



City of McMinnville
Community Development
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311
www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1 – STAFF REPORT

DATE: December 8, 2022
TO: Historic Landmarks Committee Members
FROM: Heather Richards, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Gwendolyn Hotel Public Hearing (HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, DDR 2-22)

STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

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

OBJECTIVE/S: Strategically plan for short and long-term growth and development that will create enduring value for the community

Report in Brief:

This is a public hearing to consider four land-use applications associated with the Gwendolyn Hotel project. Three of the land-use applications are requesting a Certificate of Approval to demolish a historic resource on 609 NE Third Street, 611 NE Third Street, and 619 NE Third Street. The fourth land-use application is for a Certificate of New Construction, Downtown Design Review Approval and a Waiver from the Downtown Design Review standards for a new construction project on the combined site of 609, 611 and 619 NE Third Street, entitled the Gwendolyn Hotel. The Gwendolyn Hotel is a five-story hotel with ground floor commercial, a roof deck with a pool and dining, and an underground parking structure with 67 parking stalls.

All three structures proposed to be demolished are listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the McMinnville Downtown Historic District and are listed individually on the McMinnville Historic Resources Inventory necessitating a public hearing per Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-023-0200.

The Historic Landmarks Committee opened the public hearing on September 29, 2022, and continued it to December 8, 2022.

The applicant has requested that the public hearing be continued to January 5, 2023, 4:00 PM at the Kent Taylor Civic Hall.

Background and Discussion:

At the public hearing on September 29, 2022, the Historic Landmarks Committee heard a staff report, the applicant's report and public testimony. At the end of the public testimony, the Historic Landmarks Committee had several questions for the applicant and requested more information. The applicant asked for the public hearing to be continued to December 8, 2022, to provide them the time to gather the information for staff review and presentation to the Historic Landmarks Committee.

The applicant provided the following supplemental materials on November 4, 2022.

Dockets HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22:

- *609 NE Third Street Response for Additional Information Memorandum*, by OTAK, dated November 4, 2022
- *611 NE Third Street Response for Additional Information Memorandum*, by OTAK, dated November 4, 2022
- *619 NE Third Street Response for Additional Information Memorandum*, by OTAK, dated November 4, 2022
- *Attachment 2: Historic Resources Assessment for 609, 611, and 619 NE Third Street by Architectural Resource Group*, dated November 2022.
- *Attachment 3: Contaminated Media Management Plan for 609, 611 and 619 NE Third Street*, by EVREN Northwest, dated October 13, 2022
- *Attachment 4: McMinnville Lease Rates* by Pacific Crest Real Estate Advisors, dated November 2, 2022
- Attachment 5:
609 NE Third Street Yamhill County Property Summary, dated October 31, 2022
611 NE Third Street Yamhill County Property Summary, dated October 31, 2022
619 NE Third Street Yamhill County Property Summary, dated October 31, 2022
- *Attachment 6: Contractor Assessment, Existing Buildings*, by Hugh Construction, dated October 11, 2022
- *Attachment 7: Overview of Historic Preservation Incentives for 609, 611 and 619 NE Third Street*, by OTAK, dated October 31, 2022.
- *Attachment 8: Economic Value of Structures in Downtown McMinnville, Oregon*, by Johnson Economics, dated November 2, 2022

Docket DDR 2-22:

- *The Gwendolyn Hotel, Response for Additional Information Memorandum*, by OTAK, dated November 4, 2022
- *Attachment 1: Contaminated Media Management Plan for 609, 611 and 619 NE Third Street*, by EVREN Northwest, dated October 13, 2022

- Attachment 2: *Transportation Impact Analysis Addendum, Gwendolyn Hotel*, by OTAK, November 4, 2022

And the following memorandum on November 7, 2022, for HL 6-22, HL 7-22, and HL 8-22:

- *Gwendolyn Hotel HHPR Structure Report – Response to City of McMinnville Staff Report dated September 29, 2022*, by Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc., dated November 6, 2022.

