



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1 - MINUTES

December 28, 2018
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

10:00 am
McMinnville Civic Hall
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Vice Chair Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, John Mead and Heather Sharfeddin
Members Absent: Joan Drabkin
Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner
Others Present: Martin Chroust-Masin, Bruce Kenny, Ron Pomeroy, and Andy Wilder

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Branch called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

- A. September 26, 2018 Meeting Minutes
- B. October 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Mead moved to approve the September 26 and October 22, 2018 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0.

4. Action Items

- A. HL 5-18 / DDR 4-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration and Downtown Design Review - 711 NE 3rd Street

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the request for exterior alterations to a building that was on the National Register and classified as a secondary significant contributing property in the Downtown Historic District. The proposed alterations were to remove an existing concrete block wall on the two easternmost bays of the Third Street ground floor façade and construct in its place two sets of recessed storefront window systems and entries. He reviewed the historic preservation

criteria. Regarding preserving the historic character, the proposal was only for the two bays and removal of the concrete wall. The concrete wall was not historic, but was added to the building at a later date. No other historic characteristics would be altered. The storefront window system proposed would be physically and visually compatible with the historic building. The applicant was proposing aluminum storefront windows, and the HLC would need to determine whether they were compatible with the existing historic materials and features of the building. The applicant thought the aluminum windows would be consistent with the other window systems that existed in the other bays on the ground floor of the building, however there was no evidence that the existing aluminum windows were historic materials that existed during its initial construction. The description of the property in the historic nomination for this building said that most of the windows were wood. The applicant was willing to apply wood trim to the exterior of the windows if the HLC deemed it necessary. Staff thought since the building had been heavily altered over time, the rehabilitated storefront was appropriate with the design and overall character of the building. The new materials, other than the aluminum windows to be determined by the HLC, would be compatible with the building, especially with the use of stucco and recessed entries. The applicant thought the proposed alterations should be considered a "rehabilitation" of the existing historic resource as described by the Secretary of the Interior's standards as it would replace missing historic features. Since there was not much evidence about the missing features and other changes had occurred to the building, the applicant was proposing to follow an option in the standards to design a new feature that was compatible with the overall historic character of the building. Staff did find a photo of the building from 1927, which showed a storefront window system along the entire south façade that was completely changed. The application was compatible with the overall historic character of the building and no changes were being proposed to the upper story of the building, only on the ground floor. Public testimony had been received yesterday which included a few more photos of the building. One photo was from the McMinnville Downtown Association and it was estimated the date was from the 1950s. It was difficult to see the design of the storefronts in that picture. Another photo was from 1949 from McMinnville Water and Light and showed the storefront bay more clearly. The storefront bay looked similar to what was in the 1927 photo. Other photos were from film reels from 1943 to 1950s which showed the storefront façade but not the exact details of the last two bays, and the final photo was from 1960, but did not show the ground floor nor Third Street façade.

Senior Planner Darnell then discussed the downtown design standards. One requirement was to have vertical subdivided bays. For the new bays, a stucco bulkhead would be provided at the street level from the sidewalk up to the base of the storefront windows. The top of the storefront windows would be 8'10". After including the door as an opening, only the bulkheads along the base of the building would be non-glazing material. The entry would be recessed, with a mainly transparent door. The windows would also be recessed from the outer wall and above the bulkhead. The building materials included the use of stucco on portions of the new façade that would not be glazing. The windows were proposed to be aluminum framed windows and steel doors. Metal windows were not listed as a prohibited exterior material, however they were also not listed as allowed and the HLC would need to determine if the aluminum windows should be permitted. If the HLC found they should not be permitted, staff suggested adding a condition of approval that required the storefront windows be wood framed or that wood trim and sills be

applied to the exterior of the aluminum framed windows. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

