



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

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

**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**McMinnville Civic Hall, 200 NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**  
**January 23, 2020 3:00 PM**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Agenda Items</b>
Joan Drabkin, Chair	<b>1. Call to Order</b>
	<b>2. Citizen Comments</b>
Mary Beth Branch, Vice-Chair	<b>3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair</b>
	<b>4. Approval of Minutes</b>
Mark Cooley	A. July 25, 2019 Meeting Minutes (Exhibit 1)
	B. September 26, 2019 Meeting Minutes (Exhibit 2)
Christopher Knapp	<b>5. Discussion Items</b>
	A. Check-In on Committee Processes and Procedures
John Mead	<b>6. Action Items</b>
	A. Approval of 2020 Work Plan (Exhibit 3)
	<b>7. Committee Member Comments</b>
	<b>8. Staff Comments</b>
	<b>9. Adjournment</b>

The meeting site is accessible to handicapped individuals. Assistance with communications (visual, hearing) must be requested 24 hours in advance by contacting the City Manager (503) 434-7405 – 1-800-735-1232 for voice, or TDY 1-800-735-2900.

\*Please note that these documents are also on the City's website, [www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov). You may also request a copy from the Planning Department.



**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

---

**July 25, 2019  
Historic Landmarks Committee  
Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm  
McMinnville Civic Hall  
McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Chair Joan Drabkin, Mary Beth Branch, Mark Cooley, John Mead, and Heather Sharfeddin  
**Members Absent:** None  
**Staff Present:** Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner  
**Others Present:** Andrew Burton, Jonathan Rouse, and Ernie Munch

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Approval of Minutes

February 27, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Branch moved to approve the February 27, 2019 meeting minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed 5-0.

## 4. Action Items

### A. DDR 1-19: 1025 NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street - Review of Built Example of Exterior Materials

Senior Planner Darnell stated the applicant had submitted a new built example of the proposed exterior material. The last built example that was submitted was a hardie cement panel that was not found to be similar in appearance to the stucco or other materials found on registered historic buildings in the downtown area. There was a condition that the fasteners and seams on the panels not be visible. The new built example used a sand additive in the paint to better mimic smooth stucco. Staff recommended approval. During the building permit process, staff would complete an inspection to make sure that the treatment was consistent with the built example that was approved.

Committee Member Mead asked the applicant to explain the preparation and process for this material.

Andrew Burton, representing the applicant and owner, said the seams on the panels would be caulked and the sand additive would be mixed into the paint to give it the right texture. They would start with a smooth panel and then the finish would be applied.

Committee Member Branch would prefer that the finish only be applied to the panels, not the trim components of the building.

Committee Member Branch moved to approve DDR 1-19 with the added condition that the belt course, cornice, and trim components of the building were painted but not treated with the sand additive. The sand additive should only be applied to the hardie panel siding. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed 4-1 with Chair Drabkin opposed.

B. HL 1-19 / HL 2-19 / HL 3-19 / DDR 2-19

Historic Resources Inventory Amendment, Certificate of Approval for Demolition, Certificate of Approval for New Construction, and Downtown Design Review for New Construction - 618 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street

Senior Planner Darnell read the hearing statement.

Chair Drabkin opened the public hearing and asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to hear 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. Chair Hall asked if any Committee Member needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing.

Chair Drabkin disclosed that she had known Mr. Munch for many years, but had not discussed this matter with him.

Chair Drabkin asked if any Committee Members had visited the site. If so, did they wish to discuss the visit to the site? Several members of the Committee had visited the site, but had no comments to make on the visits.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for four separate land use applications for 618 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The building was listed on the local historic resources inventory as a contributory resource. It was also classified as a primary significant contributing property in the downtown historic district. The requests were for a historic resources inventory amendment to declassify the building and classify the site from a contributory resource to a significant resource, certificate of approval for demolition to demolish the existing building, certificate of approval for new construction, and downtown design review. The code required a public hearing for demolition requests for properties that were listed on the National Register, which applied in this case because the building was located within the McMinnville Downtown Historic District. He discussed the criteria for historic resources inventory amendments. The applicant had done research on the history of the site and found that the existing building was not the original building. He explained the history of the buildings on the site and the associated dates that were found on the Sanborn maps as well as how the original building was different from what was existing on the site today. The applicant had also stated that the existing building did not have any known connection to significant people in McMinnville's past. It might have been constructed outside of the period of contributing construction in the downtown historic district.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the criteria for demolition of the existing building. The applicant had provided detailed cost estimates and estimates of rates of return on the economic use of the building. They also submitted estimates for seismic retrofitting vs. the cost of new construction. By constructing a new building, the applicant would be able to tie into the seismic building system that was put into the building next door. They were proposing a two story addition which would have a higher rate of return. The investment to seismically retrofit the existing building was not reasonable given the rate of return and those improvements might not occur if the building remained. The historic

research showed that the existing building was not of high value or significance. The existing building had been heavily altered and had no east or west wall or lateral support system. A letter from a structural engineer had been submitted stating what would be required to seismically retrofit the building, which would be to build new walls that were separated from the adjacent building to allow for shifting of the walls during an earthquake. To construct the new walls, the roof would have to be trimmed away from the neighboring building. Cracking and rotting were found as well as potential separation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade and stucco finish. Some rot was found in the windows as well. The storefront would need to be reconstructed to have a recessed entry. McMinnville's Building Official reviewed the application and concurred that it was accurate and that what was being proposed was reasonable given the level of investment required on the existing building.

