



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 2 - MINUTES

June 27, 2018
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
Community Development Center
McMinnville, Oregon

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

Members Absent: Mary Beth Branch

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner, Jamie Fleckenstein – Associate Planner, and Heather Richards – Planning Director

Others Present: Steve Cox, David Foust, Laura Foust, and Brigitte Hoss

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

A. February 28, 2018

Committee Member Mead moved to approve the February 28, 2018 minutes as written. Motion seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0.

4. Action Items

A. DDR 7-18 - Downtown Design Review and Waiver - 631 NE 1st Street

Senior Planner Darnell presented the application for a downtown design review and multiple design waivers for new construction at 631 NE 1st Street. The property was zoned C-3, General Commercial. The proposal was to construct a mixed use building that had either a commercial office or short term rental space on the ground floor and a dwelling unit in the back of the ground floor and going up to a second level. The front entry would enter into the business portion of the building, and there would be an entry to the rear to provide access to the dwelling unit. The design standards called for the building to be consistent with the massing and configuration of similar and nearby historic buildings.

This area of town was residential and the applicant was proposing to design a residential structure that would blend in with that environment. He described the proposed elevations and multiple architectural designs. The applicant was requesting design waivers for the zero setback requirement, storefront design features, recessed windows, and building materials. Staff was supportive of the zero setback and storefront design feature waivers due to the residential design of the building. Regarding the recessed windows and building materials, staff had some concerns. There were not enough details provided about the windows proposed. He suggested that if the windows were not recessed, they should be designed to mimic that historic architectural character. The building material proposed was a wood shake on the left half of the front façade, and hardy plank paneling on the other side. One criterion for the design was that the alternative design would better accomplish the historic character of the neighboring properties, and if the HLC thought the overall design was more compatible, staff thought the building materials could be waived. He then reviewed the design standards. This would be a two story building, which was consistent with surrounding property massing. Staff was concerned about the configuration as neighboring properties had a more defined architectural configuration and pattern. He gave examples of how the combination of the features for the proposed building did not fit. Also the orientation of the roofline was not consistent with neighboring properties. There would be a recessed entry. Staff was recommending denial of the application due to the configuration and number of waivers requested given that the design was not fully meeting the purpose of the downtown design standards.

Brigitte Hoss, applicant, said this had been a difficult process as it was an extremely narrow lot. They had looked into rebuilding the structure that was on the property, but it was not economically feasible. They had also taken pictures and looked at the design of the houses in the neighborhood as well as submitted the pictures in her application. After doing all of the research, the new construction with this particular style would cost \$400,000 and the property was appraised at \$330,000. She was concerned she would not be able to get financing. She thought there needed to be better communication on the land use process and historic design guidelines. The combination of styles would be consistent, especially since they had used elements of the neighboring homes in the design. Due to the timing of the application, they had one more month on their loan approval. She had been working with a general contractor and a spec home design builder.

Steve Cox, representing the applicant, discussed how the HLC could approve the application, approve it with conditions, or deny it. He thought the problems that were stated in the staff report could all be characterized as arbitrary and subjective. There were design elements of the two different styles in the area. The proposed home was not out of character with the block and would not detract from the neighborhood. He thought the house was closer to acceptable than not acceptable.

There was discussion regarding staff's findings and whether or not this application met the historic pattern of the neighborhood and how it would be better if the applicant chose one style for the proposed house.

Chair Drabkin pointed out the sliding glass door for the back entrance would need to be changed and the windows should be recessed.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought it looked like a spec home that any new neighborhood might have. It did not fit with the historic nature of the neighborhood.

David Fouste, McMinnville resident, said regarding the elevations, only the front could be seen by the neighborhood. The sides and back could not be seen.

Laura Fouste, McMinnville resident, pointed out the size of the lots in the neighborhood were much larger than the applicant's property. The main floors of these properties were five feet above the sidewalk elevation, which was different from the proposal due to the accessibility for commercial use and they had no off street parking. Some of the houses had a mixture of styles and aluminum siding. There was not a way to take the design referenced by Planning staff and reduce the dimensions proportionally for a 40 foot lot. To keep the massing in line with the neighborhood some creativity was necessary. Even if they had a large enough lot to duplicate the examples in the staff report, it was impossible to replicate the historic buildings as they did not meet current code requirements. Changing these types of features would alter the design. A new structure would always look different. In regard to the front façade, which was the only side visible on the property, if they went with staff's suggestion for a Craftsman style with a prominent gable on the upper roof, it would extend the visual aspects of the front upward and would make the building look out of proportion. By having a hip component near the top, the eye was drawn downward to the smaller gables that were proportional for the lot size. She liked the upper hip component fused with the Craftsman features as they minimized the upper mass and provided neighbors more light and sky view. She thought the design was good and compatible with the Craftsman nature of her adjacent property. Staff had said in the staff report that nearly every other property had a prominent front porch that covered the entirety of the front façade, however only half of the houses met this criteria. She was in favor of the current design as submitted and thought it fit the block and neighborhood. This property was on the extreme edge of the design review area. The proposed structure would transition nicely with the adjacent homes into the neighborhood.

There was discussion regarding the hardy plank siding.

Chair Drabkin thought the wood shake siding did not fit. She would like to know what the windows would look like and thought they needed to be consistent. There should be no sliding glass door on the back.

Committee Member Mead suggested they only go with the Craftsman style and configuring the roof with a gable and front porch along the entire front of the building.

Chair Drabkin added that all the windows needed to be consistent with the historic neighborhood and the design for the windows would be submitted to staff. The back door would not be sliding glass, but something more traditional.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified the changes suggested, which included changing the roofline to a full gable across the entire roofline and the front porch extending across the full front façade. These would be more consistent with the Craftsman style. The exterior design would include removal of the wood shakes, use of smooth hardy plank siding at a 3 to 5 inch reveal, the window design would be provided in more detail to be approved by the Planning Director, and the back door would be a traditional entry door. The HLC was comfortable with the four waivers that were requested.

Committee Member Mead moved to approve DDR 7-18 - Downtown Design Review and Waivers - 631 NE 1st Street with the conditions as stated by staff. Motion seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0.

5. Discussion Items

A. Historic Preservation Plan

Senior Planner Darnell introduced new Associate Planner Jamie Fleckenstein.

Senior Planner Darnell gave an update on the Historic Preservation Plan process. A public meeting was held last month and staff took comments and suggestions and incorporated them into the implementation plan. There had been 70 responses to the online survey and stakeholder interviews had been held. He reviewed the plan components, historic context chapter, analysis of the existing program, and incentives. He then explained Chapter 5, the goals, policies, and proposals chapter. One of the items in the chapter was continuing to do survey work and he discussed the areas where surveys could be done.

Chair Drabkin was concerned about the financial impact of designating historic districts, especially in regard to increased taxes.

There was discussion regarding the process for creating historic districts. Senior Planner Darnell said the County Assessor had stated that a historic district did not influence the assessed value of a property. There was no specific recommendation in the plan to create historic districts, however it was a possible outcome from the survey work.

Chair Drabkin would like to have the County Assessor come to a meeting to discuss it.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought there should be outreach to property owners and education to realtors as well.

There was consensus for staff to move forward with the draft plan. Senior Planner Darnell said the consultants would submit a final report in July.

6. Old/New Business

None

7. Committee/Commissioner Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

None

9. Adjournment

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 4:47 p.m.