All documents associated with these dockets can be found on the project web page at: [Gwendolyn Hotel \(HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, and DDR 2-22\) - 609, 611 and 619 NE Third Street | McMinnville Oregon](#)

Staff had some questions about the material provided necessitating more time to review the materials in preparation for the continued public hearing and asked the applicant if they would be willing to continue the public hearing to a later date than December 8, 2022. The applicant agreed to continue the public hearing to January 5, 2023 and extend the statutory deadline for a decision by 30 additional days.

Attachments:

- Email from Garrett Stephenson, Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, dated 12.1.22
- Public Testimony Received Since 09.29.22

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Committee continue the public hearing to the January 5, 2023, Historic Landmarks Committee meeting.

“I MOVE THAT THE HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMITTEE CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DOCKETS HL 6-22, H 7-22, HL 8-22 AND DDR 2-22 TO THE JANUARY 5, 2023 HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMITTEE MEETING, 4;00 PM, KENT TAYLOR CIVIC HALL, 200 NE SECOND STREET.”

From: [Stephenson, Garrett H.](#)
To: [Heather Richards](#); "[Li Alligood](#)"
Cc: [Bill Kabeiseman](#)
Subject: RE: Gwendolyn Hotel Public Hearing (HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, DDR 2-22_)
Date: Thursday, December 1, 2022 11:14:46 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Confirmed. Thank you, Heather.

[Garrett H. Stephenson](#)

Shareholder

Direct: 503-796-2893

Mobile: 503-320-3715

gstephenson@schwabe.com

[Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt](#)

[Please visit our COVID-19 Resource page](#)

From: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 10:50 AM
To: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>
Cc: Bill Kabeiseman <billkab@batemanseidel.com>
Subject: RE: Gwendolyn Hotel Public Hearing (HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, DDR 2-22_)

Just to confirm for the record Garrett. The 30-day extension identified below is in addition to the 70-days requested in the attached email for a total extension of the 120-day deadline by 100 days.

Have a great day!

Heather



Heather Richards
Community Development Director
503-474-5107 (phone)
971-287-8322 (cell)
www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

From: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 10:42 AM
To: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>
Subject: Gwendolyn Hotel Public Hearing (HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, DDR 2-22_)

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Heather,

January 5th works for us. With this email and pursuant to ORS 227.178(5), and as legal counsel for the applicant, I hereby request a 30-day extension of the 120-day deadline on for the above-referenced application.

Thanks,

Garrett

Garrett H. Stephenson

Shareholder

Direct: 503-796-2893

Mobile: 503-320-3715

gstephenson@schwabe.com

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

[Please visit our COVID-19 Resource page](#)



From: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>
Subject: RE: Check - In

Good Morning,

I provided two dates to the HLC – January 5 and January 12. They can put together a quorum for January 5, 4:00 PM. Does that work for you? If it does, can you send me a letter or email confirming it and extending the decision deadline by another thirty days. I will add that to my staff report that will go out today. Attached is a draft. I am messaging the need for a continuance based on the City's need for more time to address some questions that we had.

Have a great day!

Heather



Heather Richards
Community Development Director
503-474-5107 (phone)
971-287-8322 (cell)
www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

From: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 5:11 PM
To: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>
Subject: RE: Check - In

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Ok, thanks. Its fine if we go to the second week of January, if need be. We want to be flexible.

Garrett H. Stephenson

Shareholder

Direct: 503-796-2893

Mobile: 503-320-3715

gstephenson@schwabe.com

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

[Please visit our COVID-19 Resource page](#)

From: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 5:09 PM

To: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>

Subject: RE: Check - In

I am working on that right now. The HLC normally meets on the fourth Thursday of the month, which would be January 26, but since you requested early January I am polling the committee members about Thursday, January 12, 4:00 PM.

Have a great day!