Senior Planner Darnell said if the first two requests were approved, the applicant would like to construct a new building on the site. If the amendment was approved, the site would still be classified as a significant resource and required a certificate of approval for new construction. He then reviewed the approval criteria. The design of the new building would incorporate some of the architectural features of the original building such as the storefront window system, recessed entry, transom windows, decorative cornice, and finials. Regarding the Downtown Design Standards, the applicant was not requesting a waiver but included evidence that the application met all of the standards. The application was subject to the Secretary of the Interior standards, and this would be considered reconstruction, a complete new construction of a non-surviving building structure for the purpose of replicating its appearance. It needed to appear as a contemporary recreation of the original building. The applicant was proposing the ground floor to have many of the same features as the original, but it would be a two story building and the upper story façade would be different. The new building would be constructed up to the property line with zero setbacks on both the north and south sides. The massing and configuration would be consistent with the building to the west and would include a stepped parapet wall. They had followed the standards for the storefront features and building materials. Public comments had been received from the McMinnville Downtown Association. The Association was in support of the project. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Committee Member Branch asked if the demolition request was approved and the existing building was removed but something prevented the new construction from occurring, what were the options for conditions?

Senior Planner Darnell said that an option could be to require that the demolition permit not be issued until the building permit was issued.

Committee Member Mead asked if there were other examples of buildings being declassified and sites becoming historic.

Senior Planner Darnell gave some examples of properties that were classified as historic.

Chair Drabkin was also concerned about other projects that would want to make the site historic and demolish the historic buildings because it would be more economical to tear them down and build something new. She was concerned about setting that precedent.

Senior Planner Darnell said the Historic Resources Inventory amendment was its own action and there were criteria for demolition approval. It was not just the economic factors that the decision was based on. Each case would be unique and would be evaluated based on its specific characteristics and proposed findings.

Committee Member Mead asked what impact designating the site as historic would have on the new building.

Senior Planner Darnell said the site would be designated as a significant resource which would make it a historic landmark. In the future any alterations to the building would be subject to the historic preservation standards as well as the downtown design standards. The design of the original building that was being included on the new building would also be protected.

Chair Drabkin questioned the design proposed, as the culture of downtown was rural, plainer, and more modest. The design was more elegant and beautiful and she did not know if it would help preserve downtown as it was.

Committee Member Cooley asked if there were examples of other resources that had been significantly altered to such an extent that the underlying resource was lost.

Senior Planner Darnell gave an example of one recent application for the Douglas Hotel, where the building's storefront had been replaced at some time with a CMU block wall. In that application, the applicant had requested to re-establish the storefront window pattern that existed prior to the previous alterations, based on the best available evidence. He said that the Committee had to look at these on a case by case basis and the information and evidence that was available.

Chair Drabkin would like to know how the embossed metal siding would be preserved.

Ernie Munch, representing the applicant, gave a history of the purchase of the property and the research that was done for 608 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and for this property. Both of these properties told the story of Sarah A. and James L. Fletcher, L.A. Jamison, Milton McGuire, and the Taylor-Dale families. They wanted the construction to be good for many years. The City was not frozen in time and was evolving. They had to decide what to keep and what to get rid of to grow and save downtown. This was not a good building architecturally. He reviewed Appendix F, the historic report for the property, including when the construction of the building began, who occupied the property and when, and the historic designations. He thought the national record should be updated with this information as well.

There was discussion regarding the conflicting dates for the construction, whether it was 1912 or 1917.

Mr. Munch thought it was 1917. He then reviewed the Sanborn maps of what was on the site and surrounding area through the years, the ownerships of the site and companies, and how the building was changed. He also discussed the significance of the people tied to the building. He explained how they would preserve the embossed brick siding and integrate it into the interior of the new building as an exhibit. They would also be preserving the large wooden beam. They were requesting to take the classification off of the building and classify the site as a significant resource. This was not the original building on the site.

Committee Member Sharfeddin suggested calling it the Sarah Fletcher building instead of the McGuire building.

Mr. Munch liked that idea, however it was not up to him what the building would be called. Mr. Munch continued by stating that in the code it stated the inventory that was done in 1983/84 shall be maintained and updated as required. The HLC was authorized to make changes to and reevaluate the resources in the inventory. The decision had to be based on the criteria and he reviewed that criteria. He did not think this was a craftsman style building as it was done piecemeal and not built correctly and lacked the features needed for the downtown design standards such as lack of decorative features, no recessed entry, not enough glazing, and no bulkhead or wood base. It did not contribute to the character and continuity of the street and was not consistent with the national register criteria. The building did not embody the characteristics of the period and the method of construction did not represent the work of a master builder. They planned to tear down and reconstruct the building. The applicant planned to recreate as much as possible the original building on the lower level. There was rot and the plumbing was outdated and clearing the site would serve the community efforts for the district and would comply with the design regulations. The purpose of the building would accommodate more tourists and visitors which would boost the economy of the district. The estimated return on investment did not support the estimated cost of restoration and retention of the existing building would be a burden. He then reviewed the economic analysis that was done for a single story and a two story options. The single story would cost \$1.8 million to build at \$818 per square foot and the two story was 16% less. The applicant thought he could get \$1.50 per square foot per month out of the existing building because it was not efficient. With the new building, a higher class restaurant could be put in and he could get \$2.50 per square foot per month.

The units in the second story could be rented for \$350 per night each which could be a possible \$18,000-\$21,000 per month. He explained how the seismic upgrades could be tied together with the building at 608 and new proposed building at 618 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. There would be an elevator from the basement to the second floor and the sprinkler system and utilities would be connected from 608. He showed how they would connect the buildings and what the project would look like when done. He discussed how the building would meet the design criteria including the decorative cornice, massing, and windows.

Committee Member Mead talked about setting a precedent to downgrade classifications.

Mr. Munch said they should require the in depth research that he had done because before tearing something down, they needed to know the value of a building to the history of the community. The criteria were good to determine if a building was worth saving. A cost analysis should also be required to show the economic value of the decision.

Committee Member Branch asked about the economic analysis for the one story and two story options. There were some items in the one story option that were not included in the two story option that made the first number higher in comparison and that might be inaccurate. The site work budget for the one story was over \$200,000 and the site work budget for the two story was only \$38,000.

