



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

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

# MINUTES

**August 27, 2020**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**Zoom 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:** Spencer Howard

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Branch called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Approval of Minutes

A. May 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Drabkin moved to approve the May 28, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed unanimously.

## 4. Discussion Items

A. Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) Presentation

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, presented. This project was funded through a CLG grant. As a Certified Local Government (CLG), the City of McMinnville: maintained a historic preservation commission and the Historic Resource Inventory, surveyed local historic properties, enforced state and local preservation laws, and reviewed National Register nominations. This project was for additional survey work, and the project survey areas included commercial and residential areas south of downtown and north of Cozine Creek as well as Chandler's Second Addition. It was a standard reconnaissance level survey. 371 buildings and structures were surveyed (the total included updated forms for demolished buildings and structures). The data sets used were SHPO historic sites database, SHPO GIS layer, and City color-coded maps used in the 1980s survey. The estimated year-built was done through the limited year-built data from Yamhill County, development patterns, Sanborn Fire Insurance

maps georeferenced, and US Geological Survey aerials georeferenced. The field work was conducted on June 10 and 11. It included one form for each primary building which included all secondary buildings, high resolution digital photographs, original use, materials, plan type, comments (alterations, notable aspects), number of contributing and non-contributing resources, and eligibility evaluation. The data entry included updates to the 1980s forms, completed new forms, photographs, updated spatial data for each property, and the database was transmitted to SHPO.

Mr. Howard showed maps that were color coded by the development periods, historic functions, and architectural styles and forms. He showed pictures that were examples of the styles and forms in McMinnville. He discussed the SHPO evaluation that they assigned to the properties. ES was for eligible/significant: over 45 years of age, retained integrity, notable architectural character, high potential for individual National Register eligibility. EC was for eligible/contributing: over 45 years of age, retained integrity and/or some alterations, if there was a historic district the building would likely be contributing. NC was for not eligible/non-contributing: over 45 years of age, but extensively altered. UN was for undetermined, the building was obstructed by vegetation. XD was for demolished, the building no longer existed. He then showed a color coded map with the SHPO evaluation categories. There were 38 eligible/significant properties, 175 eligible/contributing, 88 not eligible/non-contributing, 53 not eligible/out of period, 1 undetermined, and 17 demolished. He showed another map with SHPO evaluation footprints and another with common alterations. The most common alterations were replacement of wood windows with vinyl and aluminum windows, siding replacement with vinyl, fiber cement board, and T1-11, building loss due to demolition from neglect, and additions side and rear, and dormers.

Mr. Howard described that for the Historic Resource Inventory evaluation, they used Section 17.06.060 of McMinnville's Municipal Code. The classifications were: distinctive, resources outstanding for architectural or historic reasons and potentially worthy of nomination to the National Register of Historic Places; significant, resources of recognized importance to the City due to historical association or architectural integrity, uniqueness, or quality; contributory, resources not in themselves of major significance but which enhance the overall historic character of the neighborhood or City, removal or alteration would have a deleterious effect on the quality of historic continuity experienced in the community; and environmental, resources surveyed that were not classified as distinctive, significant, or contributory, comprise an historic context within the community. The HRI methodology included Appendices 3 and 4 of the 1980 McMinnville Historic Resource Survey and Inventory Phase 1, assigned numbers to newly surveyed buildings starting with 1147, pulled previous ranking data from Appendix 5 of the 1980 survey, and report tables. They updated the scoring based on the 50 year history threshold, gave up to three points for style, up to two points for integrity, and up to two points for environment. The HRI recommendations were for 24 distinctive resources, 97 significant resources, 111 contributory resources, and 69 environmental resources. The HRI common changes from 1980-84 vs. 2020 were: history point increases, history point decreases, style point adjustments, integrity point decreases, integrity point increases, and environmental scoring increases.

Mr. Howard described other recommendations which include an intensive level survey for the eligible/significant buildings and priority areas were identified to support a phased approach. They should evaluate National Register eligibility for these properties and support walking tours and historic district development. The priorities were: SE Baker Street corridor (8 total), SE 1<sup>st</sup> and SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets (15 total), Chandler's Addition (3 total), and development period buildings (12 total). There was also a recommendation to create a South Downtown Historic District with

222 total buildings, 156 historic contributing buildings (70%) based on a period of significance from 1870 to 1965. Another recommendation was for preservation education through property owner outreach, window repair and replacement guidance, and cladding repair and replacement guidance. The City should consider grants or other direct financial incentives and coordinating with McMinnville Water & Light to provide energy rebates for the repair and upgrade of existing wood windows and compatible replacements for buildings listed on the McMinnville Historic Inventory.

