

# MINUTES

---

**May 4, 2022**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

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

**Members Present:** Mary Beth Branch, Christopher Knapp, Mark Cooley, and John Mead  
**Members Absent:** Eve Dewan  
**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director and Adam Tate – Associate Planner,  
**Others Present:** Chris Chenoweth – Council Liaison

---

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Mead called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Approval of Minutes

- May 27, 2021
- January 27, 2022

Committee Member Branch moved to approve the May 27, 2021, and January 27, 2022 minutes as presented. Committee Member Cooley seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

## 4. Work Session

None

## 5. Action Items

- Hearing for DDR 1-22 216 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street

Associate Planner Tate presented the request which included approval of new windows, doors, front façade, and paint scheme at 216 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. She reviewed Staff's recommended conditions of approval and suggested the Historic Landmark Committee (HLC) review additional or conflicting information contained in illustrations in the Application regarding stained wood columns, a black metal roof, material choice, and paint.

Door materials and structural permits were discussed. The HLC would require the Applicant to provide additional information to the existing narrative before a decision was made.

Hannah, Applicant, explained the Application was filed before all the materials were determined, and discussed the materials they planned to use. Windows would be added in the front where they were currently boarded up.

The Committee discussed that a glazing analysis would be impacted with the introduction of new windows.

Applicants noted that they would be leaving the existing roof as-is and discussed the planned color scheme, the plans for the wood columns, and roll-up door on the front.

- Changing the bay window into a roll-up door would change the footprint of the building and would require matching the outdoor brickwork where the floor had been.

Committee Member Branch felt the Application and plans were not finalized enough to come to a decision, and some plans contradicted Downtown Building Code as far as materials and colors used. The Committee would need to discuss each item before a decision could be made.

Applicants noted overhead doors arrive about 18 months after the order date, which was a risk. The Committee clarified if they granted approval the Applicants could choose whether to take the risk of ordering the door, and reiterated the Application needed to be more complete with finalized drawings and the burden of proof that the project had been planned to Code before a decision could be made.

Applicants decided against the metal roof, and some fretwork included in the Application, and would submit a more complete Application when plans become clear. The material and condition of the existing rear windows were discussed, as well as plans to replace the inoperable windows. The site would like to facilitate indoor and outdoor use by customers. Property lines were also discussed.

The Committee discussed the overhead door which would replace the front bay window. Fencing would not be included in the front.

Committee Member Branch was uncomfortable with the project as it did not fit with Downtown design standards and may set a precedent for other unconventional projects to take place. The proposed industrial look did not fit with the historical background of the building or the design of other buildings on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Applicants did not want a bulkhead rather than an overhead door as they hoped service and pedestrians would be able to pass through that space.

The asymmetry of the design plan with the overhead door was discussed. Chair Mead expressed the overhead door did not fit into the character or architecture of the Historic Downtown area, even with a street-level bulkhead included.

Councilor Chenoweth discussed the ramifications of covid, the possibility of another infectious virus, and being proactive in considering a new direction with architecture to allow businesses to keep running in the event of another infectious illness.

- The Committee had been specifically tasked with preserving the historical feel of buildings and were also committed to flexibility for the future.

The Committee discussed the possibility of installing a roll-up door as well as preserving the bulkhead. The Applicant clarified the overhead door would provide functionality, and if the access were blocked a partial garage door would be an unnecessary cost. The Committee suggested French doors or three-panel doors could be used instead to preserve the historical feel. The Code required either a bulkhead or a waiver. Functionality could be approached in different ways that would meet Code requirements and would likely cost less.

Applicants would not require a waiver if the existing window was replaced with a man door. Planning Director Richards clarified that a waiver is only required if the plan was not compliant with the Code.

The Committee discussed the use of fiberglass windows and noted most commercial windows are required to be metal unless wooden windows were approved for historic preservation. Fiberglass windows would cost the Applicant less and would be installed using the same contractor. Chair Mead discussed that similar materials needed to be used to ensure the consistency of the storefront.

The Applicants had planned to have the signage lender apply for the signage permit. They were advised that the permit could be included in the Application to cost less. The color black had been used in signage nearby, however, Committee Member Branch discussed that in those other signs, the black is not contrasted with white and it may become too prominent and detract from other features. Committee Member Knapp had no issues with the use of black. Black has been allowed as a trim color, but generally not as a prominent color. Colors could be reviewed with the Committee later, and presenting paint samples for the exact shade would be appreciated.

The Committee discussed the use of stained wood as a material, which is not usually allowed. Committee Member Knapp recommended a maintenance plan for stained wood should be submitted for consideration. Other uses of stained wood have been approved in the past but were prohibited without a waiver. Opaque stain or paint could potentially be permitted. Existing HardieBacker could be left or painted, but additional HardieBacker would require a separate discussion.

The Applicants would need to have designs submitted by the following Monday to have it reviewed by the next meeting. The decision would be given within 30 days of submission. Committee members were flexible on meeting dates to facilitate a timely review of this project.

The Applicants were advised to provide complete elevations, identify product details, provide a full narrative regarding building facades, and ensure cohesiveness between drawings and narratives, with more detail preferred. Physical color samples would be helpful to include, as well as a plan for compliant materials.

Brandon. Applicant, asked about the Code regarding can lighting installed in the soffit. The Code did not address recessed lighting or heat lamps. Color and material information would still be required. Door brands were recommended.

- HLG Public Engagement Program update

Associate Planner Tate shared a pamphlet highlighting the 30 designated sites selected for the posters with a map, a pamphlet informing homeowners of the process of working with the HLC,

and a webpage on McMinnville Historic Preservation. He discussed an upcoming speaker series on McMinnville history and shared the webpages on the selected McMinnville historic sites.

The Committee discussed whether the posters could be sold or the photos could be used to create other collectible items for sale or used for promotions on social media. The Committee also discussed the legal rights of the photos of historic sites and noted property owners should be contacted before use. The Committee considered creating a walking tour or scavenger hunt of the historic sites.

## **6. Old/New Business**

None

## **7. Committee Member Comments**

Committee Member Branch hoped to avoid having Applicants come before the HLC with incomplete or inconsistent Applications in the future. Planning Director Richards clarified Staff does not necessarily review Applications beforehand. The Committee discussed the design guidelines, the possibility of Applicants amending plans for compliance, and the issues that lead to the incomplete Application they reviewed.

Future HLC meetings will be shifted to Thursdays at 3:00 pm to allow meetings at the Civic Hall.

## **8. Staff Comments**

McMinnville would be working with two transcriptionists to get their meeting minutes caught up and IT would be working to get Zoom meeting recordings online for public access.

- Demolition Code – upcoming work

Planning Director Richards noted the Code is inconsistent in different sections. She planned to provide recommendations to amend the Code for consistency. She would provide the information to Committee Members four weeks in advance for review. The information was open for discussion.

## **9. Adjournment**

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 4:53 pm.