Mr. Munch said that was because of the need to duplicate the utilities. He explained how the two story option was able to share the utilities while the one story could not. The one story would be a completely separate building, and the two story would be considered an addition to the building at 608 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. All the systems would be integrated and they would not be able to be separated later and sold individually.

Chair Drabkin asked whether, if the current owners were to sell, could they partition off the new building and sell that individually or would they need to be sold together as one?

Mr. Munch said that they would not, because they are structurally tied together and you would have to also separate electrical service and utility services to each.

Senior Planner Darnell said that if they move forward as proposed, there would likely need to be some legal process to combine the properties or a legal agreement binding the properties together. That would be reviewed in more detail during the building permit review process.

Mr. Munch stated the plan was to eliminate the property line between the two properties and it would become one property.

Committee Member Mead asked about the timing of the demolition and building permit.

Mr. Munch said they would like to get the demolition permit right away and start working on the new building.

Committee Member Cooley pointed out that if the building was demolished and the lot was sold instead of built, it would be a hard sell due to the cost for a one story building.

Committee Member Sharfeddin thought that would make it more likely that the lot would remain vacant.

Committee Member Cooley did not think it would be economically viable for 618 as a stand-alone single or two story building. This proposal would assist the economic viability of 608. It would not to be a good choice for the applicant to vacate the lot and sell it.

Chair Drabkin was in favor of tying the demolition permit to the building permit so there would not be an issue.

Mr. Munch said they would need the demolition permit immediately to stay on schedule. There were systems that would be built in the new building that were needed to make 608 functional. That was their incentive to get the new building constructed.

Committee Member Branch suggested a condition be added that the embossed metal siding be preserved.

Committee Member Mead wanted to make sure pictures were taken of the Jamison Hardware mural sign and included in the photo documentation.

Committee Member Branch asked if the renderings accurately depicted the colors that would be used on the new building.

Mr. Munch explained the proposed colors.

There was no public testimony.

Chair Drabkin closed the public hearing.

The applicant waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Committee Member Branch agreed with the findings in the decision document and what criteria staff thought had been satisfied and what had not, which only one had not. She agreed with staff that the applicant's claim that this building did not contribute to the character or continuity of the district was not true as it did help with the continuity.

Committee Member Mead asked if there were other examples of the stepped facades.

Senior Planner Darnell said he had looked on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street for similar architecture, and there were not many other examples. Most had flat rooflines and parapet walls.

Committee Member Mead said while he was not normally in favor of designating a site, it would give them a means for the history to be put in an official record. He thought since all of the applications for demolition and new construction were coming together, and the Committee could consider these as a group, he did not think that it would be an avenue for other people to take advantage of the decision.

Chair Drabkin was uncomfortable with designating the site. She understood the reasons for the demolition, but she did not think with the new construction on the site would be historic.

Committee Member Branch questioned how they would highlight the history of the site. She was sad that the original structure was not available to preserve. She thought the application made sense due to the attention of the design detail in the new design to pay homage to the original structure.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve HL 1-19 subject to the conditions of approval provided in the decision document. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Sharfeddin and passed 5-0.

Committee Member Cooley said tying the demolition permit to the building permit was not viable for the applicant.

There was discussion about another way to tie them together without holding up the applicant.

Committee Member Mead thought the applicant would follow through with the new construction.

Committee Member Cooley was reassured by the economic analysis that it was not in the applicant's interest to vacate the property and leave it that way without developing it.

Chair Drabkin was still uncomfortable with it.

Committee Member Branch suggested the demolition permit could be contingent on the building permits being filed, not approved.

Committee Member Cooley thought that would still delay the applicant.

Committee Member Branch appreciated the information that they had been given, however she did not think the cost estimates were as telling as they could be in terms of the comparison between the two options.

Committee Member Mead suggested adding a condition that photographs be taken of the Jamison Hardware mural sign and the embossed metal siding be preserved.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 2-19 subject to the conditions of approval provided in the decision document and adding a condition that photographs be taken of the existing building and Jamison Hardware mural and that the embossed metal siding be preserved. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 5-0.

Chair Drabkin asked about the new façade being a reflection of the original façade.

Committee Member Branch thought that meant the design of the first story was based off of the design of the original structure.

Chair Drabkin questioned the construction of a two story building as opposed to a one story building when a two story building never existing on the property.

Committee Member Branch thought this design looked more cohesive in tying the buildings together and added to the historic qualities of the block. She thought the massing of a smaller building would not fit.

Committee Member Sharfeddin agreed that it tied into the property next door.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 3-19. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Cooley and passed 5-0.

Committee Member Branch suggested adding a condition that the exterior materials would be as shown in the examples today and the paint color for the window trim would be the same as the 608 building.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Branch moved to approve DDR 2-19 subject to the conditions of approval in the decision document and an added condition that the exterior materials be the ones the Committee was shown as true examples today and the paint color for the window trim to be the same as the approved paint color for the adjacent building at 608 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Mead and passed 5-0.

## **5. Discussion Items**

None

## **6. Committee/Commissioner Comments**

None

## **7. Staff Comments**

None

## **8. Adjournment**

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 6:31 p.m.



DRAFT



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

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

## EXHIBIT 2 - MINUTES

---

**September 26, 2019**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**McMinnville Civic Hall**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Chair Joan Drabkin, Mary Beth Branch, and Mark Cooley  
**Members Absent:** John Mead and Heather Sharfeddin  
**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director and Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner  
**Others Present:** David Haugeberg, Charles Hillestad, Doug Hurl, Jim Schlotfeldt, and Kelly Wilson

---

### 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. May 30, 2019 Meeting Minutes
- B. June 26, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Cooley moved to approve the May 30 and June 26, 2019 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 3-0.

