodplain standards will apply to those areas. City Planner Jim Jacks explained that those properties outside of the city limits and UGB are subject to the floodplain regulations of the county; the county’s floodplain regulations are the same as the city’s floodplain regulations. Chair Kerr asked for proponents for the floodplain overlay district and Russell Burrows thanked City Planner Jim Jacks for his work and for providing more clarification to the floodplain overlay district as the City Council did not have much time to go over it. Chair Kerr asked for comments from the opponents of the floodplain overlay district and there were none. Chair Kerr makes a motion to approve the Housing Amendments (LA 2024-01). and Commissioner Adamson seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

7. NEW BUSINESS:

None.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

City Planner Jim Jacks explained Lafayette Auto-Body’s approved site development review and non-conforming use extension that expires on February 6, 2025, they will need their permits to be approved, and work started by that date.

9. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

10. NEXT MEETING:

a. February 20, 2025 (Joint Work Session with City Council on Parks Master Plan)

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Kerr moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Adamson seconded; the motion passed unanimously (aye- Ron Kerr, Sethan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

Minutes approved on the 20th day of February 2025.

CERTIFIED:

ATTESTED:

Ron Kerr, Chair

Nicole Laudisio, Community Development Clerk

City of Lafayette
Planning Commission and City Council Work Session Minutes
Thursday February 20, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Kerr called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.
2. **FLAG SALUTE:** Chair Kerr and Mayor Malcomson led the flag salute.
3. **ROLL CALL:** Kennedee Richardson called the Roll:
Present: Chair Ron Kerr, Stephen Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb, David Rogers, Sheila Neuman, Mayor Hilary Malcomson, Joseph Carswell, Jessica Kitt, Russell Burrows
City Staff Present: Branden Dross, City Administrator; Kennedee Richardson, City Recorder; Jim Jacks, City Planner; Nicole Laudisio, City Development Clerk; Greg Robinson, Public Works Manager
Not Present: Kayla Paulsen, Lee Gilgan
Others: Augusta (no last name given), Olivia (no last name given)
4. **WORK SESSION:**
 - a. *Presentation on Yamhill River Steering Committee*

City Administrator Dross introduced the presenters from the Yamhill River Steering Committee, Augusta, and Olivia; They both focus on bringing tourism revenue to Yamhill Country through river access, Olivia works with Visit McMinnville and Augusta works with Willamette Valley Visitors Association. Augusta provided background information that led to this project- in recent years there was a demand from communities for improved recreational river access and according to the Oregon State Marine Board the geographic scope is about 120 miles of river. Olivia went through the next tentative steps, the first immediate action would be local municipalities, including Lafayette, signing a non-binding collaborative agreement that is an acknowledgment of cross-jurisdictional support. Olivia continued to the tentative plans for Spring 2025 which included continued technical team assistance and community engagement efforts with a focus on private landowners who are alongside the identified sites to-be developed. Commissioner Webb asked what kind of technical assistance is provided and Augusta answered that it includes capacity, meeting coordination, community engagement, site inventory, GIS mapping, and overall support. Mayor Malcomson clarified that the proposed site we are discussing is Terry Park and not Locks Loop which is outside of Lafayette jurisdiction. City Administrator Dross stated that he will bring the non-binding agreement to the City Council at their March 13th meeting to discuss. Mayor Malcomson thanked Augusta and Olivia for their presentation.