Heather



Heather Richards

Community Development Director

503-474-5107 (phone)

971-287-8322 (cell)

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

From: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 4:39 PM

To: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; 'Li Alligood' <Li.Alligood@otak.com>

Subject: RE: Check - In

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Heather,

When you are able, can you please acknowledge our continuance request and let me know when the next meeting will be? Thanks!

Garrett H. Stephenson

Shareholder

Direct: 503-796-2893

Mobile: 503-320-3715

gstephenson@schwabe.com

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

[Please visit our COVID-19 Resource page](#)



From: Stephenson, Garrett H.

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 4:16 PM

To: 'Heather Richards' <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>; Li Alligood <Li.Alligood@otak.com>

Subject: RE: Check - In

Heather: my client has agreed to a roughly one-month extension to get us to the first meeting in January.

Garrett H. Stephenson

Shareholder

Direct: 503-796-2893

Mobile: 503-320-3715

gstephenson@schwabe.com

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

[Please visit our COVID-19 Resource page](#)

From: Heather Richards <Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 4:15 PM

To: Stephenson, Garrett H. <GStephenson@SCHWABE.com>; Li Alligood <Li.Alligood@otak.com>

Subject: Check - In

Hi,

I wanted to check-in and see if you will be asking for a continuance and extension of the deadline or if we are moving forward with the public hearing next week?

Have a great day!

Heather



Heather Richards
Community Development Director
City of McMinnville
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

503-474-5107 (phone)

971-287-8322 (cell)*

*Please note new cell phone number

Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov



MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 1, 2022
TO: Historic Landmarks Committee Members
FROM: Heather Richards, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Public Testimony for HL 6-22, HL 7-22, HL 8-22, and DDR 2-22, Gwendolyn Hotel
(Received after 9.29.22)

Historic Landmarks Committee Members,

Following is the public testimony that has been received for the three Certificates of Approval for Demolition for the historic resources at 609, 611, and 619 NE Third Street, and the Certificate of Approval for New Construction for the Gwendolyn Hotel project since September 29, 2022.

Public Testimony:

- Mandee Tatum, 10.04.22
- Crystal55dreams, 10.25.22
- Peter and Linda Enticknap, 11.22.22
- Karen Saxberg, 11.28.22
- Jeb Bladine, 11.29.22 (response to letter from the City of McMinnville dated November 28, 2022 – also included)
- Nathan Coopridger, 11.29.22
- Ernie Munch, 11.30.22
- Marilyn Kosel, 11.30.22

From: [Mandee Tatum](#)
To: [Heather Richards](#)
Subject: Written Testimony re: Gwendolyn Hotel
Date: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 11:32:20 AM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Hi-

I wasn't sure if it was too late to contribute testimony, but I found your contact details on the website.

My husband and I moved to McMinnville earlier this year from Los Angeles. While McMinnville and Yamhill County in general have a lot of reasons to be recommended as places to live, we were drawn here in large part by the vintage downtown district. When we were searching for places to move to, I ran across a website that showed photos of the downtown area and with little other knowledge I added it to our list. But to be honest, I told my husband that if Third Street was as perfect in real life as it is in the photos, this is where we would land. And it was and we settled on this as our new home.

Sure, seems a little silly that we would pick a town based upon a single street - but it's the magic and the promise of that street that drew us in. Small, quaint, vintage, picturesque and filled with a variety of small businesses instead of chains. Coming from LA we've seen a number of small town main streets transition from local businesses housed in period architecture into malls with high end shops. Old Town Pasadena and Pacific Palisades are classic examples. In either place you would never know you were in a small town with character because they look like you are in mall/hotel complex.

It's a slippery slope from tearing down a couple of buildings to put in a modern hotel to turning a downtown into a mall full of chain stores.

It's my hope that the city will find an alternative location for the proposed hotel that doesn't require demolishing the history and authenticity of the town in favor of being tourist trap.

