



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

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

# MINUTES

**November 14, 2019**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**10:00 am**  
**McMinnville Civic Hall**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Joan Drabkin, Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, and John Mead  
**Members Absent:** Heather Sharfeddin  
**Staff Present:** Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner  
**Others Present:** Zack Geary – City Councilor, Ron Burcham, Doug Hurl, Matt Loosemore, Steven Macy, Marcia Mikesch, Jim Schlotfeldt, and Kelly Wilson

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Drabkin called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Approval of Minutes

None

## 4. Action Items

### A. DDR 4-19: 118 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street - Review of Revised Exterior Materials

Senior Planner Darnell explained the revised exterior materials for the First Federal project that was recently reviewed and approved by the Committee. One of the conditions of that approval was to provide a revised example of the brick material and grout color. A revised rendering had been provided by the applicant that also addressed some of the other conditions of approval. It included an additional window to the Baker Street façade, darker color of the wood material and soffits, and darker color metal material on the awnings. The new rendering also showed the new color of the brick.

Kelly Wilson, representing the applicant, discussed the samples of the brick, mortar, and stone panel he had brought to the meeting.

Doug Hurl, representing First Federal, said they wanted a brick color that was complimentary, but not a firehouse red brick. The brick they chose had a red hue to honor the past but allowed for a newer look.

Chair Drabkin asked if it was only because they wanted a newer look or was there some kind of message they were trying to give in a non-verbal way to customers.

Mr. Hurl said they wanted something complimentary and inviting.

Senior Planner Darnell said in the previous review, they determined the color that was being proposed was too dark and too close to black which was prohibited. They needed to determine whether this new material was acceptable and met the applicable review criteria.

Committee Member Branch asked if the intent for the metal was for it to be in a similar color tone as the stone. Mr. Hurl said yes, he explained where the metal would be located. He thought it would be a lighter color that was complimentary to the stone. They had not chosen the final color yet and they had not decided on the wood soffit color yet either.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified that Condition #10 stated the wood was to be finished with a darker stain or painted to be consistent with the allowable material of painted wood and not appear as a natural wood material. HLC approval of the paint colors was not required for this application.

Mr. Hurl said the intent for the soffit was for it to be a smaller accent. First Federal wanted to warm the building up and use warm and friendly materials and that was why they introduced the wood. They understood the design guidelines did not allow wood. As a soffit material they thought it was not a very prominent material when looking at the building as a whole. If they were to paint or darkly stain it, they would lose the intent of providing some natural material for the exterior of the building. The preference was to let the wood be wood.

Committee Member Branch thought the design element was beautiful, however they would be losing the integrity of their standards if the Committee did not hold to the standards more strongly. She was having to search for the elements that followed the standards, and she did not think wood was defensible in the criteria. The language in the standards was specific to not appear as a natural wood material.

Committee Member Cooley said it was not a question of whether or not they agreed that the natural wood graining and pattern would be warmer and more welcoming. It was setting a precedent for future applications.

Senior Planner Darnell said the condition was written not for the material to come back to the HLC but staff would review it during the building permit and final inspection process.

Mr. Macy, McMinnville resident, thought the proposed colors would be attractive for a bank. He thought it would fit in as it was on the edge of downtown. It had a reddish tone to it, especially when it was in the sunlight. He thought there was plenty of red and it had an earthy feel to it.

Committee Member Mead thought the color met the standards as it was not black and had an earthy tone. The finish was non-reflective and a matte finish.

Committee Member Cooley agreed that it would not look black, which was the previous concern.

Chair Drabkin also thought it met the standards.

Based on the examples of the revised building material provided by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the proposed materials which were consistent with the applicable downtown design standards and the findings of fact in the decision document. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed 4-0.

#### B. DDR 5-19: 903 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street - Downtown Design Review & Waiver Request

Chair Drabkin opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if any Committee member had any disclosures to make or would abstain from participating or voting on the application. There were none. Chair Drabkin asked if any Committee member needed to declare any contact prior to this hearing with the applicant or any other parties involved in the application or any other source of information outside of staff. There were none.

Senior Planner Darnell provided the staff report. This was a downtown design review and waiver request for the Mini Super Hidalgo building at the corner of NE 3<sup>rd</sup> and Irvine Streets. The property was located in the downtown design standards area. It was not a historic resource and did not have a historic resource on the property. The improvement being requested was to build an addition off of the south side of the building that would fill in the portion of the building that was underneath the covered canopy area today. He described the proposed improvements on the south and west elevations. The waiver was related to the amount of glazing being reduced to 61% on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade and 44% on the Irvine Street façade. He then discussed the review standards. The building was just over 60 feet in width and some breaks in the storefront window pattern were included. The applicant was proposing a brick bulkhead from the base of the building up to the bottom of the windows on the new storefront window system. The entryway was being relocated from where it existed today and would be recessed. There would also be a new cap on the building and the windows would be recessed. The applicant was also proposing an improvement on the fascia and building walls which would be a cement panel with sand textured paint or stucco. If the Committee found that the material was allowed, staff suggested that they add a condition that the applicant provide a built example of the material to be reviewed by the HLC. The applicant provided a rendering that identified the colors that generally met the subtle earthtone color requirements. Staff suggested that to ensure that the colors were consistent with the requirements, that a condition be included to require that the applicant provide a sample to the Planning Department for review.

