



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

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

---

**October 17, 2019**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**McMinnville Civic Hall**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

**Others Present:** Ellie Gunn and Brad Mascal

---

## 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 4-19: 714 SE Washington Street – Certificate of Approval for Alterations

Chair Drabkin opened the public hearing. She asked if any Committee member wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. Chair Drabkin asked if any Committee member needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this application. There was none.

Senior Planner Darnell provided the staff report. This was a certificate of approval for alterations at 714 SE Washington Street. It was listed as a significant resource in the local inventory which made it a historic landmark and subject to the certificate of approval process. The alterations proposed included alterations to the existing structure and construction of a detached garage with a new Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) above the garage. He explained the review criteria for the application. The applicant was proposing to maintain the main structure and its historic features. The majority of the alterations were for the single story addition in the rear that appeared to be

construction from a later date not at the same time as the historic home. The new structure would be a detached garage and ADU that would be at the rear of the building and would be designed to be compatible with the home. Staff was suggesting a condition that the remaining brick chimney be repaired and maintained if possible, but if not that it be replaced with brick. He discussed photos provided by the applicant that showed the structure and where the changes would be occurring. The doors and landings of the single story addition in the back would be removed. The old chimney that was on the 1983 photo had been removed sometime in the past, and the applicant was not proposing to replace it. They were proposing to fix up the exterior and match the color and material back to the rest of the historic home. Vinyl windows would be replaced with wood windows. The railing and landing would be taken off of the porch and the deck would be expanded and replaced and a railing added to wrap around the whole side of the house to the back. It was to be wood with materials compatible with the historic home. There would be a chimney removed and replaced with a metal flu. That was the chimney staff was requesting to preserve if possible.

Senior Planner Darnell then reviewed the design of the ADU. The roof pitch matched the existing home, the same type of materials would be used, and they had incorporated the curved window cap above the main window to match the same feature that existed on the main home. It would be differentiated by a different window pattern and it would be an ADU above the garage. There were also different gable angles on the roof. It would be compatible, yet differentiated, from the main home.

Senior Planner Darnell explained that the replacement and expansion of the deck on the east façade of the main home would replace the currently incompatible features of the deck. Staff suggested a condition that all new windows and doors would be wood. A window on the front façade would be replaced with a wood window and a glazing pattern more consistent with the historic photo. One of the front doors was currently not compatible with the historic structure, and the new left door would be 36 inches to meet accessibility standards and would be the same glazing and grid system to match the existing right door. Staff suggested a condition memorializing that style. According to the Secretary of the Interior standards, the treatment was rehabilitation which allowed for protecting a historic home but extensively replacing deteriorated, damaged, or missing features. It also allowed construction of new additions. He discussed the applicable guidelines including designing and installing new windows where the historic features were missing, replacing vinyl windows with wood, and the new construction would be compatible and differentiated. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

Committee Member Sharfeddin asked what year the house was built. Senior Planner Darnell stated it was 1895.

Chair Drabkin asked if the garage would be a new structure and where it would be placed on the property. Senior Planner Darnell said it would be new. The narrative from the 1980s described a garage in the rear, but it must have been demolished at some point. He explained where the new proposed garage would be located, which would be in a similar location and met the required setbacks.

Chair Drabkin confirmed the roof of the garage would not be higher than the main house. Senior Planner Darnell explained the height of the garage from grade would be 22 feet and the height of the house from grade was 26 feet. It would be shorter and, based on the grading of the property, not as prominent as the main house.

Committee Member Cooley asked if there was any conflict between the ADU ordinance requirement and compatibility. Senior Planner Darnell said one of the reasons they designed it this way was to meet the requirements of the ADU standards and the historic preservation guidelines required compatibility but differentiation. Staff thought the language in the ADU chapter was being satisfied

including the height requirement. The ADU language on its own outside of this process would require similar design intent for the ADU.

Brad Mascal, representing the applicant, had no additional testimony but was available for any questions.

Committee Member Mead asked when the applicant took possession of the property. Mr. Mascal said at the beginning of this year. There was a long term renter in the house and it was the applicant's plan to continue to rent out the main house, and to rent out the ADU as a long term rental as well. Eventually the applicant would move to McMinnville and might pursue a bed and breakfast type use.

Chair Drabkin asked what the timeline was for the proposed work. Mr. Mascal said the work would be phased and the first phase would be the detached garage and ADU. He did not have a date for that yet. The remodel of the historic home would be the second phase to be done at a later date.

Committee Member Branch asked about the timeline for how long the approval was good for. Senior Planner Darnell said there was no time limit in the code. If the design was approved by the Committee, it would be valid and run with the property unless someone applied to do something different.

Committee Member Branch asked about the man door under the covered porch on the east façade. Mr. Mascal said it was an original door and would be preserved. Currently there was a narrow deck and not very functional, which was the reason for the remodel. The cover over the deck would remain the same.

Committee Member Branch clarified the proposed deck and railing would be wood. Mr. Mascal said yes, and they would use a spindle railing.

Committee Member Mead asked if there was discussion about replacing the chimney on the east façade that had been taken out. Mr. Mascal said that was not a wish of the client.

Committee Member Branch asked if the owner had reviewed staff's conditions and was amenable to them. Mr. Mascal had reviewed them with the owner and she was amenable.