Mandee Tatum

From: [crystal55dreams](#)
To: [Heather Richards](#)
Subject: Hotel Project
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:31:00 PM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Good Afternoon,

After learning about the proposed hotel being put on 3rd street I felt compelled to let you know how distressing that is. Some things are better left alone. Not only would it cause major traffick problems it would take away from the charm of the town and most likely drive up prices in the area.

Hopefully the committee will realize what a mistake it would be to allow this to happen.

From: [LindayPeter E.](#)
To: [Heather Richards](#)
Subject: Gwendolyn Hotel 3rd St.
Date: Tuesday, November 22, 2022 4:36:49 PM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Ms Richards;

McMinnville is growing. The wine and tourism business are expanding. Our commercial downtown core is busy. We are fortunate that someone is willing to invest capital in our prospering community. The buildings in question at [609, 611 & 619] NE Third Street are over 100 years old and poised for redevelopment having exceeded their useful and economic life without very significant renovations requiring major investment. The current owner has tried unsuccessfully to sell two of these buildings. They are clearly in poor condition and have become obsolete. The proof is that after five years no one is willing to take on the risk and expense of restoring these buildings.

The proposed hotel project is a win-win for McMinnville. It complements existing downtown business. The current occupants will remain in McMinnville. The city will receive a significant infusion of new capital, expand the clean tourism industry by attracting folks to our downtown, create new jobs and expand revenue streams for our community. We encourage support for this hotel project by a responsible vetted developer.

Peter y Linda ENTICKNAP

2019 NW Doral St.

Mailto:lindaypeter@gmail.com
971-901-2614

Nov. 17, 2022

Oregon Development Director
Heather Richards
231 NE First St.
McMinnville, Oreg. 97128

Heather,

Coming from a family that was
the first wagontrain that came to
this valley, and became a part of the
community, and the towns history.

Our family has continued to be a large
part of it. Working at the Yamhill
County's museum my grandmother
whos family also was on the train,
helped preserve Yamhill history.

The Yamhill County Historical Museum,
still helps to keep it and preserve.

We are losing sight of that.

What has always been important,
and McMinnville being unique.

Our heritage and our historical downtown.

We have already taken some of the original
family's building down. Oh well two
more is no big deal. You can't
replace historical building with so
called look like historical buildings
When will it stop...

You have changed historic building across the street, and around the block where you are proposing your new so-called looking building. Down the street from a business that celebrated 100 years in the same place!

Think long and hard, another two gone. You can't change and go back once its gone. People that have no history, just don't get it. Very expensive, places to eat and stay, leave out the people that live and work and make this their home, and future.

Those of us that love this town want it to stay historic,

Look to our past and the preservation that was our ancestors not our future destruction of it.

Sincerely

Karen J. Sutton Saxberg
7720 N. W. Forestry Bend Rd
McMinnville, Ore. 97128

Laura Lutton-Jarvis
7720 N-W Poverty Bend Rd
McMinnville, Ore 97128



PORTLAND OR 972
22 NOV 2022 PM 1 L



Oregon Development Director
Deborah Richards
231 NE Fifth St
McMinnville, Ore 97128

97128-4999

11/29/2022

To: Heather Richards, Planning Director, City of McMinnville
From: Jeb Bladine, President, Oregon Lithoprint, Inc.
Re: Historic Landmarks Committee consideration of Docket No. HL 6-22
Response to testimony submitted by Heather Richards on 11/28/2022
A series of quotes from that testimony, and responses

City: "Regarding the historical contamination on the site, the City is generally not opposed to the redevelopment of the O'Dell Building and adjacent properties, as redevelopment provides an opportunity to benefit the community through the planned removal of contaminated soil during excavation and site development."

Response: We appreciate city recognition of this community value in the redevelopment plan.

City: "It is our understanding that Hugh Development will receive protection from contribution claims related to the LUST site when it enters the PPA."

Response: In order to obtain the requested PPA, Hugh Development must commit to pay costs associated with handling contaminated media found on the development site.

City: "Because the City is not liable under Oregon law for these incremental costs to handle contaminated soil and groundwater, the City will seek contribution for these costs from OLI, the responsible party."