Regarding the waiver for the glazing, the applicant had argued that for the south facing façade on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, it was an alteration to an existing building and they were tying into the structural components of that building. The new roof structure was tying into roof framing which was a north to south framing system that would be extending out for the new addition which had columns and foundations in the south building wall. They would need space in the building wall to provide that where otherwise it would have been used for glazing. Staff thought overall the improvements that were being done met all of the other standards and met the intent of the downtown design standards as a vast improvement of the existing building. Regarding the Irvine Street façade glazing, the argument for the waiver was that the extension of the façade was only 6 feet in length. They proposed to bring the same window that they were using on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade around to the Irvine Street façade and would carry on the new features onto that façade as well. He then reviewed the conditions. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

Committee Member Branch asked if applications were supposed to include specifics on the material selections, colors, and finishes. Senior Planner Darnell said there was not a clear precedent for that. It had been allowed in a variety of different ways in the past.

Chair Drabkin thought the Committee would be more comfortable if applicants submitted the colors with the building materials.

Marcia Mikesch, representing the applicant, said this building was originally a gas station, which was concrete block. There was an addition to the east that was a wood frame system. They had to contend with the different roof systems. The original gas station had Glulam beams and a 3-by tongue and groove decking with a low pitch roof membrane over it. They would be taking out part of the existing concrete block wall that used to have the bays for car repairs and would be putting in steel posts inside and outside and adding a 5.5 foot sheer wall. The new steel posts were located in the vertical columns that would break up the façade. The owner liked the colors on the rendering, but it was not a color board. They wanted to make sure the form and details of the building would be considered enough before they did the color board which typically came after the initial design. It would be an aluminum storefront. She did not have samples of the awning as they had not gotten approval of the material. They were also waiting to get some bids so they knew what supplier would be used. They had tried to comply with the design standards. They had the project in for the building permit as well. She wanted to work with the Committee and not delay the project. The fascia improvement could be stucco with a different color applied to it instead of a sand paint.

Committee Member Branch said the existing roof extending out past the building on the west façade, especially with the awning angling underneath, would draw a lot of attention to itself as something non-historic.

Committee Member Mead suggested bringing the west wall out to be even with the roofline or cut the roof back on that whole side so it matched the wall.

Committee Member Branch suggested the awning be attached at the base of the fascia.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified that the amendments would result in the slanted awning starting directly from the base of the fascia. Ms. Mikesch did not have a problem with that.

Committee Member Branch asked what the new signage would look like. Ms. Mikesch said they did not have a design yet, but it could be submitted for review. The applicant planned to do an image upgrade.

Committee Member Mead asked about the glazing not being met due to the sheer wall. That had been done in the downtown before, but it required extra engineering. He thought it would be inappropriate in a project of this scale and size to not include the required glazing. Ms. Mikesch stated it would cost more and steel moment frames were not as effective unless there was more foundation work.

Committee Member Mead concurred that it was not practical. Ms. Mikesch said at some point the applicant would abandon the project if it became too expensive.

Committee Member Cooley asked how much the 24 inch bulkhead contributed to the reduction in the available glazing. Ms. Mikesch said she had looked at reducing it to 18 inches and it was less than a 10% improvement. She managed to get it to 61% by increasing the window width, but when she looked at dropping the windows down an extra 6 inches, which wouldn't meet the client's needs, it was less than a 5% improvement.

Committee Member Cooley clarified they considered a moment frame, but the primary reason for excluding that was cost. Ms. Mikesch said yes, and needing to work around the existing foundation.

Committee Member Cooley said there would be the large sheer wall between the glazing units. That needed to be in line with the existing foundation elements that were further back to the north within the building. Ms. Mikesch said the new façade would have a new foundation, but it would tie in to the existing building in a couple of places. They were doing a wood frame with plywood on both sides of the sheer wall. She thought the design was such a great improvement over what was there now that the glazing waiver could be acceptable.

Committee Member Mead asked how this addition would change the business. Ms. Mikesch said it would move the existing cashier counter out so there would be more retail area. Right now there was an existing window that they wanted to change to two windows and make it more secure. It would be a customer area separate from the retail space.

Committee Member Branch discussed how corner properties were to appear to be two stories in height and not making the massing smaller on this building.

Ms. Mikesch explained how they had considered putting a new building on the corner, however there were underground tanks that would have to be dealt with. That was not something her client wanted to do. They still wanted to build a two story building on the east side of the lot, but that would be a separate building instead of being attached. They also were not planning to underground the utilities.

