



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

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

# MINUTES

**October 14, 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 Hadleigh Heller – Youth Liaison

**Members Absent:** Joan Drabkin

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director, Adam Tate – Associate Planner, Noelle Amaya – Community Engagement, and Amy Dixon – Contract Planner

**Others Present:**

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Action Items

### A. DDR 1-21: Downtown Design Review for New Construction – Modifications - 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. Chair Mead disclosed that he had the applicants over for a glass of wine, but they did not talk about this application. 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.

Contract Planner Dixon presented the staff report. The applicants had received an initial approval for the application in June for a new building on NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street. One of the conditions was for the applicants to provide samples of the exterior building colors to the Committee for their review and approval. Additionally, due to escalating costs, the applicants were requesting consideration of an exterior material change from traditional stucco to painted panels with revealed joints. The panels were not specifically listed as prohibited, but also were not listed as approved building materials. A recent project approved by the HLC used a similar building material. However it was only approved on the non-public facing facades. Staff recommended a condition that the panels only be

placed on non-public facing facades and that the 1<sup>st</sup> Street façade be seamless joints. Staff also supported the colors provided by the applicants.

Silas and Amy Halloran-Steiner, applicants, stated the colors conformed to the rules and all of the conditions had been satisfied. Regarding the siding change, construction costs had risen exceedingly high due to the pandemic. The change was relevant to their being able to complete the project. This project would bring a small business and housing to downtown and they would like to do the project now as opposed to waiting. To decrease overall costs they had taken out the rooftop access, eco roof, circular staircase, railings, and reduced windows. They agreed with the recommendations for the north, east, and west sides of the building and asked the HLC to consider their original proposal to use reveal lines throughout the whole building which included the south side of the building. There would be a stone veneer with real stone at the bottom of the street facing offices on the south facing wall. Cement panels had been approved on other projects. Another option was to allow the reveal lines on the third floor on the south side because it would be set back by the upstairs patio and plaza. This was a multi-use building on a narrow lot and it was two blocks from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. They thought the HLC could consider allowing the cement panels on 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

Marcia Mikesh, representing the applicants, noted First Federal Bank had panels with joints on the visible sides of their building. She thought the panels were an attractive application and their project would have a similar look with First Federal.

Committee Member Cooley asked what kind of panels they would be using. Bruce (last name inaudible) answered they would be using hardie panel and another supplier for the joint material. The metal trim pieces would be painted. He could supply the profiles of the joint material to the Committee.

Ms. Mikesh shared pictures of the vertical and horizontal joint reveals. The product was an extruded aluminum alloy with proprietary coating that protected against harsh weather conditions and allowed for paint adhesion. It would be painted to match the color of the siding.

Committee Member Knapp asked if they could still do the eco roof in the future. Mr. Halloran-Steiner said they did not change the engineering and would still be capable of doing it in the future.

Committee Member Branch asked if the height of the building would remain the same. Ms. Mikesh said the fire rating requirements for the east wall required a minimum 30 inch parapet on the roof side. That was what drove the height of the building.

Mr. Halloran-Steiner said they had proposed a reveal throughout the whole building, and they would like to keep that for better maintenance. Ms. Halloran-Steiner said the reveal would be more attractive than trying to cover up the seams.

There was discussion regarding the proposed panel system, the intention of the design standards, and affordable options.

Commissioner Cooley said they were seeing this specific material approach to cladding more and more. He would like to find a way to fit it into the palette of materials that could be used on projects without violating the intent of the ordinance. The intent was to create a

unifying system so new buildings had massing and scale that was consistent with historic buildings nearby and the materials were cohesive and communicated well together. He would like to get this system in use, but he would like it to be as minimized as possible.

Committee Member Knapp said they did not want it to mimic a historic building. He thought other buildings around town looked like what was proposed and the code did not prohibit it. He thought it would look nice and the design was good. It was not historical, but they were not going for that historical vibe.

Committee Member Branch said the reason they discussed the hardie paneling was because it was not in the ordinance. The ordinance needed to be updated. She thought the intent of the current standards related to the materials required for the zone was consistency and quality. She did not think hardie would hold up to the public facing façade that might take more beating. For this application, because it was not on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, not a purely commercial building, nor a renovation to a historic building, she thought they should treat the first floor façade differently than the exterior materials above it and the sides could be treated differently than the front. She thought there should be a true reveal with no visible metal elements for the vertical joints.

Committee Member Branch asked how the detail of all exterior penetrations would be treated. Mr. Halloran-Steiner said one of the conditions was to recess all the windows on the building, and they had done that modification.

Ms. Mikesch said the framing around the windows would be 2x4 and set flush with the interior face for weather proofing. It would give them an edge that would not be trim, but something that the reveal would line up with.

Bruce (last name inaudible) said the finish detail would be dependent on the HLC's decision regarding metal showing or panel joints. They would match the windows to what was done on the siding.

Chair Mead concurred that the front first floor should be treated differently than the rest. He also agreed the non-flanged pieces gave a better reveal than the accentuated flanges. Being in a historic zone, they would have more maintenance associated with the buildings than in other areas.

Committee Member Cooley thought they should use the material as it was intended to be used on a project within the historic district and find a way to treat it with the right use of the mounting clips and their position. He thought the non-flanged channels on the verticals would help with that because there were a lot more vertical joints than horizontal and the horizontal joints could be aligned with the divisions between the stories of the building. He thought it should be a condition to use the non-flanged verticals and another condition to ensure that the alignment with the penetrations for the windows and doors was achieved.

There was consensus to allow the material to be used on the street facing façade with the condition that the verticals were flangeless. This would be a waiver to the current standards.

