



MINUTES

May 26, 2022
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, Eve Dewan, Christopher Knapp, and John Mead

Members Absent: Hadleigh Heller – Youth Liaison

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director and Adam Tate – Associate Planner

Others Present: Chris Chenoweth – Council Liaison

1. Call to Order

Chair John Mead called the meeting to order at 3:09 pm. This meeting was held in accordance with land use procedures required by McMinnville Code, McMinnville Comprehensive Plan, and the State of Oregon.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Work Session

None

5. Action Items

- **Public Hearing HL 5-21: 228 NE 3rd Street**

Chair Mead opened the public hearing. There were no objections to the jurisdiction of the Committee, and no Committee Member abstained, made any disclosures, or declared prior contact or site visits.

Associate Planner Adam Tate reported on HL 5-21 (Certificate of Approval for Alteration) for 228 NE 3rd Street. The building was a secondary significant contributing site within the McMinnville Downtown Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places and fell within the boundary of the Downtown Design District. Associate Planner Tate covered a

proposal to add a rear service door and awning on the south side of the building facing the public parking lot along Second Street.

Associate Planner Tate asked the Committee to consider whether the Application met the criterion test for alteration according to McMinnville Comprehensive Plan Historic Preservation policies, 17.65 Historic Preservation of the MMC, 17.59 Downtown Design Review of the MMC, and State of Oregon Administrative Rules 660-023-0200: Historic Preservation. McMinnville Building Department had commented that a building permit would be necessary when it came time to install the door and provided some Building Code specifications regarding the door installation. Staff recommended approval of the Application subject to conditions specified.

Committee Member Mary Beth Branch asked whether adjacent businesses used fiberglass doors, and voiced concerns that similar materials are used for consistency. No one present knew what materials were used for adjacent doors.

Applicants were not present. There were no public supporters or opponents. Chair Mead closed the public hearing.

Committee Member Branch questioned the consistency of the material choice of the door. She proposed an added condition that the color and material used for the door and awning match the surrounding area.

Committee discussed the durability of the door materials.

Committee Member Branch moved to approve HL5-21 subject to conditions of approval provided in the decision document, as well as an additional condition that the exterior door used will match the adjacent business's doors in material, color, and finish. Committee Member Cooley seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion Items

- **Buchanan Cellers Special Assessment**

Buchanan Cellers has applied to be part of the State Historic Preservation Special Assessment Program, which would freeze tax rates for ten years once the property enters the program in order to use the saved funds to complete a preservation plan. The State Historic Preservation Office would review all changes made to the property in the ten-year timeframe unless the locality has a design review board with jurisdiction. The exterior changes made to Buchanan Cellers would be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Committee, and the interior changes would be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Mary Beth Branch, representing the Applicant, asked Associate Planner Tate for an assessment of the Applications made for Buchanan Cellers. The Applications appeared complete, however it would be reviewed and responded to within 30 days. The narrative of the preservation plan had been slightly altered between the versions of Applications sent to different review boards.

- Planning Director Richards thought participation in the state program would circumvent the local program. Ms. Branch explained they were required to present the proposal to several agencies to get approval.

Ms. Branch summarized the Buchanan Cellers preservation plan narrative and emphasized the significance of the site in McMinnville history. The family had planned to rehabilitate major parts of the structure as small repairs were no longer sufficient. She described the architecture and repairs necessary, and noted it was the tallest building in McMinnville.

Committee Members discussed their general approval and appreciation of the narrative and the historical context. Ms. Branch hoped their project would inspire other historical site property owners to use resources like the tax credit programs.

Ms. Branch described the poor condition of the windows at Buchanan Cellers and discussed plans for restoration. The Committee expressed general support for the project. Ms. Branch noted the correct spelling was not Cellars, but Cellers which is a last name.

- **HLG Public engagement program update**

Associate Planner Tate reported these updates on the historic outreach program:

- New posters would be going up around town in June.
- Two pamphlets were being developed; one pamphlet would cover 30 historical sites, and the other pamphlet would be a “How To” guide with information and resources for property owners of historical sites.
- A special speaker series was planned to begin in June covering historical topics relevant to McMinnville.
- A walking tour of historic sites in McMinnville was being developed.

Associate Planner Tate shared some of the new posters. The Committee discussed making the posters available for sale to the public, legal ownership of the image files, and whether property owner consent was given. Committee Member Branch suggested identifying the Historic Landmark Committee on the posters.

Planning Director Richards suggested Committee Member Branch as a potential speaker in the speaker series. Committee Member Branch agreed she could speak at an event to share her expertise with the public. Committee Member Branch suggested possibly doing virtual reality tours of historic locations for those who cannot attend.

7. Committee Member Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards noted there had been a lot of Facebook activity expressing concern over [\[inaudible 1:02:20\]](#) several historical buildings which were potentially going to be demolished. There was misinformation being spread on the topic which continued to require correction. She spoke with the Interim Land Use Attorney for legal advice on the Demolition Code and interaction with the public on the topic.

Planning Director Richards discussed topics on the June meeting agenda, and noted there were many upcoming items to discuss including several Applications, the Demolition Code, updating the Comprehensive Plan manual which has not been updated since 1981 and needs to be updated to become compliant with State Land Use laws. Northwest Vernacular will be putting together language for Volume 1. Chair Mead expressed concern over being able to

produce quality decisions with so many items on the agenda. Committee discussed how to split the topics between meetings to address all the topics. Holding a special meeting was suggested to address the Demolition Code. The City has reached out to the State Historic Preservation Office for their input and advice on the Demolition Code and managing opinions on options.

Council Liaison Chenoweth has received phone calls concerning the potential building demolitions. Committee discussed how to address the public regarding the decisions being made, and that the regulations must apply to all projects. Committee Member Branch hoped the decisions could be made quickly as this issue has been long-standing. Chair Mead reiterated holding a Special Meeting on that topic would be helpful.

Planning Director noted the extra scripting at the start of the meeting and informed the Committee that they were now an official public hearing process and will be following a more rigorous process of asking questions and putting things on record.

9. Adjournment

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 4:25.