Response: OLI does not agree with the statement that the City "is not liable under Oregon law" for incremental costs to handle contaminated soil and groundwater beneath NE Third and NE Ford Streets." OLI also does not agree with the assertion that OLI will be responsible for these costs, if they are incurred. These are complex, contestable areas of law and precedent. The city's positions on these issues are unrelated to public comments from OLI regarding the regulatory status of the LUST site and the accuracy of certain information in a city report to the HLC.

City: "For clarification, please note that the City has no authority to 'approve' any draft CMMP or 'agree' with OLI that such document meets DEQ regulations or guidance."

Response: In 2020, following review of reports and circumstances related to a near-identical draft CMMP as now proposed in 2022, the city Community Development Director responded: "The recommendations look reasonable to me, and they are consistent with our approach to encountering other contamination in the right-of-way. I'll forward to the City Manager and City Attorney with a recommendation that we indicate our support of the proposal."

Subsequently, a letter from the City Manager stated: "The City of McMinnville has reviewed drafts prepared by Oregon Lithoprint, Inc. of the Contaminated Media Management Plan, and the Easement & Equitable Servitude document, in connection with the Oregon Lithoprint aka News-Register Site in downtown McMinnville. The city supports these proposals put forth by OLI, which seek to gain closure of the environmental case with a No Further Action decision by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. We understand that this letter from the City will accompany OLI's submission of those documents to the DEQ."

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments concerning city testimony in this case.

Regards,

Jeb Bladine

President, Oregon Lithoprint, Inc.

503-687-1223

jbladine@newsregister.com



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT.
231 NE Fifth Street
McMinnville, OR 97128
(503) 434-7311

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

SENT VIA EMAIL

November 28, 2022

Jeb Bladine, President
Oregon Lithoprint, Inc.
jbladine@newsregister.com

Re: *LUST Site # 36-85-4001, O'Dell Building – Response to Letter dated September 28, 2022, Historic Landmarks Committee Docket No. HL 6-22*

Dear Mr. Bladine,

I am writing to respond to your letter dated September 28, 2022, that included comments relative to Docket No. HL 6-22 and to provide the City of McMinnville's (City) position regarding the associated Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) site associated with the O'Dell building (Site) currently owned by Oregon Lithoprint, Inc. (OLI).

Please note that this letter is specific to the LUST on the Site and should not be construed as a city position on the request for a Certificate of Demolition of the historic O'Dell Building at 609 NE Third Street and the other two historic resources at 611 and 613 NE Third Street, or the proposed new construction of the Gwendolyn Hotel. Those are decisions that will be rendered by the Historic Landmarks Committee based on the appropriate code criteria for the demolition of historic resources, and new construction in the downtown design overlay district.

Page 2

Regarding the historical contamination on the site, the City is generally not opposed to the redevelopment of the O'Dell Building and adjacent properties, as redevelopment provides an opportunity to benefit the community through the planned removal of contaminated soil during excavation and site development.

Background:

The City understands that OLI is seeking a "No Further Action" determination from Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for the LUST site. The No Further Action determination requires some property owners to record Easements and Equitable Servitudes (EESs) to limit exposure to subsurface contamination associated with the LUST site in the future. The EESs in turn require the property owners to follow the Contaminated Media Management Plan (CMMP) prepared for OLI by Apex Companies, LLC. While the City has not been asked to record an EES on the public rights of way, the CMMP applies to those areas beneath City property, primarily beneath NE Third and NE Ford Street, where contaminated soil and groundwater have migrated from the LUST site. The CMMP requires special handling and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater encountered during excavation activities within the designated Soil Management Area and Groundwater Management Area.

In addition to the request for a No Further Action determination, Hugh Development is negotiating a Prospective Purchaser Agreement (PPA) with DEQ to limit Hugh Development's liability for residual contamination located beneath the O'Dell building. It is our understanding that Hugh Development will receive protection from contribution claims related to the LUST site when it enters the PPA.