Ron Pomeroy, representing the applicant, concurred with staff's analysis and recommendation. He pointed out on page 8 of the staff report, it stated that the applicant did not provide any historic photos of the building. The applicant did provide the 1927 photo in the application. Regarding the aluminum window frames, there was no evidence that the original structure had aluminum framed windows. However, there was no evidence that the original windows had wood frames either. Staff had assumed that they probably were wood windows. He then discussed some code citations in the staff report regarding the aluminum windows. One was about building materials that included the phrase "including materials commonly found in the district." He thought the word "including" was important as it showed that this was not an exclusive list of materials that could be used in the district. He thought it left a window open for materials that were not on the list. Another area had a list of prohibited materials, and the only mention of aluminum pertained to aluminum siding or roof materials, not window frames. Regarding the national standards for rehabilitation, it stated that designing and installing a new window or its components when the historic feature was missing, it might be an accurate restoration based on documentary and physical evidence, but only when the historic feature to be replaced coexisted with the features currently on the building. There was no evidence of the original construction of the window frames or that wood and aluminum coexisted on the front façade of the building. He requested that the HLC not add a condition to wrap the aluminum frames in wood as it would cause a situation where there would be a mismatch in materials on the front façade and there was no historic evidence that they were ever mismatched.

Bruce Kenny, also representing the applicant, said there were currently aluminum windows on the other recessed facades and they appeared to date from the 1950s. They were not original to the building, but for the last 70 years they had aluminum windows and a hollow metal frame for the doors.

Committee Member Sharfeddin asked if the original transoms over the entryway were missing. Mr. Kenny said yes, they were.

Committee Member Sharfeddin noted the columnar appearance of the building, and she asked if they planned to leave the current awnings on the building. Mr. Kenny confirmed the awnings would remain.

Committee Member Branch asked how the HLC's decision affected ADA requirements for the front doors. Mr. Kenny thought what was proposed would comply because of the angles.

Committee Member Branch asked about the timeline and if the design was done before they had seen the 1927 photo. Mr. Kenny said they had seen the photo after the design.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought the design was consistent with what was there today and due to the lack of evidence, she did not think they should require the wood windows. She asked if it was possible to restore some of the appearance of the front to create the columnar look the building had at one time. She thought the awnings would have to be removed to do that, but it could be done through paint contrast.

Mr. Kenny said it was a single awning system and would have to be broken apart. Mr. Pomeroy said the columns would still be present and prominent in the proposed design as they would be part of the window system. They were not proposing to do anything to the area that had the awning.

Committee Member Cooley said he was persuaded to allow the aluminum windows due to the Department of the Interior's criterion regarding being able to match existing materials. They did not have evidence to indicate the wood windows were the correct direction to go.

Committee Member Branch did not want to create a building that was half one way and half another. Keeping the cohesive look of the building itself was important. She was conflicted about the wood windows, but she was opposed to making something look like something it was not. The Secretary of the Interior's standards were clear about things that were new looking new and being true to the nature of the remaining historic building.

Committee Member Mead was in agreement with the fundamental design of the storefront system being proposed. The Secretary of the Interior's standards clearly stated when the existing design no longer existed, making it matching was appropriate. He thought the color of the stucco below the windows should be consistent with the window color and should be historically appropriate in creating storefront areas that were contrasting rather than matching the vertical columns in color. Regarding the windows, while he thought wood was a richer material that had historic significance, in this case there was a question about it being the original material on the storefronts. He was also persuaded as they were not recreating the original storefronts and the angled entries on the western portion were aluminum. He agreed aluminum would be the appropriate approach in this circumstance.

Senior Planner Darnell said it sounded like the HLC was leaning towards allowing the aluminum windows given the lack of evidence they had and the existing condition of the building. They would also like the bulkhead painted the same color as the window systems to match the historic character of the building.

Based on the findings of fact and the conclusionary findings for approval as discussed by the Historic Landmarks Committee and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve the Certificate of Approval to allow the alteration of the historic building at 711 NE 3rd Street with the conditions recommended by staff except for the condition for the wood windows and with the added condition that the bulkheads below the storefront windows be painted to match the window frame system. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

Based on the findings of fact and the conclusionary findings for approval as discussed by the Historic Landmarks Committee and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve the exterior alterations and design waivers for the historic building at 711 NE 3rd Street with the conditions recommended by staff except for the condition for the wood windows and with the added condition that the bulkheads below the storefront windows be painted to match the window frame system. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0.

