



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

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

# EXHIBIT 1 - MINUTES

**June 28, 2017**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**Community Development Center**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Chair Joan Drabkin, John Mead, Rebecca Quandt, and Cory Schott

**Members Absent:** Mary Beth Branch

**Staff Present:** Chuck Darnell - Associate Planner

**Others Present:**

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

## 2. Citizen Comments

None.

## 3. Approval of Minutes

None.

## 4. Action Items

### A. G 3-17 – Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendments

Associate Planner Chuck Darnell reviewed the amendments. The first was the reorganization of bringing the historic preservation guidelines into the Zoning Ordinance. The second was adding review criteria to be considered when designating a historic resource. Per State rules, they had to follow the national register criteria for evaluation.

There was discussion regarding the process for a structure to be undesignated. The HLC thought there should be more education for property owners, especially regarding the benefits of being historically designated.

Chair Drabkin thought the regulations were too strict. She was also concerned about the timelines, especially if someone was trying to do something with their property and the Committee delayed a decision.

Associate Planner Darnell said demolition or any alteration request had to be reviewed within 30 days. It was up to the Committee whether an application was delayed or denied. He thought they had the ability to be flexible and work with applicants while still making sure the applications met the guidelines.

Chair Drabkin asked if there was an appeals process. Associate Planner Darnell said yes, it would go to the Planning Commission, and then to the City Council. He did not think the changes were drastically different from what had been required before. These were new rules required by the State.

Chair Drabkin asked about the timeline for issuing applicants' approval certificates. She was concerned about people waiting a long time before being able to move forward with their projects. Associate Planner Darnell said for other applications there was a five day timeframe for issuing approval letters. They could add the five day timeframe into the language.

Committee Member Quandt agreed it should be added that applications would be responded to within 30 days of submittal and if applications were approved, within five working days applicants would receive an approval certificate.

Chair Drabkin thought they should also include how to request an emergency meeting if the application was urgent or the timeframe did not work for them.

Associate Planner Darnell said applicants could negotiate with the Planning Department for what was allowable under staff review instead of coming to the Committee.

Chair Drabkin suggested adding that to the language as well, that if the timeframe did not work, applicants had the option of having a meeting with the Planning Director.

Associate Planner Darnell said the definition of alteration had been changed to not include painting, re-roofing, or general repair when the new materials and/or colors matched those already in use. There was also language that said the Planning Director would determine whether the proposed activities constituted an alteration.

Associate Planner Darnell said the third change was additional language related to owner consent. This would allow owners to refuse designation when something was proposed to be designated and outlined the process for removal from the inventory. This was language from the new State regulations. The fourth change was in regard to the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines. These standards and guidelines would only be applied to the top two resource categories. The fifth change was to require all properties on the national register to be protected. Accessory structures and non-contributing resources were exempted from this requirement. The sixth change was requiring a public hearing for any demolition of a national register resource. The bylaws for the Committee would have to be changed as well to allow the Committee to hold public hearings.

There was discussion regarding the map of the properties that were locally and nationally designated. The HLC thought the map should be updated and made clearer as to what properties were and were not contributing.

Associate Planner Darnell said the next change was the certificate of approval process which would be triggered by an alteration that impacted the design or appearance of the structure and allowed Planning staff to determine that.

Committee Member Mead asked about the enforcement section. Associate Planner Darnell said the idea of increasing the fines was brought before the Planning Commission. The City Attorney was at that meeting, and he did not think they could raise it to \$15,000 as it was higher than felony fines. The way it was written the fines would follow the violations chapter of the Zoning Ordinance. This gave the City the ability to issue a citation to appear in court and it could be a \$500 fine for every day the violation occurred.

Chair Drabkin thought how much someone would be fined needed clarification, especially if it was something like demolition or something that could not be remedied. Associate Planner Darnell said they would go to court and the court would decide if they would be fined or not.

Associate Planner Darnell said the Committee's bylaws would be moved to a City Code chapter. The Downtown Design Standards and Guidelines would be changed as well. Alterations downtown would require a certificate of approval process and the Planning Director would have the ability to determine if the activities complied and whether they were subject to the review procedures.

There was discussion regarding signs downtown that were existing non-conforming signs and which ones would be brought into compliance.

Committee Member Mead moved to recommend the proposed amendments be forwarded to the Planning Commission with the addition that within five working days applicants would receive an approval certificate. Motion seconded by Committee Member Schott and passed unanimously.

## **5. Discussion Items**

### **A. Intensive Level Survey Focus Area**

Associate Planner Darnell said staff would be putting out a request for proposals for an intensive level survey. He asked if there was an area the Committee wanted to be surveyed or if the consultant should provide a recommended area to focus on. A previous consultant had recommended the two areas as potential historic districts. One was in an area south of downtown, and the other was a residential area north of downtown.

There was discussion regarding which area should be the focus. There was consensus to direct the consultant to look at both areas, and work with the Committee to select one to focus on.

Chair Drabkin asked about the Macy House, which was considered distinctive but was now a brand new house. They had used the original plans as a jumping off point, but they had made major changes to the house. Associate Planner Darnell said the Committee could initiate the process and reclassify it.

Associate Planner Darnell said the RFP would be drafted in July with responses due in August and a consultant hired in September. The consultant would do the inventory first and then work on the Historic Preservation Plan. The Committee would be involved in the interview process.

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

None.

**7. Committee/Commissioner Comments**

None.

**8. Staff Comments**

None.

**9. Adjournment**

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 4:03 p.m.