Committee Member Branch noted the location, which was not on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, was significant in allowing this material. She suggested a condition that the exterior corners be reviewed and approved by the Chair.

Committee Member Cooley thought for the waiver criteria, the application was a mixed-use development, it was a constrained site because of its size and height of the building, and it was on 1<sup>st</sup> Street adjacent to residential uses. This building would be higher quality in terms of durability and long-term aesthetics. The applicants could not move forward with the project as previously proposed due to the construction costs and this waiver would allow them to move forward.

There was discussion regarding whether or not to use flangeless vertical panels.

Committee Member Knapp did not think the flange would make much of a difference.

Committee Member Cooley moved to approve DDR 1-21 subject to the conditions of approval, removing staff's recommendation to allow reveal joints on all facades, and adding conditions that the first two stories of the south façade would be flangeless joints, that a detailed drawing or built sample of the penetration for the exterior corners would be reviewed and approved by the Chair and staff, and that the reveal joints would be painted the same color as the hardie panels. This was based on the findings that the application met the waiver criteria. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

#### 4. Discussion Items

- First Federal – DDR 4-19 Conditions #6 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Façade Materials

Planning Director Richards said staff was requesting clarification on the requirements in Condition #6. It required the skim coated exposed foundation wall on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to be painted a tan color to match the stone panels that would be installed above the exposed foundation wall and beneath the windows. When Planning staff conducted an inspection for compliance, they noticed there was a metal finish to the foundation on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade. In some places it was 2-3 inches and in other places it was closer to 12 inches. They had reached out to the HLC Chair, and Chair Mead thought it should be painted tan to match the stone panels. First Federal asked if they could bring it to the Committee for discussion.

There was discussion regarding the public art installation on the property and past issue with the brick and mortar colors.

Kelly Wilson, applicant, explained the location of the metal finishings. Initially they had envisioned a stronger base underneath the windows, but as they developed the design they realized aesthetically it was not what the bank wanted. They brought the brick as well as the stone panels all the way down so the foundation was no longer exposed. There was metal trim at the bottom of the stone panels to protect the panels. He thought this met the Committee's original preference to not have the foundation exposed. The stainless steel trim was durable, high quality, and low maintenance. The recessed area at the entrance had stainless steel at the bottom of the panels as well. However, this would be behind landscaping and once the landscaping was mature, the stainless steel would be screened from view. The trim was the same on Baker Street.

Chair Mead asked if he was opposed to painting the trim. Mr. Wilson said painting the stainless steel would be difficult as the paint would not stick well.

Committee Member Knapp asked if it could be powder coated. Mr. Wilson did not think so. It would have to be removed and replaced.

Jim Schlotfeldt, CEO of First Federal, said this was the only area of the building that was called out in the approval process. They had covered the foundation and he thought the stainless steel blended in with the gray sidewalk and disappeared. The stainless steel was on the mock up and was not questioned at that time or during construction.

Committee Member Branch discussed the site visit she did with staff to look at the brick and mortar colors. They did not discuss any other components at that time.

There was consensus to treat the two items separately, how the condition was met or not met on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and if what was built on Baker Street was what they had originally approved. The elevation on Baker did not show the stainless steel on the application materials.

Committee Member Cooley said aesthetically the presence of the stainless steel flashing along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street was not a problem. He was more concerned about how it came about and that it should have come back to the Committee.

Committee Member Branch agreed. She was concerned about precedent for use of stainless steel material. The reflectivity of this material drew attention to itself. The areas where it was minimal on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street was not so much, but she cautioned treating it differently depending on where it was located. Their approval of an application was the material included in the application, including the drawings. The conditions called out more specific items. It did not make the rest of the application less important or enforceable. She would like to know the options for treating the stainless steel for changing its color or reflectiveness after it had been installed.

Chair Mead thought since it was already installed, it would need to be primer and paint, which would not be as long lasting as opposed to leaving it as stainless. It was not as preferable, but it was possible.

Committee Member Knapp said the bottom line was the applicant did not do what was asked. The condition was not met.

Chair Mead agreed the drawings presented to the Committee and the condition for the exposed foundation to be covered with stone panels or the concrete would be colored to match the stone panels, was not what was built.

There was consensus that the condition for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade was not met.

There was discussion regarding use of the stainless steel on Baker Street.

Committee Member Branch thought it would be inconsistent to enforce the original decision document on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street side and not on Baker Street.

Committee Member Cooley said it was the same issue with how the panels interfaced with the base of the building at grade.

Committee Member Cooley moved that Condition #6 of DDR 4-19 for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade was not met and to direct staff to work with the applicant to find remedies. In addition, staff would work with the applicant for remedies to the built condition on Baker Street which was different from the design as presented for original approval. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Knapp and approved 4-0.

- **Historic Preservation Marketing Education Program – CLG Grant**

Planning Director Richards said funds had been set aside to do a marketing education program about historic preservation. This would help elevate the value of preservation, would provide a better connection to the historical stories the buildings represented, and would provide a resource for those wanting to do something with their historic property.

Associate Planner Tate discussed his background in history and journalism. He would be managing the project, and was working on hiring a consultant. He planned to focus on the story telling aspect and making connections.

There was consensus for the Committee to give feedback early in the process and receive frequent updates. Education was needed about the regulatory process, especially for new property owners.

Planning Director Richards said staff would bring back the consultant proposals to the next meeting for the Committee to review.

## **5. Committee Comments**

None

## **6. Staff Comments**

None

## **7. Adjournment**

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 5:57 p.m.