



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 2 - MINUTES

June 26, 2019
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
McMinnville Civic Hall
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Joan Drabkin, Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, John Mead, and Heather Sharfeddin

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

Others Present: Max de Lavenne, Kari de Lavenne, and Andrew Burton

1. Call to Order

Chair Drabkin called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Action Items

A. HL 6-18 / DDR 5-18 – 620 NE 3rd Street
Review of New Exterior Building Colors

- Applicant has requested different exterior building colors than what was previously proposed and approved by the Historic Landmarks Committee. The different exterior colors are being proposed for the entire building façade, including the existing single story building and the second story addition. The proposed building colors will be provided at the meeting for the Historic Landmarks Committee's review.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for a change to the building addition at 620 NE 3rd Street. The application had been approved previously for the second story addition. There had been a condition of approval related to the exterior color of the addition. It was

to be a darker shade than the original structure. The applicant was proposing new colors. He explained the standards for colors in the Downtown Design area.

Max and Kari de Lavenne said they wanted to go with a darker color on the lower floor and a lighter color for the addition. For the lower floor they proposed a Midnight Blue color. They were proposing using the color White Wisp, a gray-white color, for the addition and Coventry Gray for the trim. It would blend in with the sky and create more historical prominence on the original structure and would be less maintenance. The addition would not look like it was modifying the historic building. They showed photos of the façades in the neighborhood and discussed how their proposal would match.

There was discussion regarding the windows, roof, colors, improvements the applicant had made, and how the addition would be used for office space and the main level for retail.

Committee Member Branch liked the proposed colors and thought they were harmonious with each other. Because it would not get much sun, she was concerned that the color on the ground floor would look like a charcoal gray in the shade. It might look closer to black which was not allowed. She thought the color of the upper addition would work well.

Committee Member Mead liked the darker color on the bottom and the lighter color on the top as it would help the addition disappear which was the intent of the code.

Committee Member Branch suggested going with a lighter color on the main floor. If it was going to appear darker because it was in the shade, she thought they could go a bit lighter.

Ms. de Lavenne said the intent was the main floor to be saturated and if they went lighter it would not be the same color.

Committee Member Cooley thought it looked like a dark shade of blue and was acceptable.

It was clarified the new colors would be Midnight Blue, Coventry Gray, and White Wisp.

There was consensus that the proposed colors were acceptable.

B. DDR 1-19: 1025 NE 1st Street -

Review of Built Example of Exterior Materials

Review of Proposed Exterior Building Colors

Senior Planner Darnell discussed a topic from last month's meeting, a built example of exterior materials for the apartment building on 1025 NE 1st Street. At that meeting, the Committee had some conditions which included the Committee reviewing the sample colors and built example of the final exterior panel material. The Committee did not approve the built example that had been provided last month because it was not similar in appearance to smooth stucco and not similar in appearance to other materials found on registered historic buildings in the downtown area. The vertical seam and reveal joints were visible and prominent. The applicant had a revised built example to share.

Andrew Burton, applicant, reviewed the proposed colors and reduced belt course. He had taken out the blue color as requested and the Downing Slate was the color of the body of the building, and Downing Sand was for the trim.

Committee Member Branch said that was opposite of what was presented last month. The Downing Sand was for the body and Downing Slate for the trim. However, she liked the slate for the body and sand for the trim better.

Mr. Burton explained how he had addressed the seam issue. If the seam was calked and treated before being painted, it made the seam virtually disappear. They would treat the seams and use nails instead of screws. He also brought a sample of the product in a smooth version which would be an alternate to the stucco pattern. They did not need to have horizontal seams depending on the size of the panels.

Committee Member Branch thought this was a big precedent to set, allowing a different material to be used in the Downtown District on the main level of a building.

Mr. Burton gave examples of other buildings that had the same material. He thought it would look like stucco when they were finished.

Senior Planner Darnell pointed out those examples had never come before the HLC for review.

Mr. Burton said this property was barely in the Downtown District.

Committee Member Branch said it was meant to be similar in appearance to smooth stucco. She did not think the proposed material represented smooth stucco.

Mr. Burton said the material had to do with keeping the apartment building affordable. They did not intend this to be a high end, expensive building.

Committee Member Branch clarified it would be market rate housing.

Mr. Burton said the owners of the property were not focused on the look of the building, but on the units that were ready to rent.

Committee Member Cooley suggested a paint technique that included sand to simulate the stucco.

Committee Member Mead thought the material missed the historic stucco appearance.

There was discussion about the need for a new built sample that would be treated in a way that was consistent with the design standards and the materials that were allowed in the district.

Mr. Burton said this material fell somewhere between painted wood and smooth stucco.

Committee Member Mead suggested making this product look like wood and wood trim at the seams.

There was discussion regarding the use of wood paneling.

Committee Member Cooley said if they introduced a new building material with the specific intention of getting it to mimic a prohibited material, that was not what the standards called for. He thought they should go back to the smooth stucco.

Committee Member branch would like to see a large sample of the smoother board with a textured paint treatment to resemble smooth stucco.

Chair Drabkin agreed she would like to see a sample. She also recommended swapping the body and trim colors.

There was consensus that the proposed building material was not acceptable and another built example needed to be brought in to address the appearance of the vertical seam, fasteners, and texture.

There was discussion regarding the type of built example the applicant should bring back and scheduling an additional meeting to review the example. There was further discussion regarding the paint colors for the building.

There was consensus for the applicant to swap the paint colors of the body and trim. The doors would be the same color as the body of the building.

5. Discussion Items

None

6. Committee/Commissioner Comments

None

7. Staff Comments

Senior Planner Darnell explained if the Committee would like to change the location of their meetings to the Council Chambers, they would have to meet on a different day to not conflict with Municipal Court. He suggested changing the meetings to the fourth Thursday of every month.

The Committee discussed and determined that the fourth Thursday of every month would be acceptable for the regular standing meeting.

8. Adjournment

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.