

# MINUTES

January 27, 2022 Historic Landmarks Regular Meeting	3:30 pm Committee Zoom Meeting McMinnville, Oregon
Members Present:	Mary Beth Branch, Eve Dewan, Hadleigh Heller, Christopher Knapp, and John Mead
Members Absent:	Mark Cooley
Staff Present:	Heather Richards – Planning Director and Adam Tate – Associate Planner
Others Present:	Chris Chenowith, Council liaison

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Mead called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Everyone present introduced themselves.

### 2. Citizen Comments

None

### 3. Oath of Service

Planning Director Richards swore in new HLC Member Eve Dewan.

### 4. Election of Officers

Committee Member Knapp moved to nominate John Mead as Chair for 2022. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed unanimously.

Committee Member Branch was nominated as Vice Chair for 2022. The motion passed unanimously.

### 5. Approval of Minutes

• October 14, 2021

Committee Member Branch moved to approve the October 14, 2021 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Knapp and passed unanimously.

### 6. Action Items

• Demolition Code Discussion and Staff Report

Planning Director Richards presented the proposed amendments to Section 17.65.050, Demolition Code. She showed pictures of historic landmarks that had been protected. She then discussed state compliance for historic resource protection, local government additional protection measures, and how the City's current code needed to be amended to be in conformance with the state. The proposed amendments pertained to Historic Resource, Historic Landmark, and National Register. There could be a delay of 120 days for a demolition certificate of approval and 180 days for Distinctive Resources to find alternative solutions to demolition. The proposed amendments also included factors for decision making. She explained what was in the model code that was not in the proposed amendments. These were for replacement plans and relocation studies.

There was discussion regarding what was considered a Historic Landmark and National Register categories and how they were protected and reviewed. There was further discussion regarding demolition applications needing to show a plan for the property and remedies if the developer did not move forward with the project, economic hardship considerations, distinguishing the integrity of the property rather than the land use, and why other cities did not get a lot of demolition requests.

Planning Director Richards said some of the struggle was the demolition code applied to all historic properties. They could apply the demolition code to only some or have a better code for the factor of historic integrity and significance and allow that to weed out what should or should not be demolished.

Committee Member Knapp liked the comparisons with other cities and was in favor of what was presented.

Committee Member Dewan agreed. She liked expanding the criteria for economic use and making it less subjective and adding the demolition by neglect term.

Committee Member Branch also was in favor of including the demolition by neglect. They had a large inventory and she thought it should be updated. She was concerned that they were looking at demolition when they should start somewhere else or looking at these simultaneously. She wanted to make sure that if a building was demolished what was built in its place was appropriate. She was concerned about properties that had been put in the wrong category and making all the categories go through the demolition process.

Chair Mead suggested creating a table that showed the demolition process for each of the categories and the remedies for replacement.

Planning Director Richards thought there should be more clarity in the criteria for how to deny a demolition. She would have to look into the process for reviewing and making changes to the current inventory.

Committee Member Branch wanted to look at the fine for demolition without permission.

Councilor Chenowith suggested instead of creating the table with the four different categories, staff could bring back recommendations for a and b and the Committee could decide if they wanted to include the c and d categories.

### 7. Discussion Items

• Update on the HLG Public Engagement and Outreach Program

Associate Planner Tate said he was working on a public outreach education and engagement program about historic preservation and historic resources. This would be through the City's

website, pamphlets, posters of historic sites, walking tours, and speakers. He asked for suggestions of sites for the posters.

The Committee made suggestions.

### 8. Old/New Business

None

## 9. Committee Member Comments

None

## 10. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards discussed upcoming applications.

## 11. Adjournment

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 5:21 p.m.