b. Parks Master Plan Revisions

City Administrator Dross opened the work session for the Parks Master Plan revisions and emphasized this meeting is to give direction to the Planning Commission and to align the Planning Commission and the City Council on the goals of the parks master plan revisions. Mayor Malcomson started on page 96 of the staff report focusing on the results

of the Lafayette Citizen's 2024 park survey question- for future park development, would you support any of the follow?; the two options that received the most votes from residents were general tax revenue and state/federal grant funding followed by a bond measure. Commissioner Webb suggested contacting local non-profits for financial support such as Friends of Lafayette Parks or local soccer clubs. Mayor Malcomson asked City Administrator Dross if our income from SDCs is starting to taper out and he explained we get SDCs from new development and we do not have any plans for large developments that would draw-in new SDC funds. City Administrator Dross pointed out that maintenance and upkeep needs to be factored into the financial aspects. Commissioner Belding asked if there is a history of bonds failing or passing in Lafayette and City Administrator Dross stated there was a bond for a new combined city hall and fire department but that did not pass but a bond for just a new fire department passed after the original combo bond. Commission Chair Kerr suggested giving citizens an idea of what their money will get them so they can make an informed decision about park finances. Discussion ensued and Mayor Malcomson asked to focus on the three main parks: Terry Park, Commons Park, and Veterans Park. Commission Chair Kerr went over the results of the parks survey questions pertaining to what the citizens would like each park to become on pages 94 and 95 of the staff report; Veterans park received the most votes for a dog park followed by a walking path, Terry Park received the most votes for a family picnic style park followed by recreational activities, and Commons Park had varied results with Event/Entertainment, Water Feature, and Sports Facilities all receiving similar amounts of votes. Mayor Malcomson suggested that Veterans Park will have a walking path, dog park features, and possibly dedication for dogs who are veterans of war, Terry Park could possibly receive support from the Yamhill River Steering Committee so we do not want to overdevelop that park, and Commons Park could get a small play structure and a basketball court that is covered serving dual purpose as a gathering space as well. Councilor Burrows suggested changing the name of Veterans Park to Heros Park to encompass veterans and first responders and including a water fountain for dogs if it becomes a dog park. Discussion ensued. Malcomson asked the City Councilors if they are in favor of Veterans Park being a dog park down the road and the councilors were in favor of a dog park. Mayor Malcomson asked what councilors and commissioners would like to see Terry Park become and Councilor Burrows stated he would like to see a dock on the Yamhill River, the east end having boat and kayak access, and a skatepark. Councilor Kitt asked if there is any liability for the city if someone is injured at the city park or a possible skatepark and City Administrator Dross explained the city could create a recreational liability ordinance and install signs warning users of liability. Commissioner Neuman explained that there is only about a mile of useable river way for recreation because of waterfalls and locks on the river that limit use. Mayor Malcomson stated that it seemed like the City Council and Planning Commission agree that Terry Park will retain the natural aspects of the park; Mayor Malcomson continued on to Commons Park, Councilor Burrows stated that he envisioned a walking path and public bathrooms in Commons Park and possibly a covered elevated stage for events. Commissioner Webb used an aerial view on Google Maps of Commons Park to show the lack of parking that he has noted at events held at Commons Park. Discussion ensued. Mayor Malcomson confirmed that they are aiming for recreational sports and older kid activities in Commons Park. City Administrator Dross recommended that the councilors

and commissioners keep in mind that all the money in the SDC fund is not for parks and to aim for spending half of the fund on the Master Park Plan. Commissioner Webb mentioned partnerships with local nonprofits such as Friends of Lafayette Parks to give a vehicle for volunteers and local businesses to donate money as an alternate financial supplement. City Administrator Dross informed the City Council that he will give rolling updates on the Planning Commissions progress discussing the Master Parks plan further, around six months from now the Planning Commission will have something to present to the City Council.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

Commissioner Belding moved to adjourn; Commissioner Neuman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. No further discussion.

Minutes approved on the 20th day of March 2025.

CERTIFIED:

ATTESTED:

Ron Kerr, Chair

Nicole Laudisio, City Development Clerk

City of Lafayette

486 Third Street, P.O. Box 55

Lafayette, Oregon 97127

Phone: (503) 864-2451 Fax: (503) 864-4501



TO: LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JIM JACKS, CITY PLANNER

SUBJ: WORK SESSION TO DISCUSS CHAPTER'S 2 (Socio-Economic Information) and 5 (Proposed Park Improvements) OF THE 2013 LAFAYETTE PARKS MASTER PLAN (LA 2024-02)

DATE: March 20, 2025

I. BACKGROUND

The March 20, 2025 work session follows-up on the July 11, October 17, and the November 21, 2024 Planning Commission (PC) work sessions, and the November 14, 2024 City Council (CC) work session, and the February 20, 2025 Joint Planning Commission and City Council work session.