### 4. Action Items

- A. DDR 4-19: 118 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street - Downtown Design Review Application with Requests for Waivers from Five (5) Downtown Design Standards

Chair Drabkin opened the public hearing and read the hearing script. 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 any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a Downtown Design Review request for a new building to be constructed at 118 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and included waiver requests. This was the

location of the First Federal Bank on the full City block of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> and Adams and Baker. The existing buildings on the site would be demolished and a new building would be constructed oriented towards the corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Baker. There would be a reconfiguration of the parking and the driveways and entrances would be on Adams and Baker. He showed the site plan and renderings of the proposed building. There was a request for five waivers from the Downtown Design Standards. One was the minimum glazing requirement to reduce it from 70% to 40% on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade and down to 25% on the Baker Street façade. Others were the construction of a new parking lot on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, an egress on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street from the parking lot, reduction of the landscape buffer on the south side of the property from five feet to three feet, and for the use of steel material for the awnings.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the Downtown Design Standards. One that was satisfied by the project was building to the property lines with zero setback. There was a slight projection over the property line on Baker Street on the second and third stories of the proposed building and staff was suggesting a condition to require the applicant to enter into an agreement and license to allow for the upper story projection. The elevation was high enough for clearance. The next standard that was met related to the overall building massing and configuration. It required that they be similar to adjacent or nearby historic buildings on the same block. There was not another historic building on the same block, however they were proposing an overall massing that was similar to other historic buildings in the downtown. The project incorporated a balcony on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street that provided a setback of the third story from the corner. Regarding the building façade, there would be varying roof and building heights and the building was divided into three sections with vertical changes and changes in material and details with the brick. Regarding incorporating store fronts, the applicant was requesting a waiver from the glazing requirement but the other components of the store front were included. There was a concrete precast belt course in a different color to identify prominently on the façade. There would be a brick soldier course around the base of the building, although it was not shown in the renderings and staff recommended a potential condition to require detailed plans of the brick soldier course. The required bulkhead would be the areas beneath the windows where they were proposing stone panels. It would continue along the areas where there were no windows by keeping the same level of the bulkhead where it was under the windows with the seam and stone panels continuing at the same elevation all around the other facades. There would be a decorative metal cap cornice along the top of the building and a recessed entry underneath the corner of the building which was required for the storefront. There would be a glass door with transom windows as well. The windows would be recessed, and staff proposed a condition that there be detailed construction plans that identified those recessed windows. In terms of building color and materials, overall they were proposing to use primarily brick and stone panel material. There was a portion on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade that was identified as a skin coated exposed foundation, and a condition was included to require that foundation be tan to match the material above it or have the stone panel material run all of the way down to the sidewalk. There was a requirement that the surface parking lots be landscaped and a landscape buffer provided between the property and right-of-way. The applicant was proposing landscaping around the majority of the property lines except for the south side where they were proposing the reduced width.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the waiver requests. The first was for a reduction in the glazing, and the applicant based that on the proposed use as a bank and loan office and needed security. The applicant did an analysis on how the design still met the intent of the Downtown District including the window pattern on the façades and that other non-commercial uses in downtown had a lower amount of glazing. The applicant also did a comparison to other buildings on the same block and how the proposed design was compatible. The next waiver was for a surface parking lot to be located on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street which was prohibited in the Downtown Design Standards. The applicant based the request on keeping the building that was in that location operational during construction of the new building, then tearing that building down and using the space for parking. They would be creating a space between the parking lot and the sidewalk as a historic/art area. This was a gateway and entrance to downtown and the applicant planned to install something like decorative walls, statues, art, and/or historic district gateway monument signage. In terms of access from the parking lot, the

applicant provided arguments for the need for the additional access point due to the unique circumstance of their entire block being surrounded by high classifications of roadways that were often slowed by traffic at the major intersections near the subject site. To address the design of the parking lot access, the applicant was proposing this access point to be only a one-way right-only egress from the surface parking lot onto 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. This reduced the number of vehicles that would use the right-only egress, and allowed for the egress drive aisle to be only 12 feet in width to minimize the crossing distance for pedestrians. Staff recommended conditions, one which memorialized the collaborative historic/art area proposed and design process for that area. A condition was also recommended for the right-turn only egress that more detailed plans for the painting and signage be submitted showing that the signage did not distract from the historic/art area and the painting within the sidewalk space enhanced the pedestrian experience and differentiated the driving space and sidewalk space. Another waiver was for the landscape buffer reduction on the south side of the property. The buffer proposed would be reduced to three feet in width and the argument for that was to preserve space on the site for the parking and circulation that met the zoning ordinance. A decorative trellis fence would be put in with plantings to function as a green fence and provide for screening and buffering between the sidewalk and the surface parking lot. There would also be diamond shape bump outs in the landscape planting area to allow for trees to be planted in that space. The last waiver was for the awning material. The applicant had proposed a flat awning to be constructed on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade that better fit in with the overall design and architectural form of the building. A canvas or fabric awning that the code required would not function well on a flat awning surface and the applicant was proposing to use steel awning material. It was a subtle awning on the façade that blended in well with the location they were proposing between the ground floor windows and transom windows above. There was a standard that required the building provide a foundation or base, and the applicant described their foundation or base as the same as their bulkhead space. Staff wanted to make sure the HLC was comfortable with that proposal. A more typical type of foundation that had been included on more recent new construction within the downtown design area was a continuous concrete foundation immediately above the sidewalk and below the beginning of the primary exterior building material. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions.

Chair Drabkin had issues with the parking lot and the egress onto 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Committee Member Cooley asked about the distinction between arterials and collectors. Senior Planner Darnell explained Adams and Baker Streets were arterials, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street was a major collector, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street was a minor collector. Arterials were the highest level, then collectors, then local streets. The classification of the streets was the larger and wider the street, the more traffic it would accommodate and there were different improvement standards for the type of street. The applicant's argument was that they had the two sides, Adams and Baker, that were arterials and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> were collectors and busy streets between the two arterials. There was a lot of traffic in this area and the movement to go northbound onto Baker could be difficult and having this additional right turn only egress would be beneficial.