The City's position on OLI's application for a No Further Action determination and Hugh Development's PPA is primarily related to its ability to recover future costs associated with handling contamination originating at the O'Dell LUST Site.

Page 3

As you note in your letter, the City anticipates future public works projects beneath NE Third and NE Ford Streets that will likely encounter contaminated soil and groundwater. The City also expects to comply with the requirements in the CMMP (even though such compliance is not required by an EES), but such compliance will cause the City to incur additional costs not associated with the planned public works projects. In other words, the O'Dell LUST site will incrementally increase the City's construction costs. Because the City is not liable under Oregon law for these incremental costs to handle contaminated soil and groundwater, the City will seek contribution for these costs from OLI, the responsible party. The City notes that a No Further Action determination from DEQ does not provide OLI protection from third party claims for contribution in the same way the Hugh Development PPA is expected to do.

Response:

With regard to your letter, staff notes that it bases its report, at least initially, on information provided by the Applicant. Thank you for providing additional information related to ownership of the development site.

With regard to whether the City regularly encounters contamination of the magnitude in the public streets identified in the OLI's LUST case, the City has not conducted a survey for purposes of this application, nor would it be appropriate to include those results in this land use case.

With regard to the LUST case, the City has *supported* OLI in its efforts to identify contamination and follow DEQ rules and guidance on appropriately protecting the environment, City and private land affected by circumstances identified in the relevant DEQ cases. For clarification, please note that the City has no authority to "approve" any draft CMMP or "agree" with OLI that such document meets DEQ regulations or guidance. When DEQ opens OLI's case for public comment, the City will likely submit comments at that time and in that forum.

As the City understands the various site investigative reports, no prior development applications, nor investigative reports concerned excavation of

Letter Re: LUST Site #36-85-4001

Date: November 28, 2022

Page 4

the magnitude proposed in this development application nor required the City to express its concern over water quality.

Finally, we understand your letter to provide your conclusions based on the meanings various studies and investigative reports provide. Those conclusions may or may not be supported by the factual conclusions expressed in the various reports. We appreciate your letter and look to ensure the decision-makers are fully informed.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather Richards", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Heather Richards, PCED
Community Development Director

Memo: Public Testimony

Gwendolyn Hotel applications HL- 6-22, HL-7-22, HL 8-22, and DDR 2-22

Date: Tuesday, November 29, 2022

By: Nathan Coopridner

Thank you Historic Landmark Committee for the opportunity to provide additional testimony regarding these applications.

I am very impressed with this admirable team. I deeply appreciate their clear passion, skill, determination and effort. I do hope that they can bring a project to fruition. My main concern is that the new building proposed is too big for this location within historic 3rd Street (height, width, mass, scale, density), and that the setbacks and material changes proposed aren't effective at diminishing the scale of the building and aren't consistent with the historic patterns of the district.

Historic 3rd Street is the "Town Square" of the community, requiring thoughtful preservation and protection for future generations. When considering the value of each historic building, it is important to remember that they are a part of the continuous building fabric which make up the district as a whole. I think of the experience of walking in historic urban areas around the world, where the buildings individually are often not awe-inspiring, but where the patterns that they adhere to together creates a memorable environment, distinct to that place, and different than anything else in the world.

The National Historic Register nomination describes the significance in this way:

"Buildings along Third Street represent several phases of development but have a marked cohesion by virtue of their density, common scale, materials and overall design elements. While ground story storefronts have been altered over the years, distinguishing features of the upper stories are intact and provide visual continuity."

It is the cohesions, the common scale, and the continuity of the downtown that the community has designated as important to preserve, protect and enhance.

