



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

March 11, 2021
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
Zoom Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, Joan Drabkin, Christopher Knapp, John Mead, and Hadleigh Heller – Youth Liaison

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director, Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner, and Amanda Guile-Hinman – City Attorney

Others Present: Brian Jackson, Mary Ann Rodriguez, Dave Haugeberg, and Susan Agre-Kippenhan

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

- A. June 25, 2020 Meeting Minutes
- B. July 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes
- C. January 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the June 25 and July 23, 2020 and January 28, 2021 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Knapp and passed 5-0.

4. Action Items

- A. HL 1-21: Certificate of Approval for Demolition - 900 SE Baker Street (Mac Hall on Linfield University Campus)

Chair Mead asked if any Committee Member wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. He 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 hearing. There was none.

Chuck Darnell, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. This was a request for a certificate of approval for demolition of the Mac Hall building on the Linfield University campus. He explained the site location. The building was listed as a significant resource on the Historic Resources Inventory. He reviewed the approval criteria. Preservation of the building was a deterrent to an improvement program of substantial benefit. The university needed science-focused academic facilities and labs. The proposal was to construct a connected and centrally located science complex. This was critical to the future success and viability of the university. Regarding the physical condition of the historic resource, the applicant provided an extensive list of code issues associated with the building. The improvements were needed for the safety/functionality of the building. The bearing wall structural system was constructed of unreinforced clay tiles which would be difficult to seismically retrofit. Regarding the economic use of the historic resource, the applicant provided findings that the building had no economic use in its current condition and that preservation was not reasonable because it could not accommodate needed spaces for the science facilities. The analysis regarding the inability to renovate included: floor plate dimensions and floor heights, lack of space for HVAC systems necessary for laboratory spaces, the central corridor through the building was structural and load bearing and prevented spaces of size necessary for science facilities, and the Structural Engineer's assessment supported these arguments. The applicant argued that retention was not in the best interests of the majority of citizens. The proposed science complex and expansion of the science curriculum was of more substantial benefit to the community. The need for the science complex was directly tied to the future success and existence of the university. There was a HLC precedent of requiring opportunity to move structures as an alternative means of preservation. The Structural Engineer's assessment stated that moving the building was impractical. The applicant was proposing an alternative means of documenting/memorializing the history of the building with a memorial plaque and time capsule. Staff did not think that these review criteria were met: the value and significance of the historic resource and whether the historic resource constituted a hazard to the safety of the public or its occupants. As a landmark, the building had historic value and significance in relation to its location on campus and the relationship to the academic quad and other historic buildings. Any potential hazard to occupants could be mitigated with some level of investment—perhaps not for the types of needed uses. Staff suggested the HLC consider the possibility of requiring the owner to provide the opportunity for relocation of the resource given the construction type of the building. The applicant's findings and description of the improvement project might be found to be more influential when weighed against other review criteria. There should be consideration of the university's stated need for a science complex and its relationship to the long term stability and success of the university. If the HLC supported the applicant's proposal to create a monument and time capsule to document the history of Mac Hall on site, they could include it as a condition of approval. If the HLC agreed with the applicant's provided findings, staff recommended approval with conditions. If the HLC did not find that the applicant provided adequate findings, staff recommended continuance to allow the applicant time to provide additional information or to allow staff to update the decision document. He then reviewed the recommended conditions.

Chair Mead asked how this project compared to the renovations at TJ Day Hall. Senior Planner Darnell said that was done before he began working at the City and he did not know the details.

Susan Agre-Kippenhan, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, said this was a critical academic enterprise. She explained what higher education looked like now, the challenges they faced, and how the project fit into those challenges. They had recently invested in a new Portland campus which was the new home for their nursing program. The science complex was the next big investment. The goal was to meet the science needs of the McMinnville campus as well as the expanded nursing program. All students were required to take science general education classes. The way they taught science now was very different than how it was taught in the past. The new complex would accommodate equipment, infrastructure, venting needs, etc. None of it could be accommodated in the current historic building. Financially this building complex could offer a lot to

Linfield. It would bring in 35,000 square feet of space which would accommodate 166 more students per semester which would bring revenues of \$1.8 million. If they could not build the complex, they would not be able to attract exceptional faculty and students, could not accommodate the growth in the sciences, nursing, and future programs, and would lose the significant private donations that were made to fund this project. She did not think there was a partial fix for Mac Hall. It was unreinforced clay tile and there were serious risks to the occupants. She did not think it was acceptable to have people in the building. It was highly impractical to move the building due to its materials, construction, and life safety issues. Regarding the value and significance of Mac Hall as a historic resource, City leaders made contributions to Mac Hall, but it was not a gift to Linfield by the City. Other members of the Linfield community also made contributions. Mac Hall could play a critical role in Linfield's future by providing this important location for the new science complex.

****RECORDING ENDS HERE****

5. Discussion Items

A. Annual Committee Ethics & Public Meeting Training

6. Committee/Commissioner Comments

7. Staff Comments

8. Adjournment