The purpose of the March 20, 2025 PC work session is to continue the consensus reached at the February 20, 2025 Joint Planning Commission and City Council work session. Veterans, Commons and Terry Parks are the focus for this 2024/2025 Parks Master Plan Update.

The mostly updated socio-economic information in Chapter 2 is attached to this staff report. The primary focus, however, of the March 20 meeting is Chapter 5, Proposed Park Improvements. The existing Chapter 5 is attached.

The 2013 Plan is 12-years old and an update of the Plan's Chapters 2 and 5 will reflect the conditions in 2025.

As noted in the staff report for the October 17, 2024, work session, because most of the City's parks are small, it would be challenging for any one given park to include multiple recreation elements.

Terry (5.5 ac.), Commons (1.1 ac.) and Joel Perkins Parks (1.1 ac.) are the largest. Veterans Park is 0.64 acres. Joel Perkins Park is not the subject of this review because it is built-out with the picnic pavilion and Public Works water facility building (northwest portion), kid play equipment (southwest portion), park bathrooms (northeast portion), and open space with sandbox/kid play equipment (southeast portion).

II. SUMMARY OF THE 2/20/25 JOINT PC/CC WORK SESSION

The draft minutes of the February 20, 2025 joint PC and CC work session are attached. Representatives from Visit McMinnville (Olivia) and the Willamette Valley Visitors Association (Augusta) spoke to the issue of recreational river access to the Willamette River and its primary tributaries such as the Yamhill River. Olivia indicated the first immediate step would be for the City sign a non-binding collaborative agreement that would acknowledge cross-jurisdictional support to increase recreational river access. The non-binding agreement is in the March 13, 2025 packet for the CC to adopt.

Further activity in 2025 will include continued technical team assistance and community engagement efforts with a focus on private land owners who are alongside the identified sites to be developed.

Lafayette's identified Yamhill River access is Terry Park. The Yamhill County Locks Loop Park is not within Lafayette's jurisdiction.

For Veterans Park, the most comments by citizens in the parks survey questions favored a dog park, and a walking park was second.

Terry Park was favored for family picnic style facilities and recreational facilities were second.

Commons Park included varied results with event/entertainment, water feature and sports facilities all receiving similar amounts of votes.

As Mayor Malcomson inquired of the CC and with the PC also commenting, the consensus was:

Veterans Park (possibly to be renamed Heroes Park): Dog park.

Terry Park: Retain natural aspects of the park.
Dock and boat/kayak access.
Skatepark.

Commons Park: Recreational sports (older kid activities).
Other possibilities: Walking path. Bathrooms. Covered elevated stage for events. Covered basketball could, possibly, provide cover for a stage.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the above and Chapter 5, and discuss the existing list of improvements for each Park and possible changes to the list for each Park.

Chapter 2

Community Profile

Lafayette’s location and characteristics present opportunities and constraints for the community’s park system. This chapter describes socioeconomic data for Lafayette. Demographic trends provide an understanding of present and future park needs. Development trends provide information on the rate, type, and location of growth. These factors should be considered when siting future park facilities and in prioritizing capital improvements. The community profile information can also be used in grant proposals to fund specific parks and recreation improvements.

Demographic Characteristics

Population

Table 2-1 shows population trends from 1970 to 2020 for Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon. Lafayette grew at an average annual growth rate (AAGR) of 7.2 percent between 1990 and 2000, 3.75 percent between 2000 and 2010, and 1.69 percent between 2010 and 2020. The growth rate between 2010 and 2020 was higher than the 0.83 percent AAGR of Yamhill County and the 1.01 percent of Oregon.