Committee Member Cooley clarified 3<sup>rd</sup> Street was still identified as a higher use with higher volumes compared to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Senior Planner Darnell said that was how the streets were identified in the Transportation System Plan, although there was more traffic on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street currently. The Transportation System Plan was last updated in 2010 and these streets would be reanalyzed in the next updated plan.

Kelly Wilson, architect representing the applicant, had done the design for the project. He asked if there were any questions he could answer about the project.

Committee Member Branch asked about the exterior building materials. She stated the brick shown in the renderings was dramatically different than the color of the brick on the sample board. On the sample board it looked like a solid black color and in the renderings it was a lighter tan. The intention of the requirement for the brick was related to what they would see in a more historic building and the renderings made it look more contemporary and modern.

Mr. Wilson explained the rendering did show a different color due to the limitations of the software. The brick on the sample was what they intended to use. It was darker and he thought the grout color would make a difference in the overall feel of the brick.

Committee Member Branch had an issue with the color and asked about alternatives.

Mr. Wilson said they had long discussions about the color and this was the one they had decided on. If the Committee wanted to see a more accurate rendering they could do that.

Chair Drabkin asked why they had chosen that color when it did not match what was in downtown.

Mr. Wilson said they had thought to do another red brick building in the area, though it might be consistent with the other buildings, it would add to the sea of red brick and they thought an alternative darker color should be used.

Chair Drabkin said the intent was to have a cohesive look in downtown. She thought putting black in would be quite dramatic. The building would stand out in a way that was not beneficial to downtown.

Senior Planner Darnell said there were color standards in the Downtown Design Standards. They should be low reflective, subtle, neutral, or earth tones. The use of high intensity color such as black except for building trim was prohibited. On a recent project, the Committee did approve a charcoal colored brick that was not determined to be black.

Committee Member Branch thought the scale of the use of this brick was substantial. The design of the building was attractive and she appreciated the intention of brand new buildings were not meant to look like they were 100 years old. However, the design, shape, and lines of the building were contemporary. It was important that not every aspect of the building had modern components. She also had a concern with the use of metal on the building, especially since it was a light colored metal and drew more attention. She was also curious about the cream colored metal that was underneath the large windows in the corner and on the awnings. She also asked about the finish of the wood for the soffit of the balcony area.

Senior Planner Darnell said painted wood was allowed, however he did not know if that was acceptable to the Committee in that location not being a primary exterior material allowed in that soffit area.

Mr. Wilson said there were two locations where the natural or clear finished wood was used, one at the soffit on the top floor above the balcony for the boardroom of the bank and another for the soffit at the front door. The purpose was to make the building look warmer and more natural. They thought using it in more limited amounts was appropriate in this design.

Committee Member Branch thought it did add warmth, but was not sure that it fit with the criteria and was defensible. It could set a precedent for future applications. The soffit material on the underside of the entry concerned her more than the other due to its visibility by pedestrians. The visibility of the top soffit from the street level was more limited.

Chair Drabkin thought the cornice stood out too much and she asked what other materials could be considered besides metal.

Mr. Wilson said they had not considered other materials for the cornice due to the color perception. He thought metal cornices were very common and were often painted so they became a color element as opposed to a material element. Other elements were precast concrete or brick which would add more impact to the building. Having a lightweight metal cornice had some advantages, and he thought the color was the most important thing rather than the material.

Chair Drabkin was not in favor of the black brick and thought the applicant should come forward with some other suggestions. They wanted that feeling of cohesiveness in the downtown. She thought the cream color would be fine if they had red brick, but the black with the cream was really dramatic.

Committee Member Branch asked if there was an alternative to the wood soffits, such as a painted wood soffit or a different material that did not read as firwood which as it aged became an orange-red undertone.

Mr. Wilson said they could consider an alternative if the Committee wanted something different.

Committee Member Branch asked about the timeline for the project.

Mr. Wilson said they expected to start in January/February 2020. The building would take about a year to construct and they should open January/February 2021.

Committee Member Branch asked what the turnaround time was on building permits.

Planning Director Richards said it was about six weeks for completed applications, however if there were questions in the building plan review it could take longer or if there were issues it could be put on hold.

Mr. Wilson said they planned to submit a building application in December.

Committee Member Cooley asked about the glazing waiver and how applicants had to have demonstrable difficulty in order for the Committee to approve the waiver. He asked if the applicant could speak more specifically to the demonstrable difficulty in meeting the glazing requirement.

Mr. Wilson clarified the building for the most part had two major functions, and one portion was the branch portion where customers came in and where the tellers were. That area needed a certain level of security and fewer views into the building. The windows were limited in that portion based on the use. The other portion was the loan department which was also a public area with offices for customers to come in and talk with bankers. That area needed to be semi-private as opposed to fully glass. The requirement of 70% glazing was a large amount and more suited to a retail situation and this use did not fit the criteria.

Committee Member Branch asked for the dimensions of the proposed windows.

Mr. Wilson said the windows on the office side were 6 feet wide and 8 feet tall. They were large windows. The windows on the branch side were smaller, 3.5 to 4 feet wide and 6 to 7 feet tall.

Committee Member Cooley asked if they would consider altering the color of the metal glazing in order to create the impression of more glazing. By choosing the light colored metal glazing it emphasized the lack of windows.

Mr. Wilson said the intent was for the metal fins to be a darker color to match the dark aluminum window frames. He explained the purpose of them to read as windows and would serve as sun shades as well as add architectural interest and possibly a way to add greenery to the building for climbing vines.

Committee Member Cooley said once the existing building became a parking lot, at some point it could be redeveloped as a new building.

Mr. Wilson thought it could be done and at some point the applicant might want to expand. He did not know how they would want to use it in the future.