B. HL 11-18 / HL 12-18 / DDR 10-18 – Certificate of Approval for Demolition, Certificate of Approval for Alteration, and Downtown Design Review and Waiver Requests - 300 NE 3rd Street

Vice Chair Branch opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the Committee hearing this matter. There was none. She asked if any Committee member wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. She asked if any Committee member needed to declare a contact prior to his hearing with the applicant or any other party involved in this hearing or any other source of information other than staff. There was none. She asked if any Committee member had visited the site. Most members had visited the site.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the request for demolition of the southern portion of the building at 300 NE 3rd Street that was listed on the National Register as a primary significant contributing property in the downtown historic district and a request for a new building addition to be constructed in the same footprint of the portion of the building that would be demolished. He discussed the demolition review criteria. The proposal to demolish the south portion of the building would preserve the primary and historically significant building, and only demolish the portion of the building that was described as an addition to the main building. The applicant had provided detailed descriptions of the construction of the addition that showed the addition was made out of different materials that were not consistent with the primary historic building and with the historic district. The addition was originally constructed for and used as a meat smoking area, but most recently had been used only for storage. Given the existing construction and building materials, a large scale renovation would be required to bring the structure up to a standard that would provide some level of current economic use, and that type of renovation would likely completely change the appearance and construction form of the addition. The main building was one that had high historic value and historic significance, as described in the National Register of Historic Places nomination form and the Historic Resource Inventory. The main building would be preserved and no portion of the main building was proposed to be demolished. The addition's building condition and building materials were not consistent with other buildings from the primary period of development in the Downtown Historic District, and detracted from the historic value and significance of the main building. The construction and building materials of the addition were not of high quality or of any construction technique that was of significance to the primary period of development in the Downtown Historic District. In addition, the applicant had stated that the west façade of the addition had begun to separate from the southwest corner of the main building due to settling of the southwest column on the addition and there was a crack in the exterior wall. The applicant had stated that they believed that the retention of the addition portion of the historic resource would cause a financial hardship. Staff agreed that preservation of the addition portion of the historic resource did not outweigh the financial hardship that could be caused for the owner and would not be in the best interests of a majority of the citizens of the City.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed the Certificate of Approval for alteration review. One criterion was the need to avoid the replacement of intact or repairable historic materials and the alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterized a property. In this case, the existing building was not proposed to be changed or altered in any way. The proposed new

