



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

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

# MINUTES

**June 24, 2021**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**Zoom Meeting**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, Christopher Knapp, and John Mead  
**Members Absent:** Joan Drabkin and Hadleigh Heller – Youth Liaison  
**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director and Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner  
**Others Present:** Silas & Amy Halloran-Steiner, Marcia Mikesh, and David & Laura Foust

---

## 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. November 18, 2020

Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the November 18, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

## 4. Action Items

A. DDR 1-21: Downtown Design Review for New Construction - 631 NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street

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 application. There was none.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a Downtown Design Review for new construction on NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street. The previous historic resource was demolished in 2018. The proposed construction was for a 2,700 square foot mixed use office building with two upper story dwelling units above office space on the ground floor. He reviewed the approval criteria. The applicant requested an exception for the plaza/courtyard space due to the adjacent properties having a setback, providing transition between sidewalk and entrance, and providing visibility for the drive aisle. A potential condition could require the plaza space to be different material or

finish to provide visual identification of the plaza space. This was a unique site as adjacent and nearby historic buildings were on the same block and all were residential structures in the C-3 zone. The proposed building had a rectangular footprint and configuration on the lot that was similar to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. The massing was also similar as the nearby historic buildings were mostly larger 2 or 2.5 story homes with a large building footprint. The setback on the third story reduced some massing of the building. The proposed building would have a belt course separating the upper stories from the first floor. The bulkhead would be at the street level, there would be the required amount of glazing, recessed entry and transom with a transparent door, and a decorative cornice or cap at the roofline. Another condition was to require all windows to be recessed. The main body of the building would be smooth stucco, the horizontal trim bands would be stucco, windows would have black exterior frames, and the railings and stairs would be prefinished black metal. The main body would be light grey in color. The trim bands would be medium and dark grey and the windows, railings, and stairs would be black metal similar to the trim. He suggested a condition that final samples of the colors would be provided to the Planning Department prior to use. The applicant described the foundation or base would be similar to the proposed bulkhead. The parking lot would meet the size requirements in the standards. It was located behind the building and would be screened from the street. No awnings or signage was proposed at this time. Staff recommended approval with conditions. He then reviewed the conditions.

There was discussion regarding the proposed spiral staircase which was not specifically prohibited, timeframe of the building permit, material for the plaza to differentiate the plaza space and drive aisle, and reason for the exception to the setback for the plaza.

Silas and Amy Halloran-Steiner, applicants, said they planned to use the ground floor for their office space. The apartments would provide some much needed downtown housing. They would like the setback request to be granted. They asked about the need to recess the windows on all sides of the building.

Committee Member Branch asked about the exterior building materials. She asked for more description of the profile and dimensions of the belly band, trim band, bulkhead, and cornice.

Marcia Mikesh, applicant's architect, said the exterior would be real stucco. She explained the design elements. It would be a relatively simple rectangular design.

Committee Member Branch asked about the proposed setbacks. Mr. Halloran-Steiner said the setbacks would help with accessibility for maintenance, utility access, and storage. Ms. Mikesh said increasing the bottom floor footprint would also increase the number of parking spaces required. Any windows facing from the east would need the three foot setback because it was so close to the property line. Senior Planner Darnell said the zero foot setback requirement applied to the front facing façade, not on all property lines. In this case, they needed to provide access to the parking and the site was not in the downtown core where there was a pattern of buildings constructed to each property line. Staff did not think the zero foot setback applied to all property lines, but the front façade was what was intended.

Committee Member Branch asked about the recessing of the windows. Ms. Mikesh explained the wall assembly thickness proposed. Senior Planner Darnell clarified the requirement was for all windows to be recessed.

Ms. Mikesh thought the requirement only applied to the storefront façade, not the other walls. Chair Mead said because of the setback for the parking lot access, that side of the building

would be visible to the public. He thought any publicly visible facades should have the recessed windows.

Committee Member Branch asked about the spiral staircase. Mr. Halloran-Steiner said the staircase would be usable to the apartments and give access to the HVAC system and maintenance of the partial living roof. He explained the other options they had looked into. The design would also allow them to retain the street tree in the front.

Chair Mead asked about the material to differentiate the plaza from the walkway. Mr. Halloran-Steiner was open to the Committee's input about the material.

Chair Mead thought a different colored or textured concrete would work.

Mr. Halloran-Steiner thought the recessed windows should only be required on the storefront façade, not on all sides.

David and Laura Fouste owned the building next door. They supported this application.

Committee Member Cooley thought the intention of the ordinance was all the windows should be recessed. He was not concerned about the setbacks.

Committee Member Knapp agreed the setbacks were acceptable. He had no opinion about the recessed windows.

Committee Member Branch did not think just because a spiral staircase was not prohibited, it should be allowed. She thought it needed to meet the intent of the design standards. She had no problem with the setbacks and she liked the idea of a courtyard. The material of the courtyard should be differentiated from the sidewalk, such as stamped concrete or concrete pavers. She thought the spiral staircase had a prominent design implication on the façade of the building and changed the perceived massing of the entire structure. She did not think it looked historic for McMinnville's downtown. She thought all the windows should be recessed due to the public view.

There was discussion regarding the spiral staircase and whether or not it was compatible with downtown. Committee Members Cooley and Knapp were in favor of the staircase.

Committee Member Branch was also concerned about the metal railing across the top of the parapet wall.

Mr. Halloran-Steiner thought it met the requirements and their goals for what they wanted to do with the roof. Ms. Mikesh further explained the purpose of the railing.

Chair Mead was in favor of the setbacks and plaza, recessed windows for all the windows, and spiral staircase.

Committee Member Cooley suggested adding a condition that the railing be grey to be more visually negative and disappear into the grey stucco.

Committee Member Branch did not think the patio space on the third floor should have a metal railing. She also thought the paint colors should come back to the Committee instead of staff.

There was consensus to change Condition #4 to require the paint colors to come back to the Committee for approval and to add Condition #5 that required removal of the railing along the third floor balcony and replacement with a parapet wall to the height necessary to maintain the belt course separating those two stories of the building.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the amended conditions.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and material submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve DDR 1-21 subject to the revised conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

## **5. Discussion Items**

### **A. Presentation from Northwest Vernacular Historic Preservation on Goal 5 Historic Resources Survey Work in New UGB Areas**

Senior Planner Darnell introduced this item and intent behind the work.

Spencer Howard, Northwest Vernacular, discussed the survey areas, methodology, Area A summary where 17 resources were surveyed, Area B summary where 5 resources were surveyed, Area C summary where 8 resources were surveyed, Area D summary where 7 resources were surveyed, Area E and F had no resources surveyed, Area G summary where 43 resources were surveyed, and Area H summary where 10 resources were surveyed. For all the survey areas, they saw a high level of alteration and post-1940s housing developments on smaller parcels that were part of a transition from agricultural to domestic land use. He discussed the notable resources and how there were very few A and B categories, and the majority fell in the C and D rankings.

There was discussion regarding the assessment of historic agricultural sites, Committee's role in the process, Goal 5 requirements, recommendations, and next steps.

## **6. Committee Comments**

Chair Mead asked about going back to in-person meetings. Councilor Chenoweth said there was some reticence from members of the Council and staff, but it was moving forward slowly. They were allowing hybrid meetings.

## **7. Staff Comments**

None

## **8. Adjournment**

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 5:44 p.m.