Committee Member Cooley asked about the proposed historic/art area and potential future redevelopment.

Dave Haugeberg, general counsel for First Federal, said that area would not go away without the City's approval.

Committee Member Cooley asked how long they would be occupying the new building before they had the egress on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Mr. Wilson explained the phasing of the project and how it would be about a year before it was completed. He thought there would be an impact on operations until that egress was built and limited parking until it was completed.

Chair Drabkin asked if the land dedication could be given back to the applicant and they could create a pocket park instead of a history/art area. She did not think it was good to have the entrances on both sides of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street be parking lots.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the land dedication on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street was required during a previous transportation project, and there was no process for the City to give it back because the transportation project included public right-of-way improvements that have already been constructed.

Committee Member Branch asked about the approval process for the use of the historic/art space and what would the required timeline be for that process.

Senior Planner Darnell said the applicant proposed a collaborative process that would involve the applicant's Board, Planning Department staff, and Public Art Committee. Staff included a condition that memorialized that process. There was no timeframe currently.

Committee Member Branch asked if they could add a condition that the final recommendations be brought back to the HLC.

Senior Planner Darnell said the Committee could discuss adding that condition.

Chair Drabkin asked if the egress could be closed down after the construction due to concern about safety for pedestrians.

Mr. Haugeberg said currently there were four ingress and egresses and they had gone out of their way to limit all but one on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and it was only an egress. He thought it met the standard. He thought the egress was the safest option and people would not have to go around the block and add to the traffic congestion.

Committee Member Branch thought when the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street improvements were done there would be more traffic on the street. There would always be heavier pedestrian traffic on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street because there were places for pedestrians to go. She asked what the parking capacity was now and what was being proposed. Right now there was parking access from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street but it was for a very small parking lot. What was being proposed was introducing an exit that would be accessible by a large number of parking spots. It was a dramatic shift.

Mr. Wilson said the current parking was 60-65 spaces and they were proposing 63 parking spaces. The building would be larger but the amount of parking would not be increased. It would most likely be used more heavily because of the extra activities on the site. To reduce the number of spaces would have an impact.

Committee Member Branch asked how deep the proposed historic/art area would be.

Mr. Wilson replied 15 feet.

Committee Member Branch asked if there was not a right turn only onto 3<sup>rd</sup> Street was there enough space to be able to keep the same number of parking spots.

Mr. Wilson said there would need to be space for cars to back out and go down the aisle. If the egress was not there, there would still be a need for a T at the end of the parking lot which would be 5 to 6 feet. It could potentially encroach in the historic/art area but it would not go as far as the sidewalk.

Mr. Haugeberg said currently there was an egress on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. They were not adding something new. People were also able to exit out onto 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Charles Hillestad, McMinnville resident, was a retired real estate law specialist and broker, former Planning Commission member, and had long time active interest and involvement in historic preservation and promotion. He liked First Federal and this was a good building, just not in a historic district. This was a critical site, not just for the historic district but also the commercial area. Their current building was not very historic looking and the proposed building was more attractive than the

current building. Historic districts were vulnerable and what was being proposed was a precedence that could be adverse to the historic district. They needed to do everything they could to preserve the environment in which these buildings existed. There was a consistency downtown that needed to be maintained. It was not only the black brick, but the glazing. He did not think they needed small windows as other banks had larger windows and were secure. He did not think the justifications for the waivers were compelling. He thought there were good reasons for the criteria and they should be followed. The landscaping was important as well and the landscaping requirements should not be diminished. He asked the Committee to be mindful that they were temporary custodians of historic downtown and they needed to be looking ahead to the future and preserving and promoting the past. He recommended denial of the waivers.

Mr. Haugeberg gave rebuttal. He stated the code had very specific things that they could control such as materials and colors, but he did not think they could deny an application because it did not look like a historic building.

The Committee discussed the building colors.

Committee Member Branch was not comfortable with the color selection. She would be open to seeing other options and options that were not McMinnville red, but colors that were in the same color tone or family. It needed to be something lighter and more naturally occurring. She also was not comfortable with the natural wood exposed soffits. She suggested using a stain to make it darker or paint them. She did not think the cream color for the awning was defensible.

Committee Member Cooley said the downtown design review criteria addressed material, finish, position on the site, glazing, etc. that had historic components but drove the design to be compatible but not identical or simulated. They did not want a simulated historic building, but one that was compatible.

Chair Drabkin thought this was a lovely building, but this was the wrong place. This site was an anchor to the downtown and the first thing people would see was a very contemporary building.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified the purpose of the downtown design chapter in the code stated that it was not to create a themed or artificial downtown environment, but to build on the main street qualities that existed and foster an organized, coordinated, and cohesive historic district. The standards did not call for a style particularly. When reviewing this application, they needed to look at its individual components and whether they met the individual standards within the code. A lot of the design standards were being met by the building design.

Committee Member Cooley asked if they could build a building this big that was organized, coordinated, and cohesive with the historic district. There were concerns about the size, which was not specifically addressed in the criteria.

Senior Planner Darnell said there was one for massing and configuration, which called for being consistent with the historic buildings on the block. However in this case there were no other buildings on the block. The building they were proposing met the basic zoning requirements for C-3, but materials and other design components came into play when they were talking about the façade and façade articulation. Those were the components that they were looking at for a building of this scale.

Committee Member Cooley wanted to be cautious about veering into exclusionary zoning. He did not want to go down the road of applying standards that made it impossible for people to develop a certain kind of project.

The Committee discussed the requested waivers.

Senior Planner Darnell said the applicant provided examples of other commercial buildings that had similar glazing or less glazing than what was being proposed.

Committee Member Branch thought the size of the windows on the north side or 3<sup>rd</sup> Street façade was acceptable. There was minimal glazing on the east side.



Committee Member Cooley said the applicant had explained the demonstrable difficulty at meeting the glazing requirement and he did not know if they needed more than that.

