



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1 - MINUTES

May 15, 2018
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
Community Development Center
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Joan Drabkin, Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, John Mead, and Heather Sharfeddin

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Associate Planner and Heather Richards – Planning Director

Others Present: Larry Collver, Max de Lavenne, Erika Everett, Ernie Munch, and Caleb Roach

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Action Items

- A. HL 3-18 / DDR 2-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration and Downtown Design Review and Waiver - 608 NE 3rd Street

Associate Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a proposal to make alterations to the Taylor-Dale building. The property was in the Downtown Historic District and was a local distinctive historic resource as well as a contributing property on the National Register of Historic Places. The alterations proposed were changes to the ground floor and second floor entryways and windows. He then reviewed the approval criteria. The proposed uses of a restaurant on the ground floor and short term rentals on the upper floor were being achieved without a loss to the historic materials and features of the structure. They were preserving the exterior masonry as well as the decorative and defining features in the brickwork. The changes to the entryways would

improve access and meet building code requirements. He explained the specific changes that would be made and said an elevator would be installed as well. The applicant would retain the wooden storefront system with the exception of changing the glass. Staff had suggested a condition to preserve the architectural details described in the inventory. The original wood windows on the second floor were being proposed to be replaced, and there was a condition that the applicant would provide the City with evidence of the deterioration of the windows and staff would evaluate that evidence to determine if replacement was necessary. He discussed the Secretary of Interior standards that were applicable to the project. Staff thought the changes proposed were minor on the main facades and the larger scale changes were on façades that were not visible and not on the prominent historic facades. He then went over the Downtown Historic District design review criteria. The main design was not being changed and no prohibited building materials were proposed. However, the applicant was requesting a waiver for the awning material and location in order to use a steel awning over the second story entryway on 3rd Street. The argument for using steel was that it fit with the steel system proposed for the seismic upgrade to the building. The awning would be the same depth as the adjacent storefront system and would not stand out. Instead of a canopy awning, it would be a flat awning that would blend in with the building. The proposed signage met the criteria. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

Ernie Munch, representing the applicant, described the building and its current condition. He explained the applicant wanted to keep the original masonry, but there was water damage that would need to be repaired. The applicant viewed this as a long term investment. They wanted to have better access to the apartments on the second floor and to make it more welcoming for guests. There was very little steel in the building and in an earthquake the columns would collapse. The engineers suggested adding steel plates to the columns and for most of the building it would be on the inside. However in one area the steel would be exposed. They had taken it as an opportunity to attach a steel canopy to the steel plates. They had looked at how steel was used at the time the building was constructed and he explained how the detailing would be done to be historically accurate. It would also be long lasting and easily maintained. Staff had asked them to look into coating the columns with wood and they found it would add extra width on the columns. He thought the changes should be distinguishable and not copy the original details. The glass was cracked in places and would need to be replaced. This was the time to make these changes when the building was empty and a new owner had the resources to fix it.

There was discussion regarding the proposed changes to the doors and the use of the steel.

Mr. Munch stated the improvements were important to adapt the building to the new use and for people to want to come back. The new work would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the historic materials in features, size, scale, proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property.

Committee Member Branch asked if they had looked into alternative options for the entrance door to the upstairs. She thought it should match the double entry door.

Chair Drabkin agreed that the door was jarring to the rest of the building and the downtown community itself. She asked if there was another alternative.

There was further discussion regarding the windows and the glass that would be used. Mr. Munch thought they could take the current glass out and do the earthquake upgrades then put the glass back in.

Committee Member Cooley asked about the canopy width and if it was needed for shelter for guests coming and going. The vertical elements of the brick were partially interrupted by the width of the canopy. To the extent the door stood out, it was partly because the columns were being intersected.

Mr. Munch clarified the canopy width was for guests and to protect the entry system from the weather.

Committee Member Branch appreciated that it would protect the wood elements.

Mr. Munch discussed the evaluation report for the windows, how they had been originally installed, and the deterioration and water damage that had resulted. They were proposing to replace a number of the windows with double pane windows. He then explained the process that would be done to replace the windows and maintain the brickwork. They could not save the windows and the brick; it was one or the other. It would take 120 days to replace the windows and they would like to begin as soon as possible. He also discussed his concerns regarding the Jeld-wen windows that had been put in by the previous owner that still needed to be evaluated. If they needed to be replaced, it would be with windows that were consistent with the building. Some of the glass was cracked as well. He continued by discussing the flashing for the windows and the material to use for the flashing.

Committee Member Branch said she had been concerned regarding the awning and changing the proportion of the door, but after the discussion she realized the proportion, door, and windows were non-negotiable because of ADA requirements. There was never an awning in that location before, but it was a new piece and meant to look like a new piece. She thought it worked in the way it related to the existing design. The report on the windows was informative and explained the current conditions. She was in favor of allowing the second story windows to be replaced. The original bronze fasteners and items listed on the National Register nomination should be preserved and the replacement doors should be constructed out of wood. She was not in support of the condition for the steel structural system to be encased in wood.

Committee Member Mead agreed with Committee Member Branch. He saw the awning as an addition and that it should be compatible yet distinctive. However the niche below the awning had always been part of the building and he struggled to bring that distinctiveness into the new area. Should the awning and the niche be viewed as one whole addition to the building or if the awning was the only addition, should they consider the wood to match the rest of the façade?

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought it was being altered substantially enough that it created a new structure. She thought the wood was not needed because this was an addition and not part of the original building.