Table 2-1. Population Trends in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon 1970 - 2020

Year	Lafayette	AAGR	Yamhill County	AAGR	Oregon	AAGR
1970	786		40,213		2,091,385	
1980	1,215	4.5%	55,332	3.25%	2,633,105	2.3%
1990	1,292	0.2%	65,551	1.7%	2,842,321	0.8%
2000	2,586	7.2%	84,992	2.6%	3,421,399	1.85%
2010	3,740	3.75%	99,193	1.55%	3,831,074	1.15%
2020	4,423	1.69%	107,722	0.83%	4,237,256	1.01%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2010, 2020 and MWVCOG.

State law requires city population forecasts to be coordinated with county-level forecasts (ORS 195.025 to 195.036). For the 2004 Lafayette Parks Master Plan, Yamhill County and Lafayette developed a coordinated forecast of 5,257 population through 2025 (a rate of 3 % per year). The 3 percent per year forecast was too high because as of July 1, 2024, the Oregon Population Research Center (PRC) estimated Lafayette’s population was 4,563 (694 more than the forecast).

In 2012 Yamhill County contracted with the PRC to develop a forecast for the County and the 10 cities in the County out to the year 2032 in 5-year increments. The average annual growth rate of the increments ranged from 1.8% per year to 2.1% per year. The Lafayette forecast was 4,874 in 2025 (311 more than the July 1, 2024 estimate of 4,563). The forecast was higher than the estimate. The 2012 forecast showed Lafayette’s population at 5,552 in 2032, and that figure was used in the 2013 Parks Master Plan to estimate future parkland needs for Lafayette.

The Oregon Population Research Center’s 2024 County-wide coordinated forecast for the Lafayette UGB (as of 2024) out to 2054 is 6,907 (a 30-year forecast). The following shows the 5-year increments:

- 2029: 4,989 at a 1.36% average annual increase.
- 2034: 5,318 at a 1.29% average annual increase.
- 2039: 5,661 at a 1.26% average annual increase.
- 2044: 6,031 at a 1.27% average annual increase.
- 2049: 6,441 at a 1.32% average annual increase.
- 2054; 6,907 at a 1.14% average annual increase.

The future need for additional parkland presented in Chapter 7, Parkland Acquisition Plan, uses the 2024 Population Research Center coordinated forecast of 6,907 in 2054.

Future population growth will create increased demand for all types of infrastructure, including parks. By 2054, the existing parks system will be servicing a larger population. The City will need to acquire new parkland to achieve the National Recreation and Park Association’s recommended national level of service.

Age Characteristics

Age is a factor in parks planning. Each age group has different needs and desires. Current and future age distribution of a community can influence the facilities and amenities offered in parks.

The 2000 U.S. Census showed the median age in Lafayette was 30.7 years which was younger than the median age for Yamhill County, 34.1 years, and Oregon, 36.3 years. The 2010 Census showed the median age in Lafayette was 33.2 which was 2.5 years older than in the 2000 Census, but it was younger than the 2010 Census median age for Yamhill County, 36.8 years, and Oregon, 38.4 years.

The 2020 U.S. Census showed the median age in Lafayette was 34.2 years which was younger than the median age for Yamhill County, 39.3 years, and Oregon, 36.3 years.

Figure 2-2 shows that Lafayette included a similar percentage in the less than 5-years old category and a lower percentage in the 65+ age group than Yamhill County or the State of Oregon.

Figure 2-2. Age Distributions in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon in 2020

	< 5 years	5 – 19	20 – 44	45 - 64	65+
Lafayette	5.3%	19.3%	35.9%	31.6%	7.9%
Yamhill Co.	5.6	19.5	32.7	25.0	17.2
Oregon	5.5	17.7	34.0	25.3	17.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2020

Lafayette includes higher percentages in the younger age groups and lower percentages in the older age groups than Yamhill County or the State of Oregon.