Chair Drabkin thought privacy and security were important, however she thought those could be provided and still meet the glazing requirement.

Committee Member Branch discussed the floor plan and proposed windows. She had a hard time finding where they took the downtown design review standards and made an effort to meet them. She suggested a privacy treatment could be put on the inside of the windows, but on the outside it could still look like regular glazing. They could still allow for a variance, but not taking the glazing down to 25%. She thought the east elevation should have a higher percentage of windows like the north elevation.

Regarding the parking lot waiver request and 3<sup>rd</sup> street egress, Committee Member Branch thought they were acceptable with the conditions suggested by staff if the final plan was brought back to the Committee for approval.

Chair Drabkin wanted to make the historic/art area larger and more inviting, something that people could go into instead of a wall that hid the parking lot.

Committee Member Cooley thought the overall direction of the downtown design review standards was to produce an elevated level of engagement between pedestrians and the built environment.

Chair Drabkin thought if the corner was made deeper and became more like a park or a room, then there would be interaction with pedestrians and it would buffer the view of the parking lot. She thought that buffer was needed.

Senior Planner Darnell clarified the language stated surface parking lots shall be prohibited from being located on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The Committee had to determine what "on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street" meant, as the parking lot was proposed to be 15 feet from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Chair Drabkin thought if there was more landscape area there, it would buffer the parking lot.

Committee Member Branch had concerns about what would be done with that space and that it was private property and not required to allow public access to it. She thought the Committee needed to decide what the size of the area should be. She would also like the Committee to be able to review the final plan for that area.

Senior Planner Darnell pointed out that the historic/art area was described by the applicant as being unique to the site because it would be a gateway into the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street corridor.

There was discussion regarding how this would not set a precedent because there were not any other lots that would have the same situation.

Senior Planner Darnell said the last waiver was for the awning material.

Committee Member Branch thought the cream color made it too noticeable.

Committee Member Cooley agreed. Where they were permitting waivers to materials, those materials should be as visually minimized as possible.

Committee Member Branch suggested they use a darker color like the metal framing around the windows and sunshades. The entirety of the construction of the awning should be in the darker color in order for it to better blend in.

Committee Member Branch was willing to allow the cream color cornice, but was not comfortable approving the proposed color of the brick.

Senior Planner Darnell summarized the Committee had said the parking lot and egress onto 3<sup>rd</sup> Street would be acceptable as proposed if the final design for the historic/art area came back to the Committee for final review. For that area they needed to provide something that interacted with pedestrians. The awning material would be allowed as proposed but in a darker metal color. All the

other waiver requests and conditions of approval were acceptable. The color of the brick and the wood soffits were not acceptable.

Committee Member Branch stated the applicant thought the grout color would make a difference with the brick, but she did not think it would make a difference for her.

Senior Planner Darnell said the Committee could continue this item and allow the applicant to respond to the concern with the color of the brick or they could include a condition on it.

Committee Member Branch wanted to see it in person to approve it.

Chair Drabkin thought they should continue it to let the applicant respond.

Jim Schlotfeldt, president and CEO of First Federal, said they would be willing to bring back another brick color. He did not think it would be a problem to use a darker color on the metal awnings.

Doug Hurl, First Federal Board Chair, said they had spent a lot of effort and time in developing this project and making it a good project for the City. They would be celebrating 100 years in McMinnville in 2022. The new building would be something the City would be proud of and they would be a gateway to the downtown. He agreed the brick was dark and the dark awnings would be no problem. He did not want the project held up for small items. They gave a lot back to the community and the new building would be tremendous for recruiting and retaining staff. There would be landscaping and trees. They could count on First Federal to do a good job for the City. He requested that they vote on the application tonight so they could move forward with the process.

Committee Member Branch did not want to stand in the way of progress, and the changes they were requesting did not impact the development of the construction and permit drawings. She asked if they could approve the application with the condition that the brick color had to come back to the Committee for additional review.

Senior Planner Darnell said if they did not approve the application tonight, they would have to meet very soon to continue the review in order to allow for all of the potential appeal processes to occur within the 120 day timeframe required for decisions on land use applications.

Committee Member Branch asked that both the brick and grout color be brought back.

Senior Planner Darnell said the conditions of approval proposed by staff were in the decision document. He suggested adding a sentence to Condition #1 that said the final design of the historic/art area shall be provided for the HLC's final approval. A new condition could be added that stated the applicant shall provide a revised example of the brick and grout material in a lighter color than what was originally proposed. A finding would be written that the proposed color was too close to black.

Committee Member Branch was willing to let the glazing go.

Chair Drabkin was on the fence regarding the glazing. She understood the reasons, but it was quite a reduction.

Committee Member Branch asked if the ATM room could have a window with a screen on the inside so people could not see into it. Mr. Schlotfeldt said the ATM room would also have telecommunications switch gear. It was not only the security of the ATM, but also network security that terminated there. The use of computers and privacy laws had changed and it was difficult to have a fully glazed window where people could see not only the customers, but also the computer screens.

Committee Member Branch asked about the work room which had one window now, could it have an additional window?

Mr. Wilson said that would require removing some upper cabinets, however they could add another window to the work room.

Senior Planner Darnell said they could add another condition that one additional window shall be provided on the Baker Street east façade in the work room space to minimize the level of waiver requested.

Based on the findings of fact, conclusionary findings for approval, and materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Cooley moved to approve DDR 4-19 subject to the conditions of approval provided in the decision document and the additional conditions as read into the record by staff. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Branch and passed 3-0.

## **5. Discussion Items**

None

## **6. Committee/Commissioner Comments**

### **A. Project Updates**

Senior Planner Darnell gave an update on the Taylor Dale 2 project. The HLC had approved the new construction, but they had come in with a boundary line adjustment to become one property. He asked if the HLC was comfortable with that.

The HLC thought it would protect the decision and more guarantee the project happening.

