



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

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

# MINUTES

---

**September 1, 2021**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

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

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

**Members Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director, Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner, and Amy Dixon – Contract Planner

**Others Present:** Dave Rucklos – McMinnville Downtown Association

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

Planning Director Richards announced Senior Planner Darnell's resignation and how they would move forward with the staffing gap.

Senior Planner Darnell explained his future plans to relocate to Colorado.

The Committee thanked him for his work.

Contract Planner Dixon introduced herself.

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Approval of Minutes

- A. May 14, 2020 Meeting Minutes
- B. January 5, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the May 14, 2020 and January 5, 2021 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Drabkin and passed 6-0.

## 4. Action Items

- A. HL 4-21: Certificate of Approval for Alterations - 300, 303, 406, and 546 NE 3<sup>rd</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 application 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. He discussed the site location of the four different buildings on NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in the Downtown Historic District. Each property was listed on the local historic resources inventory. The proposal was to install exterior lighting along the side/rear building facades. There would be 3-4 lights on the side facades and 2 lights on the rear façade of one building. The applicant thought the light fixture was compatible. The lights were proposed to improve lighting for the pedestrian corridors and in public parking lots. He explained the proposed locations for the light fixtures, review process, and criteria. In general, the proposal would not cause significant alterations or changes to the exterior materials or building architectural features. The impacts were limited to where the light fixtures were mounted to the building walls. The lights were proposed on the side and rear facades, which preserved and avoided impact to the primary front and character defining building facades. The exterior mounted conduit may be the most visually impactful. Methods of concealment were proposed to minimize the visual appearance. The applicant was proposing "rehabilitation" treatment. He explained the Secretary of Interior's recommended guidelines for installing a new mechanical system on historic buildings and preserving masonry features. The proposed mounting, with concealment, could be found to not be causing "extensive loss or damage" or features being "radically changed."

Dave Rucklos, McMinnville Downtown Association, said they were putting together a grant request from Travel Oregon for outside dining. One of the things they discussed was a need for lighting to increase safety and deter graffiti. Alternates to conduit were cost prohibitive and holes would have to be drilled in the façade.

There was discussion regarding the location and size of the conduit, adjusting the spacing of the lights, how the lights would be on a photosensor, design of the lights, possibly choosing lights that better matched the street lights, and timeline for installation.

There was no public testimony. Written comments were received by Jerry Hart, a property owner in support of the project, which were included in the packet.

Committee Member Drabkin was in support of the project.

Committee Member Cooley was also in support. He did not think the lights needed to be similar to the ornate, historic street lights. He thought what was proposed would be less visible, camouflaged and blended in. Since they were being added to historic resources, they should be a feature that contrasted with the historic structures.

Committee Member Branch was concerned about the spacing and thought the priority should be how the lights interacted with the existing architecture. She thought they needed to be spaced equally between windows. She also suggested a round conduit box that matched the shape of the backplate, although that looked like what the applicant was proposing. She did not think the lights should be as ornate as the street lights. She liked that the lights were simple, but was not sure about the caging.

Committee Member Drabkin thought the caging was necessary due to vandalism.

Committee Member Knapp suggested using a black color instead of bronze.

Committee Member Branch thought black would make them more visible.

Chair Mead thought the black would look more historic and appropriate as well as would match the color of the street lights. He thought keeping the conduit on the sides of the building and camouflaged with paint would be acceptable. There would be no vertical conduit.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve HL 4-21 with the amendments to change the finish to black and adjust the spacing of the lights to be done in consultation with Committee Member Branch. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 6-0.

**5. Committee Comments**

None

**6. Staff Comments**

None

**7. Adjournment**

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 4:12 p.m.