Race and Ethnicity

The 2010 U.S. Census data for race and ethnicity for Lafayette, Yamhill County and Oregon showed Lafayette is more diverse than Yamhill County or Oregon. The data shows 10.6 percent of Oregon’s population was of Hispanic or Latino origin, Yamhill County was 13.6 percent and Lafayette was 27.7

percent. During 2010 to 2020 Lafayette’s population maintained its diversity in ethnic and racial composition. Table 2-2 summarizes the trends and shows the Hispanic population in Lafayette decreased slightly from 27.7 percent to 24.6 percent of the city’s total population from 2010 to 2020.

Table 2-2. Race and Ethnic Composition in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon, 2010¹ and 2020¹

Race/Ethnicity	Lafayette		Yamhill County		Oregon	
	2010	2020	2010	2020	2010	2020
White	81.9%	70.4%	86.4%	77.7%	86.2%	74.8%
Black	0.0%	0.3%	0.7%	0.8%	1.7%	2.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.7%	2.6%	1.5%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0%	1.6%	1.2%	1.7%	3.8%	5.0%
Other Race	13.0%	12.7%	6.9%	7.6%	3.3%	6.3%
Two or More Races	4.5%	12.5%	2.4%	10.4%	3.3%	10.5%
Hispanic or Latino Origin (of any race)	27.7%	24.6%	13.6%	16.5%	10.6%	13.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2010 and 2020

¹ Percentages may add to more than 100 percent because individuals may report more than one race.

School Enrollment

The 2020 U.S. Census shows the median age in Lafayette (34.2 years) is younger than for Yamhill County (39.3 years) or Oregon (36.3 years). According to the 2010 Census, 34.4 percent of the population in Lafayette was 19 years of age or younger compared to 28.5 percent in Yamhill County and 25.4 percent in Oregon.

The 2000 Census showed 51.3 percent of the Lafayette residents enrolled in school were children attending elementary school (grades 1-8) and that number declined to 45.5% in 2020. The percent of Lafayette residents enrolled in school in grades 9-12 varied with 19.8% in 2000, 31.7% in 2010 and 15.1% in 2020.

Table 2-3. School Enrollment in Lafayette in 2000, 2010 and 2022

School Enrollment	Lafayette 2000	Lafayette 2010	Lafayette 2022
Nursery School, Preschool	7.5%	4.1%	5.5%
Kindergarten	10.5%	6.2%	9.8%
Elementary school (grades 1-8)	51.3%	50.4%	45.5%
High school (grades 9-12)	19.8%	31.7%	15.1%
College or graduate school	10.8%	7.5%	24.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2000 and 2010, and ACS 2018-2022 5-Year Estimates (2022)

Housing Trends

Housing Tenure

Housing characteristics provide information that can be useful for parks planning. The rate, type, and location of housing development are important variables that provide information on where future parks could be located. Moreover, this data is useful for parks planning because it gives insight into the potential funding base (e.g., property taxes and systems development charge fees).

According to the 2020 U.S. Census, 88.9 percent of the occupied housing units in Lafayette were owner-occupied which was significantly higher than for either Yamhill County or Oregon (see Table 2-4). The 88.9% ownership was an increase from the 78.9% ownership in 2010. The 2020 Census shows the average household size of owner-occupied units is 2.97 people and is 3.69 for renter-occupied households.

Table 2-4. Housing Tenure and Average Household Size by Housing Tenure in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon, 2022

Housing Tenure	Lafayette	Yamhill County	Oregon
Owner-occupied	88.9%	69.4%	63.2%
Renter-occupied	11.1%	30.6%	36.8%
Average household size of owner-occupied units	2.97	2.7	2.57
Average household size of renter-occupied units	3.69	2.54	2.26

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2018-2022 5-Year Estimates

The City’s housing stock is heavily weighted to detached single family housing. The only apartment development in the City is the approximately 30-year old 30-unit Abbey Heights Apartments at 12th and N. Bridge Street on 3.1 acres.