Partial list of the building design rarity and value:

The Historic Resource Assessment provided by the applicant, documents some of the many unique and well-preserved historic features deserving of preservation. I would also like to share my own thoughts regarding these buildings:

609 NE Third Street:

The O'Dell Building is a "Significant Contributing" building in the district. The building was stucco when it was classified as significant. Stucco is a part of the palette of historic downtown McMinnville. The scale, composition, and simple rhythm of the façades contribute significantly to the historic downtown. The simple, proud massing is consistent with the pattern which exists for corner buildings in the district. Restoration of the stucco, storefront, windows, new color, new awnings are all relatively simple ways to renovate and give new life and vibrancy to this building exterior. The interior contains a beautiful, open space with exposed brick walls, wood ceiling and exposed wood structure and skylights. This is a wonderful space for any number of uses. According to interior photos, it appears that much of the building is actually one-story, with the upper level windows bringing in clerestory light. This type of tall space on a corner is very valuable, and renovation can be fairly simple. On a single story building, seismic renovation is easier than on taller buildings.

611 NE Third Street:

The News Register Building is a "Significant Contributing" building in the district. The upper story of the façade is remarkably well preserved and offers significant historic value. The detailed brickwork, cornice and unique pediment shaped parapet are in well preserved condition. The stairs which connect the sidewalk with the upper floor is an element which occurs all along historic 3rd Street and an

important pattern which contributes to the spirit of the place. The lower level storefront is not original, but remains in the same state it was in when placed on the National Register of Historic Places. It could be improved from its current state in a creative renovation. Even if it were determined that the building behind needed to be rebuilt, it seems feasible that the existing façade could be preserved. The building adheres to the common scale and density which exists in the historic district.

619 NE Third Street:

The façade of the Bennette Building is a well preserved piece of McMinnville history. The delicate and subtle brickwork on the façade is of a character and quality that is rarely replicated by modern construction. I have not seen similar narrow mortar joints in modern construction. The woodwork is also very subtle and elegant, and of rare quality and design deserving of preservation. The exposed brick mass wall at the east adds historic texture to the streetscape, especially as it defines one edge of an outdoor dining plaza. The authentic historic texture that these brick mass walls add is very valuable. I remember the wonderful brick interior of Cornerstone Coffee, and how that distinctive feature helped create such a wonderful gathering place which contributed greatly to the vibrancy of downtown. The Bennette Building, like other single story buildings facing 3rd Street, is designated as a "Significant Contributing" building in the district. These single story buildings are an important part of the fabric of the historic downtown. If additional square footage is required to help ensure preservation of this building, a more context-sensitive approach might be similar to that of the Troon wine bar across the street, where the 3rd Street façade was preserved, and a second story was added.

Possible reasons discussed for demolition of these 3 historic buildings (and my thoughts in response):

Reason: Not due to significant structural issues or imminent public safety hazard.

Reason: The challenge and expense of upgrading / renovating unreinforced masonry buildings.

Response: *(This would apply to many historic buildings in the district. This challenge and expense is faced by most all historic building owners downtown.)*

Reason: That buildings were identified as primary and secondary contributing resources based primarily on the estimated age of the structure and not the historic integrity of the extant structure.

Response: *(If they lacked the historic integrity required to be "Significant Contributing", it seems that they would have been classified as "Historic Non-Contributing")*

Reason: That structures underwent significant modifications which have compromised the historic integrity of the structure.

Response: *(Most of the modifications occurred prior to classification as "Significant Contributing". These modifications appear to have been considered during the classification process.)*

Reason: That only the overall form and massing of the buildings, and perhaps some individual components remain.

Response: *(The importance of the overall form and massing of historic buildings in creating the main street qualities of the historic downtown should not be underestimated or overlooked.)*

Reason: That 1 and 2 story buildings do not represent the highest and best use of the site.

Response: *(1 and 2 story buildings are the heart and soul of historic 3rd Street. Taller buildings are the exception, not the rule. Greater density can be added to the downtown where no historic buildings need to be demolished, and within the building scale guidelines provided).*

Reason: That the MAC-Town 2032 Plan encourages additional high-quality hospitality offerings and offerings for small and large conferences.