Committee Member Cooley agreed with what had been said. A lot of the distinctive inventory was seismically vulnerable and there were a number of different approaches to address it during a

restoration. In almost every case it involved something that affected the historical quality of the resource. He thought it would be a benefit to see the improvements instead of trying to conceal them. Regarding the vertical elements being interrupted by the canopy, he thought because of the change in use it had to be allowed for.

Committee Member Branch wanted to make sure the paint colors would match with the awning.

Committee Member Mead suggested that the applicant invite the Committee to monitor the replacement of the windows.

Chair Drabkin still had reservations about the awning and the door as they were jarring.

Committee Member Branch said the awning was only sticking out two feet and she did not think it would be as jarring when it was installed.

Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 3-18 / DDR 2-18 with Conditions 2, 3, and 4. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 5-0.

B. HL 4-18 / DDR 3-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration and Downtown Design Review - 618 NE 3rd Street

Associate Planner Darnell described the application for the single story building next to the Taylor-Dale building. The alterations proposed were driven by the changes made to the Taylor-Dale building, but since it was a separate property it had to be reviewed separately. The property was listed as contributory on the local inventory and was classified as a contributing property to the Downtown Historic District. The proposed changes were removal of the existing exterior staircase from the second story of the Taylor-Dale building and to demolish a one foot by seven foot portion of the southwest corner of the building to accommodate egress from the neighboring property and reconstruction of new walls. The new walls would have stucco and be painted consistent with the existing building. No changes were being made to the historic character-defining features of the building. The changes would allow for the uses of the neighboring building and would bring the building into compliance with the City Code. He reviewed the drawings of what was being proposed and discussed the existing conditions of the building. He then explained the conditions of approval.

Mr. Munch explained where the bollards, trash containers, and gas meter would go. He clarified they would paint the new walls to match the existing building color.

Committee Member Branch moved to approve HL 4-18 / DDR 3-18 with the conditions proposed by staff and an added condition that the applicant paint the new walls to match the existing color. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed 5-0.

C. HL 6-18 / DDR 5-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration and Downtown Design Review - 620 NE 3rd Street

Associate Planner Darnell stated this property was listed as an environmental resource on the local inventory and as a contributing property in the Downtown Historic District. He

described the existing front façade and discussed the review criteria. The proposed alterations included a second story addition to the existing one story building and an exterior staircase on the south alley facing façade. The applicant proposed to use the addition for office space. They planned to retain the existing storefront ground floor façade. He then explained the proposed addition and the applicable standards and guidelines. The addition was limited to one story and it was set back 20 feet to meet the guidelines and not detract from the existing façade. It also distinguished the addition from the existing building. The addition would be built to the property lines to be consistent with the scale and massing of the existing building. The walls would be stucco and hardie board siding on the less visible sides and there would be wood soffits. The existing building and new addition would be painted the same colors. These would be subtle earthtone colors, tan and charcoal gray. Staff recommended approval with conditions which included repair of some of the windows on the ground floor and that the storefront would be maintained.

Max de Lavenne, applicant, introduced himself and Larry Collver and Caleb Roach, the project team.

Chair Drabkin did not think the proposed aluminum windows were allowed. Associate Planner Darnell agreed aluminum windows would not meet the Downtown Historic District design standards. A waiver of that standard would have to be approved to allow them.

Mr. Lavenne said the reason for the aluminum windows was to distinguish the new from the old. The second story would be set back and the windows would not be as noticeable. They had talked about doing a wood trim on top of the aluminum frame but there was a lot of wood rot and deterioration currently on the ground floor and they wanted the upstairs windows to last longer. Aluminum windows were the most affordable option.

Associate Planner Darnell said that was an option, to allow wood trim over the aluminum frame.

Committee Member Branch did not think the addition was compatible with the original building. The shed roof with an exaggerated overhang and introducing new materials of raw wood and exposed beams on the sides did not fit. These items drew attention away from the original building. She thought the overhang should be removed.

Committee Member Sharfeddin suggested painting the ground floor the brighter tan color and the addition a darker color to bring the historic building forward and the addition back.

Mr. Lavenne said the overhang was important so they could use the patio in the winter. The overhang was about six feet wide.

Committee Member Cooley thought the purpose of the setback was to create a separation between the new use and the historic resource. There was also a proposed new use for the patio as well.

Committee Member Mead suggested adding a squared off parapet wall to the roof.

There was discussion regarding the interior ceiling height, putting in a parapet, and the size and location of the overhang. It was suggested to lower the overhang to be built in with the window system to make it less detracting.

Committee Member Branch would be more in favor of the aluminum windows if the overhang went between the top windows and the doors. Because the massing of the overhang was much more comparable to the existing structure, there needed to be more compatibility.

Chair Drabkin asked about the material and design of the stairs. Mr. Lavenne described the stairs, which were proposed to be metal. There was a lot of activity in the alley and there needed to be an exit off the second level. The reason for the metal was to keep the stairs from deteriorating over time. There would be a gate that would open out so people could get out of the building, but not get in.

Associate Planner Darnell summarized the changes the HLC would like, which were removing the soffit and canopy from the addition so the north elevation would be flush to the building, allowing a canopy between the second story windows and main story windows, adding a parapet wall on the east and west elevations to square off the roofline of the building, and the addition would be painted a darker color while a lighter color would be on the main floor. The HLC was in support of the aluminum windows without the wood trim. These conditions would be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.

Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 6-18 / DDR 5-18 with the conditions as discussed. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 5-0.

5. Discussion Items

None

6. Old/New Business

None

7. Committee/Commissioner Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

None

9. Adjournment

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.