Senior Planner Darnell asked if the Committee was interested in moving forward with making any updates to the local Historic Resources Inventory based on the recommendations and updated scoring and survey work that was part of the project. There were some that would change categories. He asked about the differences in scoring from the 1980 survey to this one.

Mr. Howard said a lot of it had to do with alterations to windows and cladding. They also tried to make sure the style was identifiable and doing a good job of conveying that style. They tried to follow as closely as they could the 1980 survey scoring.

Committee Member Mead asked if there were legislative hurdles to adding properties to the historic registry that had not been previously listed.

Senior Planner Darnell said this was only survey work, no formal action was being taken. If the Committee was interested in moving forward with updating the local inventory with the new listings suggested, it would require notification to the property owners. There had to be an owner consent process where the owner could object to listing their property on the local inventory. There was also a suggestion to change some of the properties already on the list to a different category. He was still waiting to hear back if that would also require owner consent.

Committee Member Drabkin asked what happened if a listed property changed owners. Did the new owner have any recourse to try to remove the property from the list?

Senior Planner Darnell said no, changes in ownership did not affect the building's listing.

Chair Branch asked about SHPO's categories versus McMinnville's local inventory categories. Were the local categories in line with SHPO's categories for what was eligible and not eligible?

Mr. Howard said the eligible/significant properties aligned with the distinctive category on the local inventory and the significant properties aligned with the eligible contributing SHPO category. The contributory overlapped with eligible contributing. He could pull a summary of the numbers and send it to staff to show a better comparison.

Chair Branch wanted to make sure the language they were using was in line with SHPO's language or if they should make adjustments. She asked if it was typical for cities to have this many categories on their local inventories, and if they had a category that was equivalent to the Environmental category.

Mr. Howard said other cities did not have an environmental category. McMinnville's inventory did double duty as the local register and inventory and a lot of municipalities separated those out. The Distinctive, Significant, and Contributory categories McMinnville had were not that unusual.

Senior Planner Darnell asked if McMinnville had a lot more on their inventory than other cities.

Mr. Howard said it was unique in the comprehensiveness of the inventory. As far as a local register, it compared better with larger metropolitan areas than smaller municipalities. They had significantly more than other cities the same size as McMinnville.

The Committee thanked Mr. Howard for his work.

There was discussion regarding sharing the information and getting participation from these properties.

Chair Branch asked how many properties were added.

Mr. Howard said 374 properties went into SHPO's database including the 17 buildings that were demolished and 301 buildings received a category recommendation. There were 128 new properties. He thought some properties were missed previously, some had been moved, and some were added due to the expanded dates.

Senior Planner Darnell said the total number in all four categories was around 1,200. He then discussed the potential next steps which could include an intensive level survey and creation of a historic district or individual listing. He thought the HLC should determine whether there should be an update to the City's inventory as well. They could look into property owner notification and education as a first step.

Committee Member Drabkin suggested finding incentives and possibly funding that could be used for window and siding projects before they updated the inventory. They needed to come up with a marketing plan to the property owners.

Senior Planner Darnell said funding for improvements was difficult to find.

There was discussion regarding potential incentives, such as data about property values of homes in a designated protected area.

Committee Member Cooley thought they should look into possible grants for educational materials, especially for promoting preservation of wood windows and cladding.

Chair Branch thought they should have a list of qualified restoration contractors and create pre-approved options that if followed, applicants would not have to come to the HLC.

There was consensus not to move anything forward immediately so the Committee could study the recommendations further. They would look at updating the historic preservation code chapter and decide if they wanted to update the inventory. For the next round of the CLG grant they could come up with educational projects and incentives. There would also be discussion regarding whether or not to keep the Environmental category.

There was discussion regarding getting a Council liaison to attend the Committee meetings, especially as they were discussing code changes.

## **5. Committee Comments**

Committee Member Cooley encouraged the Committee to look at the recommended category changes.

**6. Staff Comments**

None

**7. Adjournment**

Chair Branch adjourned the meeting at 4:52 p.m.