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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1 - MINUTES

May 28, 2020 **2:00 pm**
Historic Landmarks Committee **McMinnville Civic Hall**
Regular Meeting **McMinnville, Oregon**

Members Present: Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, Joan Drabkin, Christopher Knapp, and John Mead

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

Others Present: Ernie Munch

---

1. Call to Order

Chair Branch called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Action Items

A. HL 3-19 & DDR 2-19: Amendment to Approve Proposed Change in Exterior Materials - 618 NE 3rd Street

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

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for a change in exterior materials for the Taylor Dale 2 building on NE 3rd Street. This project came to the HLC in 2019 which included applications for demolition of the existing building, reclassification of the site to significant, and construction of a new building. He explained the original proposed design for the new building and the materials, which were brick on the front with storefront windows, stucco along the east façade, and a combination of brick and stucco on the rear façade. The materials that were being requested by the applicant to be changed applied to the east and south elevations where what was previously shown as stucco was proposed to be cementitious 4 x 8 panels mounted on a rainscreen and flashed with minimal metal extrusions. It would be painted to match the buff color of the brick on the 3rd Street façade. For the south elevation, a similar treatment was proposed with the exception of shiplap siding on the three elevations which face inward and enclose the second story patio on

DRAFT

the north, east, and partial south sides. He showed drawings of the facades that had been provided by the applicant. There were some changes to the rear façade that were approved administratively by the Planning Director. Those included switching the location of the roll-up service door and utility meters, adding a vent panel for interior ventilation, and adding window fenestration.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed the criteria for the downtown design review. Cementitious panels were not listed as either an approved or prohibited exterior building material. The applicant provided some examples of the use of cementitious panels on other approved projects within the Downtown Design Area. These included the building next door at 620 NE 3rd Street and a new building currently under construction at 1025 NE 1st Street. The photo provided by the applicant showed that this material was not installed as approved on NE 1st Street, and might be evidence of the difficulty in applying the alternative treatment (sand additive paint and caulked seams) intended to better mimic smooth stucco. Staff was aware of the installation and was working on a resolution to that issue with the builder. Similar to the cementitious panels, cementitious shiplap siding was neither listed as allowed or prohibited. The shiplap material was not readily found on registered historic buildings in the downtown area, so the Committee should consider whether reliance on the historic photographs justified the material as appropriate. The material appeared to have been a material on the buildings within the historic district during the period of development. Staff suggested the HLC consider the parameters for when these materials were appropriate and that these materials only be allowed on new construction in the downtown area and only allowed on elevations that were not public facing. The Committee could also consider the installation of the panel materials and how that was proposed to be designed since there was evidence that the attempts to hide the seams between cementitious panels might be difficult. One consideration would be to treat the seams and the metal “T” and flashing components between the installed panels as part of the design of the building, similar to a reveal between stucco. A similar design treatment was included on the facades of the Atticus Hotel.

Ernie Munch, representing the applicant, said the shiplap was a good material to use in a historic district. The two buildings in the photos were still there and if they were ever restored could go back to the shiplap. It was a cementitious product that was hardy and held its paint better. It was rot and fire proof. He thought it was appropriate, especially for buildings of the federal style that were on the corner. When they were looking for a substitute to the stucco, they looked at the project on 1st Street. It looked good in the application, but when it went up there were problems. They were panels that would react to temperature and weather changes and it was difficult to make the seams last and properly caulk them. For what they were proposing, the panels were a T aluminum section that would minimize the vertical joints. The horizontal joints were designed to carry water in a Z shape to the outside. These would all be painted as well. The shiplap had a reveal of varying depth and he explained how it would not be easily seen on the rear façade and from the alley. This was being proposed to help save money on the project.

Committee Member Drabkin asked if the patio was going to be visible to the guests. Mr. Munch said that was correct. That was why they switched from the larger panel to the shiplap with a smaller scale pattern.

Chair Drabkin was uncomfortable with it especially the parts visible to the public. She thought they needed to keep the highest standards for this building as they did for Taylor Dale 1. Mr. Munch said that was the plan until the pandemic and economic crisis. They were not changing the front façade and thought the finish on the back could be a compromise.

Chair Branch asked if the T piece and horizontal flanges would be painted the same color as the panels. Mr. Munch said yes, it would all be painted. They would try to keep the panels as inconspicuous as possible and he did not think they would call attention to themselves.

Chair Branch asked how far the brick wrapped around the corner. Mr. Munch said it was about 2 feet.
Chair Branch asked how much of the shiplap was being proposed to be used. Mr. Munch said the patio would be 11 feet deep, the outside wall was 12 feet, and the height was 12 feet. There would be a parapet that was 3 feet tall.

Chair Branch said the original plan had brick on all of the walls of the patio. Mr. Munch explained which walls would still have brick and which would have the shiplap.

Committee Member Cooley asked if they had considered using a wood plank instead. Mr. Munch said they had not.

Committee Member Cooley asked if their selection of hardie plank was driven by product life. Mr. Munch said yes, and the material held paint very well and it looked good. It was also a non-flammable exterior material, which was more appropriate for an area that was tightly packed.

