



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 2 - MINUTES

October 22, 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 – Senior 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. HL 9-18 – Certificate of Approval for Demolition - 180 NE 7th Street

This item was postponed to the next meeting due to the applicant's request to revise the application.

Committee Member Cooley asked if the HLC could consider the economic use of the historic resource as it related to the adjacent property. Senior Planner Darnell said they were only to consider the historic resource, not the adjacent property.

Committee Member Cooley asked if the current zoning in combination with the lot size permitted other types of uses that were permitted in the C-3 zone like short term rentals or multi-family dwellings. Senior Planner Darnell said it could.

B. HL 10-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration - 219 SE Lincoln Street

Chair Drabkin had driven by the house and saw that the work had already been done.

Senior Planner Darnell said this was an application to approve the addition and physical modification to the historic resource on SE Lincoln Street. The request was to install a railing around the perimeter of the front porch. The applicant proposed to use an alternative building material, which was not wood but a composite polymer material. He thought the overall criteria related to preserving the historic use and character were met. The porch railing would not be inconsistent with the historic design. It would add safety to the porch as well. Regarding the alternative material, the guidelines allowed for alterations to occur and for missing features to use the same material or a compatible substitute. Since it was not wood, the proposed material would not match the materials on the porch today, but the Committee could find the material to be compatible as a substitute material as from a distance it was hard to tell that it was not the same material. However, it would be a clear change in materials that could impact the historical integrity of the home. The question that the Committee would have to answer would be whether the proposed composite material is compatible with the other wood material on the porch, and whether there could be findings to support that for the applicable review criteria. Staff believed that the proposed material had a visual sheen to it, and if the Committee was going to find the material compatible, staff recommended that a condition of approval be included that the railing be painted the same color as the rest of the porch to help it blend in more and be more visually compatible. Staff recommended approval with that condition.

Chair Drabkin offered an opportunity for the applicant to provide testimony on the proposed application, but the applicant was not in attendance.

Chair Drabkin agreed it should be painted.

There was discussion regarding the consequences for the applicant not following procedure and doing the work prior to the decision.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified that it could be viewed as a zoning violation. It could be part of the decision letter that the City was aware the work had been done prior to approval and the property owner could be cited for it.

Committee Member Branch was concerned about the precedent this might set regarding materials that could be used. The sheen of the material was especially unauthentic and she was concerned about what paint might do to the material.

Committee Member Cooley thought the material was unlikely to be the same weight and density as wood.

Senior Planner Darnell asked whether this could be viewed as a unique circumstance as this was mainly the replacement of a missing material. The Committee could consider whether this was a unique circumstance because the railing was missing and the applicant was adding something back with a different material.

There was discussion regarding the reasons the applicant did not want to use wood, which was described in the application as mainly due to the ongoing maintenance of wood materials.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the review criteria in regard to materials. If the Committee chose to deny the application, they would need to provide findings as to why it was denied.

Committee Member Branch thought anything added or replaced should be constructed to be like what was existing. She thought that the railing could be made higher to 36 inches to meet code, but it should be the same design and material. She was not in favor of using this type of material on historic properties, especially in such a prominent way.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified the concern was using the composite material. The Committee found that the proposed material was not visually compatible with the existing wood materials on the porch, that the proposed material did not match the composition of the old and existing materials, and that wood should have been used to match the existing front porch and what was likely there before. He explained the criteria that the Committee were finding were not being met, which were Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(c), Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(f), and Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(i).

Committee Member Branch thought that the criteria in Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(f) was clear in that the new material needed to match the old in composition, which was the physical make-up of the materials. The proposed composite polymer material did not match the existing wood in composition.

Based on the findings of fact and conclusionary findings, Committee Member Cooley moved to deny the application based on the fact that the proposed alternative material was not compatible according to criteria in Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(c), Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(f), and Section 17.65.060(B)(2)(i). The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 5-0.

5. Discussion Items

None

6. Old/New Business

None

7. Committee/Commissioner Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

Senior Planner Darnell would bring back the revised language to the Historic Preservation Plan to the December meeting. The next Committee meeting would be held on November 28. The Committee discussed and decided to wait until the November meeting to determine whether the December meeting needed to be rescheduled due to the holiday and the ability to have a quorum.

There was discussion regarding how to let property owners know their properties were historic, such as during the transfer of title. Senior Planner Darnell stated that the Historic Preservation Plan listed this as an activity, and the Committee will begin to prioritize all of those activities at a future meeting to develop their next work plan.

9. Adjournment

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.