addition would be of the same massing and configuration as the existing building and would be constructed at the same setbacks and height as the existing building, which would provide an uninterrupted transition between the spaces of the existing building and the new addition. The façade of the addition was proposed to include similar decorative features as existed on the main building, which were all noted as being significant features in the National Register of Historic Places nomination form and the McMinnville Historic Resources Inventory. The building materials were also proposed to be consistent with the materials on the existing building. The applicant had argued that the proposed alterations could most closely be considered a “rehabilitation” of the existing historic resource, which was a type of treatment of historic properties described in the Secretary of the Interior’s standards. The Secretary of the Interior also provided a number of guidelines for additions. One was constructing a new addition on a secondary or non-character-defining elevation and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building. The proposed addition would be constructed on the south side of the existing building, which was functionally the rear side of the building. The new addition would have a new façade and expanded building wall to the south along the west property line, but that property line was the secondary elevation. The main entrance to the existing building was on the north side, fronting Third Street, which made that the primary elevation. The applicant was proposing for the addition to be the same height and follow the same setbacks as the existing building in an effort to make the addition compatible with the existing buildings form and massing while also being consistent with the overall development pattern in the surrounding area. However, the overall footprint of the addition would be limited in size and scale in relationship to the existing building, given that the addition’s footprint would be 20 feet in depth by 40 feet in width, and the existing building’s footprint is much larger at 80 feet in depth by 40 feet in width. The other guidelines had to do with being compatible with the historic structure and considering the design of the historic building and surrounding historic district. Staff thought the addition was compatible due to the same scale and massing and including the same materials and decorative features in the design as the historic building. It would be consistent with the development pattern of the downtown historic district. There were also guidelines about additions being compatible, yet differentiated from the main historic building. The addition would be secondary and subordinate to the historic building, the entry into the new space was fronting and oriented towards the right-of-way on Cows Street, and the window pattern was different from the historic building. Also a fabric awning was proposed to be installed along the entire west façade over the main entry and the windows on the ground floor. This would clearly identify where the building addition started from the ground floor and at the pedestrian scale along the sidewalk on Cows Street.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the downtown design review criteria. The existing building was currently constructed with a zero setback from the north and west property lines and sidewalks, and the proposed addition continued that same zero setback along the west property line. The addition would also be constructed with a zero setback on the south property line. The proposed addition would be the same massing and configuration as the existing building on the same property. The applicant had proposed to use materials that were listed as allowable exterior building materials. The new awning would extend along the entire 20 foot width of the new addition’s west façade. It would be at the same height as the awnings on the north side of the building and would be a soft canvas material in charcoal grey color. A condition of approval was

suggested by staff to require the applicant to submit a sample of the awning material for Planning Director review to ensure that the charcoal grey was a neutral grey color and was not dark enough to be considered the high intensity black color that was specifically prohibited. The applicant was requesting design standard waivers because it would make the addition non-compatible with the main historic building as they were not features present on the historic building. These included vertical divisions on the façade, bulkhead at the street level, 70% storefront glazing, recessed entry and transom with transparent door, and a foundation on the ground floor. The storefront standards that the applicant requested waiving were glazing of the storefront windows and recessed entry. However they were providing some features and design treatments that would meet some of the standards such as the color treatment and decorative cornice. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions and he reviewed the conditions.

Committee Member Mead asked about the waiver for the recessed entryway, were there building requirements that the entry door not swing out into the right-of-way? Senior Planner Darnell said there were some requirements related to that, but the City had allowed for exceptions when the accessible path and sidewalk around the door could be maintained. That was something the applicant would have to work out with the City's Building Official.

Committee Member Cooley stated there was guidance from the Secretary of the Interior in respect to additions to historic resources that encouraged differentiation in both scale and material while simultaneously there was downtown design review guidance that went in the opposite direction. Senior Planner Darnell said that was true, there was conflicting language between the two. Staff's recommendation was that the historic preservation standards took a higher precedence in this case to maintain compatibility with the historic building and preserving the historic building. If this resulted in some of the design standards not being met, there should be waivers of those standards.

Martin Chroust-Masin, applicant, agreed with the staff report. He noted the awning would break up the façade to give it a different dimension and he thought the vertical height would be broken.

Committee Member Mead asked in regard to the proposed hardy stucco panels, what would the installation at the seams be? Andy Wilder, applicant, explained how all of the seams would be hidden.

Vice Chair Branch asked if the cornice of the historic building would be replicated exactly on the addition. Mr. Wilder said yes, it would basically be the same. One of the issues might be replicating the galvanized tin, but the profile and shape would be the same.

Vice Chair Branch asked about the transition from the historic building to the new addition and where the façade details on the new addition ended. Mr. Wilder explained how they had distinguished between the two structures.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought the design made the addition look like a separate building. Was there a reason this was an addition and not its own separate commercial building? Senior Planner Darnell clarified it was because this was one parcel.

Mr. Chroust-Masin said he could change the design to look totally different from the historic building if that was preferred.

Committee Member Mead suggested using three part stucco instead. He was still concerned about concealing the seams. Mr. Chroust-Masin said the hardy stucco sheets were less expensive and were easily attached. He thought it would look just like any other stucco building in town.