Committee Member Cooley asked if she preferred modifying the awning design or cutting back the overhang of the roof structure. Ms. Mikesch said modifying the awning would be less costly.

Chair Drabkin closed the public hearing.

Chair Drabkin was in favor of the improvement and modification to the awning design. She would like the colors and sample stucco to be brought back to the Committee.

Committee Member Cooley said when they granted a waiver for the glazing requirement, that was a permanent decision that would carry through the life of the structure going forward. It came up fairly regularly with applicants and it was worthwhile to discuss how feasible the 70% requirement was and economic hardship due to a moment frame was not a criterion for granting the waiver. The existing structural components and the intended construction to tie into those existing building components were related to the waiver criterion, and he thought the comments made argued in favor of granting the reduction to the glazing requirements in this particular scenario based on the existing building's construction type. He did not want the glazing requirement to be an obstruction to getting this project approved.

There was discussion regarding the importance of the findings in explaining why the waiver was approved and not setting a precedent for the future.

Committee Member Cooley pointed out that there was nothing in the language that empowered the HLC to consider economics as a condition for granting a waiver. The defect was not that they set a precedent but that they used a non-allowed criterion in making a decision.

Committee Member Branch was in favor of the materials coming back to the Committee for approval, specifically all of the exterior materials, paint colors, finishes, and signage.

There was discussion regarding the timeline of the building permit and construction. There was further discussion regarding the sign and how the Committee would like to see the color, material, size, and placement of the sign.

Committee Member Mead moved to approve DDR 5-19 with the following conditions: the applicant shall submit a building permit prior to completing any work, the construction plans submitted with the building permit shall be reviewed by the Planning Director for consistency with the written narrative, exhibits, drawings, and renderings reviewed by the HLC along with any revisions to respond to conditions of approval, the applicant shall provide a built example of the final exterior panel building material to be reviewed and approved by the HLC prior to application of those materials, the built example will include an example of the treatment of any seam that was to be caulked or painted over with the sand textured paint, the applicant shall provide examples of the exterior building colors to the HLC for review and approval including the sign and awning, the glazing percentage was approved for this project based on the size and scale of the project and the existing structure as per the comments made on the record at the HLC meeting, and the awning to the west side of the building would start at the base of the eave. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

## **5. Discussion Items**

A. Upcoming Request for Proposals (RFP) For Survey Work

B. 2020 Work Plan

Senior Planner Darnell said the HLC's 2020 Work Plan would include a reconnaissance level survey for the area south of downtown, updates to the historic resources inventory materials, and outreach to property owners of homes on the historic resources inventory. There was a draft RFP for the reconnaissance level survey work that would move forward with the HLC's approval. A deliverable from the survey would be a recommendation on potential updates to the inventory.

There was discussion regarding the area being surveyed and making sure the map and description in the RFP document matched.

There was consensus for staff to move forward with the RFP.

## **6. Committee Comments**

Chair Drabkin suggested holding HLC meetings somewhere other than the Council Chambers.

There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of meeting in the Council Chambers, especially in regard to the level of respect shown to the Committee as decision makers.

Committee Member Branch discussed her frustrations with the Committee's lack of involvement and access to information about applications early on in the process. It made them feel like it was too late for the Committee to deny something that was already through most of the process.

Committee Member Cooley said the request for built samples could blow someone's finances apart or delay projects.

Committee Member Branch said people came in with the assumption that their applications were a done deal and it was only a formality to bring them to the HLC. When the HLC wanted to enforce standards, they were told they were causing disruption to the investment of the development. They shouldn't make decisions based on those optics. She did not think the system and application process were working. She suggested adding a review of the process and making recommendations for changes to the Work Plan. She would like the Committee to be able to be involved earlier in the process.

There was discussion regarding the current application process and examples of applications that the Committee had been under pressure to approve quickly.

Committee Member Mead said the HLC also had a short amount of time to review applications before meetings and asked if the information could be forwarded earlier.

Senior Planner Darnell thought there were some simple changes that could be made to the process. He explained staff's processes for pre-application, application submittal, and completeness review.

Committee Member Branch asked if a member of the Committee could participate in the internal review of completeness. Senior Planner Darnell did not know as that was not typical.

There was discussion regarding applications where standards were not applied and no waiver had been required.

Committee Member Branch thought they needed to schedule time to review all of the criteria and standards in 2020 and receive training from the City Attorney about the quasi-judicial process.

There was consensus not to meet in December, but to discuss processes and procedures further at the January meeting. Senior Planner Darnell would put binders together with the DDR standards for HLC review.

Committee Member Cooley stated Senior Planner Darnell gave the HLC annual report to Council on Tuesday. He did a great job and there was complimentary feedback from the Council.

## **7. Staff Comments**

None

## **8. Adjournment**

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 12:25 p.m.