Building Permits

Lafayette has experienced significant residential growth since 2000. Census data showed 406 new residences were constructed between 1990 and March 2000 which represented about 46 percent of all the residential units identified in the 2000 Census. Several subdivisions were developed in the north-central and northeast portions of the City. In 2021 the 238-lot Meadowbrook Subdivision in the northwest portion of the City began building out and as of February 4, 2025 21 lots in Phase 4 were vacant and the 50-lot Phase 5, the last phase, remained to be platted.

Table 2-5. Residential Site-Built Building Permits Issued in Lafayette, 2001- 2024

Year	Residential Building Permits
2001-2005	313
2006-2010	169
2011-2015	111
2016-2020	66
2021-2024	145
Total	804

Source: City of Lafayette, 2024.

From 2001 through 2023 the City issued 805 building permits for new “site-built” residences as shown in Table 2-5. From 2003 through 2010 an additional 31 manufactured home set-up permits were issued.

The Park System Development Charge (SDC) was not adopted and effective until 2004, but the above data gives an indication of how many housing starts contributed to the Park SDC fund. The Park SDC program collects funds from new residential development, places them in a dedicated fund to buy parkland, construct new parks and purchase park and recreation equipment and facilities. The Park SDC funds cannot be used for maintenance.

Economy

The economy of Yamhill County is shifting from a dependence on the forest products industry to an economy with expanding technology, service, and tourism sectors. Agriculture still plays a dominant role in the county economy and the expanding local wine industry brings together the agricultural and tourism sectors. With its small-town character, location between McMinnville and Newberg, and within commuting distance to the Portland Metro Area, Lafayette serves as a “bedroom community” and provides quality of life attributes that are important for families. The City’s park system can serve an important role in maintaining and improving the quality of life that Lafayette residents enjoy.

Income and Poverty

As shown in Table 2-6 in 2000 the median household income for Lafayette residents was lower than the median household income for Yamhill County and Oregon. By 2009 the income increased for the City, County and State, but Lafayette’s increase was slightly higher than the County and clearly higher than the State. In 2022 Lafayette’s median household income had extended its lead over Yamhill County and the State.

Table 2-6. Median Household Income in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon, 2000, 2009, and 2022

Location	2000¹	2009²	2022³
Lafayette	\$38,611	\$51,857	\$93,243
Yamhill County	\$44,111	\$51,191	\$80,125
Oregon	\$40,916	\$49,033	\$76,632

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000

²2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

³2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

Table 2-7 shows the percentage of persons below the poverty level in Lafayette declined slightly between 2000 and 2009, and it declined significantly between 2009 and 2022. although the percentage was still higher than for Yamhill County and Oregon. By 2009, however, Lafayette’s poverty level was lower than Yamhill County and Oregon. During the period 2000 to 2022 the poverty rate for Yamhill County and Oregon slightly increased.

Table 2-7. Percentage of Persons below Poverty Line in Lafayette, Yamhill County, and Oregon, 2000, 2009, and 2022

Location	2000¹	2009²	2022³
Lafayette	13.0%	12.1%	6.4%
Yamhill County	9.2%	12.9%	11.3%
Oregon	11.6%	13.6%	11.9%

Source: ¹U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 .

² 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

³ 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

Summary

1. Lafayette is a growing community. As such, population demands on parks and recreation facilities need to be addressed.
2. Lafayette has a younger population that needs to be considered.
3. As Lafayette’s residential land develops the Park SDC will be collected, but it will be insufficient to provide adequate funds to acquire new park land, develop parks and fund the purchase of equipment and facilities. Other funding sources must be identified and implemented.
4. Lafayette’s median income has been increasing to the level where it is the highest, or near the highest of Yamhill County’s 10 cities, Lafayette’s poverty rate remains relatively low. Income and poverty rates should be considered in the parks planning process, as they can affect the public’s willingness to pay for new facilities.
5. Demographic trends should be periodically reviewed to ensure parks planning keeps pace with community needs.