Chair Drabkin was uncomfortable with approving something that had no time limit. She suggested adding language that if the ADU was not started in a year, the application approval lapsed.

Committee Member Cooley said when they were designing the garage and ADU, did they reference the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines regarding new structures adjacent to historic structures or were they mostly just focusing on the ADU ordinance. Mr. Mascal said they started with the ADU ordinance and then they looked at the Secretary of Interior's guidelines for a rehabilitation project and changed some of the design to be differentiated from the main house.

Committee Member Cooley read from the list of how the new structure could be differentiated. Staff mentioned that the garage doors were different from the fenestration patterns of the rest of the building. Senior Planner Darnell confirmed staff referenced the garage doors design which was different from the house and the window patterns around the west and south façades were smaller, square windows rather than the vertical aligned windows on the house. Mr. Mascal pointed out the garage/ADU would be set back a good distance from the right-of-way as well.

Committee Member Branch thought the curved window cap on the ADU to match the house should not be included as it was a unique feature of the historic house. Mr. Mascal said they could be flexible on that detail.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought a Victorian home and a Craftsman ADU might create a misinterpretation of the property. It might make more sense for the ADU to be Victorian in style but with differentiating elements to be more consistent with the age of the property.

Ellie Gunn, McMinnville resident, lived next door to this home. She asked what the distance would be from the edge of the ADU/garage to the fence line. Senior Planner Darnell clarified it would be setback of six feet from the property line to the ADU.

Ms. Gunn asked about the timeline for the ADU to be built. Senior Planner Darnell stated it would be at least a few months as they would need to submit construction drawings and go through the permitting process.

Ms. Gunn said the back of the house had been hit by a tree in the 1990s and they might have redesigned the slope of the roof in the back.

Mr. Mascal provided rebuttal. He thought the new building would have low visibility. The timeline for construction was a matter of how long it would take to go through the process.

Chair Drabkin closed the public hearing.

Committee Member Branch said the window with the curved window cap on the north façade was the most important as it was viewed from the street. It was a similar replica of the main house window and she was concerned that it was too similar and was not appropriate. It should be left off the ADU to make it clear that it was not a renovation of an old garage. She thought the unique roof line differentiated the ADU from the main house. It was more Craftsman in style.

Committee Member Sharfeddin said the neighborhood was Victorian and a very Craftsman ADU would change the historic feel of the neighborhood. The shed roof was what she was most struggling with.

Committee Member Cooley said there was a distinct form for a Victorian home when compared to a Craftsman that could be identified. The new structure should reflect the form, massing, and scale present in the resource. They had not worked out what the techniques were for differentiating while keeping the consistent form, massing, and scale.

Committee Member Branch noted that the ADU standards were not compatible with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She put the federal standards at the highest level of importance.

Committee Member Cooley thought the intent of the guideline was people could identify what the historically important structure was compared to anything else around it. If they were too closely matched, then that might not happen.

Committee Member Branch said the shed roof was a Craftsman detail, but beyond that she did not see a lot of traditional Craftsman in the design. It was more of a contemporary take. She appreciated how this application showed care to follow the standards and was straightforward and not asking for variances. She also noted that there was a need for additional rental housing in the City.

Committee Member Mead agreed it was hard to follow both guidelines. He could go either way on the curved window detail. The Secretary of the Interior's guidelines asking for differentiation was what prompted the different roofline. He thought those guidelines were being met.

Committee Member Branch asked about the paint color requirements. Senior Planner Darnell said the guidelines stated it had to be within the same color range of the historic building but did not

duplicate the color. The applicant was proposing to match the color but they could pick a different shade to differentiate it further.

Committee Member Branch suggested adding a condition that a different color be used and that it be reviewed by staff or the HLC.

Mr. Mascal clarified the color of the main structure would not be changed. There was differentiation on the main house as there were different types of shingles being used. It was called out in the resource inventory and it was not their intention to use any other types of shingles on the ADU which would also set it apart.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the comments that had been made regarding the timeframe of the approval, removal of the curved window detail, and color of the ADU.

Committee Member Branch thought the lack of timeframe protected the property.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 4-19 subject to the conditions of approval provided in the decision document and adding a condition to require removal of the curved brow over the windows on the ADU and a condition to require submittal of the ADU paint colors to the HLC for approval. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 5-0.

## **5. Discussion Items**

None

## **6. Committee/Commissioner Comments**

### **A. Project Updates - 219 SE Lincoln Street (HL 10-18)**

Senior Planner Darnell said the HLC's decision not to allow the use of the plastic based material was appealed by the applicant to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission upheld the HLC's decision. The applicant was notified that they needed to replace the railing and the applicant failed to do so. They were now in the code enforcement process and the applicant was working on removing the material. They were proposing to install wood top and bottom rail and balusters and paint them white to match the existing porch. He asked if the HLC was comfortable with that proposal.

There was discussion regarding the lack of communication between the applicant and the owner in the initial phases and how staff had been meeting with the owner and they were willing to make the changes.

There was consensus for the proposal to go forward as discussed.

## **7. Staff Comments**

Senior Planner Darnell said the HLC's annual update to the City Council would be on November 12. Staff was scheduling quasi-judicial land use training for City committees. The November meeting of the HLC would be rescheduled to November 14.

## **8. Adjournment**

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.