The applicant chose to waive the seven day period for final written arguments.

Vice Chair Branch closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Branch did not have any reservations regarding the demolition permit as this building was not put on the national register or local inventory to preserve the addition. The addition was an eyesore to the rest of the building. She agreed with the findings in the staff report on the demolition.

The rest of the Committee agreed with those comments.

Vice Chair Branch had concerns about how the addition related to the historic building, especially as they were the same height and had the same elaborate cornice. The new windows in the addition looked like they were larger than the historic building.

Vice Chair Branch reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Chroust-Masin clarified the windows in the new addition would be scaled to be the same size as the windows in the historic building. Mr. Wilder said the intention was to remain consistent with historic structure. If it would be better to have a differentiation between the two, they could make minor changes to the design.

Committee Member Sharfeddin asked what the plan was for the third story. Mr. Chroust-Masin said it would be a loft.

Committee Member Sharfeddin was curious about whether the height of the addition could be slightly smaller so that it did not have the same prominence as the historic building.

Vice Chair Branch asked what the ceiling heights were for each floor. Mr. Chroust-Masin said they were 10 feet tall.

Committee Member Mead asked if the applicant would be open to reducing the roof height or parapet height and reducing the cornice so the addition would appear different from the historic building. Mr. Chroust-Masin said they were open to that.

Vice Chair Branch agreed that reducing the scale and massing of the addition and less replicating the exact dimensions of the historic building would help it feel less prominent. She thought they could keep the 10 foot height for the ground floor, but she questioned the necessity of a 20 foot high second floor and the loft could be reduced as well. The cornice could come down 3-4 feet and the scale and design of the cornice could be much simpler. This could also potentially allow the upper windows to be taller.

Vice Chair Branch closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Branch wanted none of the new windows to be larger than the existing windows. The scale of the taller, skinnier windows was preferable. She asked how the HLC should deal with the trim details and how to distinguish them as something new but not outweigh the historic building.

Committee Member Mead liked the idea of continuing the cornice, but it created a tension of replicating exactly what was there and a continuation of the historic building. He thought they should either allow the same materials, window height, and façade or request a change to the design to be subservient and set down in height and prominence.

There was discussion regarding whether the HLC should approve the application with conditions or have the applicant come back with a revised application.

Some of the changes the HLC would like to see were the new windows should not exceed the existing windows in size and the top of the parapet should be less than the existing building. They wanted the addition to be distinguished from the existing building, yet it needed to follow the downtown design guidelines.

Based on the findings of fact and the conclusionary findings for approval as discussed by the Historic Landmarks Committee and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the certificate of approval to allow the demolition of the south portion of the building at 300 NE 3rd Street with the condition recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Sharfeddin and passed 4-0.

Based on the findings of fact and the conclusionary findings for approval as discussed by the Historic Landmarks Committee and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to continue HL 12-18 / DDR 10-18 to January 23, 2019 so the applicant could revise the design including the window size, building height, and scale and prominence of the cornice. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 4-0.

There was discussion regarding what should be included in the revised design to make it compatible but differentiated.

5. Discussion Items

None

6. Old/New Business

A. HL 5-18 – Certificate of Approval for Alteration

Senior Planner Darnell said the applicant had requested continuation of this application.

7. Committee/Commissioner Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

A. Historic Preservation Plan

Senior Planner Darnell recommended additional language for the Historic Preservation Plan related to the Committee's previous discussion on adding additional information and policies addressing the pre-European settlement history of McMinnville. This information would be included in the history of the City chapter and a proposal in Goal 1 to partner with tribal organizations or consultants to further research and document the history of human settlement prior to European explorer arrival. It would also be added to the implementation matrix as a midterm action.

Committee Member Cooley moved to recommend to the Planning Commission the adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 4-0.

Senior Planner Darnell said at the next HLC meeting there would be a discussion on the work plan for the coming year.

9. Adjournment

Vice Chair Branch adjourned the meeting at 12:39 p.m.