Senior Planner Darnell asked if the next HLC meeting could be held on October 17. There was consensus to schedule the next meeting on that date.

## **7. Staff Comments**

None

## **8. Adjournment**

Chair Drabkin adjourned the meeting at 6:06 p.m.



**City of McMinnville**  
**Planning Department**  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311  
[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

## EXHIBIT 3 - STAFF REPORT

**DATE:** January 23, 2020  
**TO:** Historic Landmark Committee Members  
**FROM:** Chuck Darnell, Senior Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Historic Landmarks Committee 2020 Work Plan

### STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



### GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Guide growth & development strategically, responsively & responsibly to enhance our unique character.

**OBJECTIVE/S:** Define the unique character through a community process that articulates our core principles

---

### Report in Brief:

The purpose of this agenda item is to review and adopt the 2020 Work Plan that will guide the Historic Landmarks Committee's historic preservation program and work activities over the coming year. The draft work plan was developed using activities identified in the Implementation Chapter of the Historic Preservation Plan.

### Background:

During 2017 and 2018, the Historic Landmarks Committee oversaw the development of a Historic Preservation Plan, which focused on providing guidance for the next 15 to 20 years of the City of McMinnville's historic preservation program. In early 2019, the Historic Preservation Plan was adopted by the City Council. The Historic Preservation Plan includes goals, policies, and proposals that the City should adopt and follow to implement and expand upon the current historic preservation program. More specifically, the "proposals" function as actions and activities that could be undertaken, and are included in the Implementation Chapter of the Historic Preservation Plan.

The Historic Landmarks Committee previously identified activities from the Implementation Chapter of the Historic Preservation Plan and had selected activities that they would like to focus on. Those activities were organized by staff into a draft 2020 Work Plan.

### Discussion:

Based on prior discussion, staff has compiled a draft 2020 Work Plan for the Historic Landmarks Committee to review and consider. Some of the activities are carried over from the 2019 work plan that were not completed in 2019. Some of the major activities proposed to be completed in 2020 include:

- Conducting a Reconnaissance Level Survey of residential properties in the area south of downtown
- Continuing to explore the viability of a historic district in the residential area north of downtown by conducting outreach and education with property owners
- Education and promotion activities
- Continuing the annual Historic Preservation Award program
- Making information on McMinnville's historic resources and historic preservation program more readily available through website updates, mapping, and property owner notifications

Detailed actions, timeframes, and estimated costs have been developed for each activity in the work plan. Also included with each action item is a description of the Historic Preservation Plan goal, policy, and proposal that the activity aligns with.

#### **Fiscal Impact:**

The City has received a Certified Local Government (CLG) grant to assist in funding projects and activities from the work plan. The CLG grant program requires a 50% local match, and the Planning Department has \$11,500 in the budget to serve as the required local match for the upcoming CLG grant period for a potential total CLG project budget of \$23,000.

The Planning Department will also explore the possibility of hiring an intern to work on some of the updates to the City's webpage, mapping, and potentially property owner outreach. Other activities may have to be completed in-kind by city staff as workloads allow.

#### **Recommendation/Suggested Motion:**

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Committee, after discussing the draft work plan and deliberating, adopt a 2020 Work Plan for the Historic Landmarks Committee.

***Suggested Motion: "That the Historic Landmarks Committee adopt the 2020 Work Plan as provided by staff."***

CD

# DRAFT McMinnville Historic Landmarks Committee - 2020 Work Plan DRAFT

## GOAL: Document and Protect Historic Resources (Goal 3 in Historic Preservation Plan)

Strategy	Action	HP Plan	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Conduct a Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) of Residential Properties in Area	Oversee the Development of the RLS Work	Proposal 3.E.3	2/1/20 - 5/31/20	\$ (CLG Grant)	City/HLC/Consultant
Explore Viability of Historic District in Residential Area North of Downtown	Conduct Outreach and Education with Property Owners in Area	Proposal 3.D.1	12/31/20	Staff	City/HLC

## GOAL: Increase Public Awareness and Understanding of McMinnville's History and its Historic Preservation Program (Goal 1 in Historic Preservation Plan)

Strategy	Action	HP Plan	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Educate Community on Historic Resources and Historic Preservation	Actively Promote National Preservation Month (May) by Participating in "This Place Matters"	Policy 1.A Proposal 1.B.1	5/1/20 - 5/31/20	Staff	City/HLC
	Participate at Farmers Market and Provide "Stroll McMinnville" Booklets	Proposal 1.B.2 Proposal 1.C.1	5/1/20 - 10/1/20	\$ (CLG Grant)	City/HLC
Acknowledge Property Owners that Preserve Historical Resources	Request Nominations for Annual Historic Preservation Award Program	Proposal 1.A.1	4/30/20	Staff	City/HLC/City Council
	Present Awards at City Council Meeting in May	Proposal 1.A.1	5/12/20	Staff	City/HLC/City Council
Make Information on McMinnville's Historic Resources Readily Available	Update Historic Preservation Webpage on City Website	Proposal 1.D.1 Proposal 1.D.2 Proposal 1.D.3	4/30/20	Staff	City/HLC/Intern
	Add Examples of Complete Design Review Applications on Website	Proposal 3.B.2	5/31/20	Staff	City/HLC/Intern
	Map All Historic Resources and Post Maps on City Website	Proposal 1.D.4	5/31/20	Staff	City/HLC/Intern
	Notify Owners of Historic Resources	Policy 1.C	8/30/20	\$ (CLG Grant)	City/HLC/Intern

## GOAL: Encourage the Preservation and Rehabilitation of Historic Resources (Goal 2 in Historic Preservation Plan)

Strategy	Action	HP Plan	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Promote All Incentives Available for Historic Resource Preservation	Create List of All Incentives on Website and in Graphic Handout	Proposal 2.A.1 Proposal 2.A.4	8/30/20	Staff	City/HLC/Intern