Committee Member Cooley asked about the design of the patio and why they added a second set of doors and transom windows. Mr. Munch said adding the transom windows was to break up the concrete wall and brought the view up to see sky from the interior. It might add to the cost, but they were the only light for some of the units. They had also found a custom craftsman who could put them in for an economical cost.

Committee Member Mead asked how visible the east elevation was from the sidewalk. Mr. Munch said it was visible, but he did not think it would attract attention. As the street trees grew up, it would become invisible.

Committee Member Knapp asked how they were attaching the panels to the building. Mr. Munch said the fasteners would be exposed and painted. He explained where the Z and T shape panels would go.

There was discussion regarding the prohibition of wood siding in the standards. Committee Member Cooley said it was a historic building material in the downtown design area and applicants might want to use it to be consistent with the existing structure.

Chair Branch thought the standards allowed for it to be used if an applicant wanted to restore a historic building and there was evidence that wood had been used. She was uncomfortable allowing it on new construction.

Chair Branch said when this was approved they had looked at all of the pieces together. It was difficult to know how they would have voted if this other material had been proposed. They did allow the material on the building next door, but it was for a second story addition not the historic structure.

Committee Member Drabkin noted that it was also not as visible from the street.

Chair Branch said it was not successful on 1st Street and she was not interested in investigating alternatives, such as adding some kind of product to the material. It would never appear to be a non-paneled product. She thought there was a case to be made that it was on the second story, but it was visible from the street. She was not in favor of the use of shiplap.

Committee Member Drabkin agreed about the shiplap.

Committee Member Mead said they had not allowed a wood siding material in the past in the downtown design area. He discussed the design of the old Taylor Dale building and suggested using

stucco on areas of the east elevation where it was visible from the street. On the parapet and back alleyway the cementitious material could be used. Their experiment with the seams from the application on 1st Street did not work and they had to accept the limitations of the application.

Chair Drabkin discussed the implicit contract between the Committee and the applicant that this was going to be done well and to a high standard. It was extremely uncomfortable to be chipping away at that contract now. They had approved the demolition of a historic building because the new building was going to be done to certain standards and now they were coming back to chip away at that. The Committee was trying to be consistent regarding the materials allowed and making exceptions would cause problems down the road.

Committee Member Knapp liked Committee Member Mead's idea. Regarding the shiplap, if it was painted he didn't know if it would make much of a difference visually.

Committee Member Cooley said if wood siding was a prohibited material, approving a non-wood siding that attempted to mimic wood siding did not make sense.

Senior Planner Darnell said the intent for the painted wood material was likely to be for trim, bulkhead, window sills, etc. He had not seen an approval for wood siding or shiplap material. If the Committee thought the shiplap was not allowed, they should give the applicant options, such as either using the brick as previously approved or the cementitious panels for the patio.

Mr. Munch thought if they could not do shiplap, they would want to use the cementitious panels and look into ways to make it smaller scale. He explained that the pandemic had caused uncertainty and the need to reduce costs, which was the reason for this request.

Chair Branch was comfortable with Committee Member Mead's proposal for the stucco to go back to the beginning of the second story of the adjacent building. She was also comfortable with the cementitious panels on the rest of the areas and that the patio walls could either be brick or cementitious panels. She thought the cementitious panels for the patio could be justified because the patio was not visible from the public right-of-way.

Committee Member Drabkin thought the patio walls should be the brick as originally proposed.

Committee Member Cooley said if it was not in the public view from the right-of-way and if they were allowing the cementitious panels on other non-visible facades and elevations, then the cementitious panels should be allowed on the patio as well.

Committee Member Knapp liked the shiplap and thought it would look better, but understood about precedent and standards. He was good with whatever they decided for the patio and he was in favor of Committee Member Mead's proposal for the east facade.

Committee Member Cooley agreed that he preferred the shiplap to the cementitious panels.

Committee Member Mead moved to approve the changes to the exterior materials for DDR 2-19 as proposed by the applicant with the following exceptions: the area on the east façade on page 6 between gridline #1 and #2 would remain stucco and the shiplap would be replaced with cementitious panels or the original brick. The motion was seconded by Chair Branch and passed 4-1 with Committee Member Drabkin opposed.

4. Committee Comments

Chair Branch requested staff to look into the building on 3rd Street that Mr. Munch mentioned to make sure hardie panels were not on the front elevation, but only on the sides and back as approved by the Committee.

Chair Branch asked about the administrative approval process for alterations to applications that the HLC made decisions on. She requested that the Committee be notified of these administrative approvals.

Senior Planner Darnell said staff received these requests and they were reviewed by the Planning Director who made the decision. They were typically small scale decisions. They could discuss the threshold for these types of requests and what should and should not come to the Committee.

5. Staff Comments

Senior Planner Darnell gave an update on grant funded projects such as digitizing the historic resources inventory materials that should be completed by the end of June and reconnaissance level survey which had been delayed due to Covid but the field work would be done June 10-12.

6. Adjournment

Chair Branch adjourned the meeting at 3:49 p.m.