

# MINUTES

---

**June 12, 2024**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Special Meeting**

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

**Members Present:** John Mead, Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, Katherine Huit, Christopher Knapp, and Chris Chenoweth

**Members Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Community Development Director and Matthew Deppe – Associate Planner

**Others Present:**

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

## 2. Citizen Comments

None.

## 3. Minutes

- July 27, 2023
- August 24, 2023
- September 28, 2023

Committee Member Knapp moved to approve the July 27, August 24, and September 28, 2023, minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0-1 with Committee Member Huit abstaining.

## 4. Action Items

- HL 3-24: Certificate of Approval for Alterations 609 NE Cows St

Chair Mead opened the hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Committee member wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application.

Committee Member Branch would abstain from participating and voting as the applicants were close, personal friends.

Committee Member Knapp was currently doing work on the house and would also be abstaining.

Chair Mead asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to hear this matter. There was none.

Staff Presentation: Community Development Director Richards presented the request for a certificate of approval for alterations at 609 NE Cows Street. She described the subject site and property information, statement of significance, proposed alterations to the windows, doors, gutters, and siding, review process, applicable criteria, standards findings for the windows and door, and conditions of approval. If the HLC found the alterations met the applicable standards, staff provided a Decision Document that would approve the application with conditions. If the HLC did not find that the applicant provided adequate findings to support their design, the applicant might wish a continuance to provide additional information.

There were questions regarding the nook windows and glass blocks which were there when the house was added to the historic inventory but were not wood windows. The glass blocks were on a non-primary façade. There was also discussion regarding the definition of wood clad windows and how the applicant proposed wood clad windows for the exterior and an interior wood product. Staff's recommendation was that the exterior should be wood.

Applicant's Testimony: Beth Rhoades, representing the applicant, said the side of the house with the nook windows was an addition to the original home. They were aluminum clad windows, two casement and two fixed. They were proposing the two outside windows to remain casement windows and the two interior windows would become one large fixed window. They would like to replace the windows with the same type currently on the house. She showed a sample of the clad material. They planned to use a wine red color and the single door and side lights would be replaced with wood French doors. The two double hung windows in the kitchen would be replaced with new material and the glass blocks would be removed and replaced with two fixed glass windows.

Jennifer and Scott Green, applicants, said they wanted to preserve the home and substitute materials could be cost effective and increase durability. They thought it would be indistinguishable from the original and would be better to preserve the home. The French doors would mimic others in the home. They wanted to use cement board siding which was approved for another application in 2023. It was more of a sustainable material and there was no substitute available for the original siding. They had already done expensive projects to the house and wanted to make it beautiful. They would be painting all the windows the red color. The gutters had to be replaced with a similar copper-like gutter. The cedar siding was too expensive and they would leave the current aluminum if the cement board siding was not approved.

There was discussion regarding the reasons for the French doors, cost of wood windows, date of the windows, and type of French doors.

Public Testimony: Walt Gowell, McMinnville resident, said he lived near the house and supported the application as presented. He thought the proposed wood clad window replacement would be better for durability and sustainability compared to the historic wood clad on wood windows. It did not have a different appearance to the public and would not change the character of the structure.

Chair Mead asked if they proposed to replace the whole façade with the cement board or just sections. Ms. Green said the intention was to repair the existing cedar, but if that was not feasible, they would like to replace all of it with the cement board lap siding. They planned to restore the original stucco. They were asking for approval of the option to do cement board.

Committee Member Cooley suggested salvaging the cedar siding and using it on the primary façade. Mr. Green was not thrilled to have cedar on the front and a different material on the rest of it. He would prefer to have it all the same.

Chair Mead closed the public hearing.

Committee Deliberation: The Committee did not have an issue with the proposed gutters. Regarding the windows and doors, it was noted the windows had no historical value as they had been altered from the originals. The glass block windows did not contribute to the historic character of the building. There was consensus for the changes to the form of the windows and doors. However, for the window materials, there was discussion regarding the use of metal clad wood windows as opposed to wood windows and what the Secretary of the Interior's standards were.

They asked the applicant about the proposal to remove the glass blocks and not replace them with any window. Ms. Rhoades said it was a small nook area with a door and a large window already. Putting in another window would take up more room in the space.

Community Development Director Richards read from the document "16 Preservation Briefs" regarding rehabilitation and how substitute materials could be used that matched the visual and physical properties of historic materials. They could use in a small area different composition materials if the existing materials were unable to be used.

Ms. Green noted if they were going to replace materials, they wanted to replace them with sustainable materials.

Community Development Director Richards said the standards for rehab did allow for economic feasibility to be part of the decision-making process, but she did not think the durability and maintenance discussion was supported.

Chair Mead asked if any of the windows proposed to be replaced were wood windows. Ms. Green said the two double-hung windows were wood, but these were not original windows and were on the back of the house. The four nook windows were a clad material.

Community Development Director Richards said If they were going to approve the clad material, they would need the applicant to provide a basis for why it was not economically feasible to do wood windows.

Ms. Green pointed out durability was part of the Preservation Brief. Community Development Director Richards said if they were going to use the Preservation Brief as a basis for durability, she would have to investigate its relevance in comparison to the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Regarding the siding, the Committee asked the applicant if they would be removing the original wood siding or would the cement block be placed over the wood siding. Mr. Green said the

wood siding would be removed, sheeting put down, and then the cement block would go over that.

Chair Mead said the applicant would need to provide economic feasibility information on the windows for metal clad vs. all wood and siding replacement with cement siding vs. wood. The applicant would use the Secretary of Interior's standards to defend their arguments. The economic feasibility should include the total cost of the product's lifespan.

There was consensus to approve the gutters as proposed. This item would be continued to the June 27, 2024, meeting.

- HL 2-24: Historic Resource Inventory Amendment 639 SE Ford St

Chair Mead opened the hearing and read the hearing statement. He 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 there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to hear this matter. There was none.

Staff Presentation: Community Development Director Richards presented the staff report. This was a request from the Housing Authority to remove an environmental historic resource (level D) on SE Ford Street from the inventory. She explained the site location, property information, application/request, review criteria, pictures of the current condition of the house, and staff's recommendation for approval.

There were questions regarding preserving the trees and if a survey had been done for preservation of other structures in the area.

Applicant's Testimony: Mark Urban, McMinnville resident, discussed what the Housing Authority would do if the application was approved. The property had been vacant for many years and the plan was to build 3-8 homes for low-income families. He did not think there was any historic value on the property or in the neighborhood, and there was very little evidence in the survey. They might put the property in a community land trust where they would retain ownership and sell the structures to the homeowners.

Community Development Director Richards showed a map of other lots on Ford Street that had been built as high density residential.

There was no public testimony.

Chair Mead closed the public hearing.

Committee Deliberation: The Committee discussed staff's recommendation for approval and agreed the structure did not satisfy the criteria for recognition as a historic resource at the time of listing, how neglect of these structures was frustrating even though that was not the basis for this decision, and how it did not meet any of the City's historic resource levels.

Committee Member Knapp moved to approve HL 2-24, removal of the Historic Resource Inventory at 639 SE Ford St per staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed unanimously.

**5. Committee Member Comments**

None

**6. Staff Comments**

Chair Mead left the meeting.

There was discussion regarding revising the demolition by neglect code and establishing a fund to help those who could not maintain the homes, update on code compliance cases on historic properties, challenge to the City's processing of land use applications and 30 days for review after an application was deemed complete, sign removal, upcoming applications, and cost recovery for applications and creating a less expensive, more expedited process.

**7. Adjournment**

Vice Chair Branch adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.