Response: *(This does not seem to be a reason to demolish historic 3rd Street buildings. There are other locations for new hospitality offerings. Change of use is possible for these buildings. Not all historic buildings need to be hospitality offerings. If historic buildings are not well suited to certain types or densities of use, it does not mean they will not lend themselves well to other important uses needed downtown.)*

Reason: That a preservation project is unfeasible.

Response: *(Based on what detailed information? The “News Register / Wild Haven Hotel” analysis provided does not seem conclusive because different, lighter, and more efficient renovation projects are possible.)*

Demolition Applications:

I do not believe that demolition is required here, or that retaining these buildings is a ‘substantial financial hardship’ any more than retaining any other historic buildings in the district. The idea that demolishing the buildings is the way to achieve the highest and best use of this location does not factor in that the 6 story building proposed is not allowed under the Downtown Design Standard. The 80’ maximum height in the C3 zone is overridden by the more restrictive height and massing limitations for the historic district (See Zoning section 17.04.040.B *Most Restrictive Requirements Apply*).

Based on what I understand, these are my thoughts regarding the demolition criteria provided in the 9-29-22 Staff Presentation:

Demolition, State Compliance Criteria (OAR 660-023-0200(8)(a) Factors to Consider):

1. Condition

Poised for continued occupancy, or renovation / restoration.

2. Historic Integrity

No change of integrity since being established as “Significant Contributing”, the highest ranking in the downtown district.

3. Age

Built during the period of significance.

4. Significance

“Significant Contributing”, the highest ranking in the historic district.

5. Value to Community

The historic downtown, and specifically the 3rd Street corridor, is the “Town Square” of the community. Maintaining its character and historic building fabric is essential to preserving this important asset of the community for all of its citizens, current and future.

6. Economic Consequences

Keeping the historic building fabric intact is an important economic draw to the downtown. Residents and visitors alike love historic buildings and the main street qualities that exist, and this unique attraction is of great economic benefit to the entire community.

7. Design or Construction Rarity

Each of the three buildings are a rare, unique and authentic piece of the fabric of the historic downtown. Each are of beautiful design in their own way, while also adhering to the patterns of the historic district. The National Historic Register nomination describes the significance of the district in this way: *“Buildings along Third Street represent several phases of development but have a marked cohesion by virtue of their density, common scale, materials and overall design elements. While ground story storefronts have been altered over the years, distinguishing features of the upper stories are intact and provide visual continuity.”*

8. Consistency with Local Policy Objectives in the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan establishes the historic preservation standards and codes. See the “Purpose” statements of the Historic Preservation Code (Chapter 17.65) and the Downtown Design Standards and Guidelines (Chapter 17.59). Preserving the historic downtown is a goal of the community. Other comprehensive plan policies can be achieved without the demolition of historic buildings on 3rd Street.

Demolition, Local Compliance Criteria [7.65.050(B)]:

1. Comprehensive Plan Policies

The Comprehensive Plan establishes the historic preservation standards and codes. See the “Purpose” statements of the Historic Preservation Code (Chapter 17.65) and the Downtown Design Standards and Guidelines (Chapter 17.59). Preserving the historic downtown is a goal of the community. Other comprehensive plan policies can be achieved without the demolition of historic buildings on 3rd Street.

2. Economics

Keeping the historic building fabric intact is an important economic draw to the downtown. Residents and visitors alike love historic buildings and the main street qualities that exist, and this unique attraction is of great economic benefit to the entire community.

3. Historic Significance

“Significant Contributing”, the highest ranking in the historic district.

4. Physical Condition

Poised for continued occupancy, or renovation / restoration.

5. Public Safety Hazard

Seismic improvements are a good idea for all masonry buildings downtown.

6. Deterrent to an improvement program

No.

7. Retention is a Financial Hardship to the Owner

Not any more than retaining and maintaining any other historic building in the district.

8. Retention is in the best interest of a majority of the citizens

The historic downtown, and specifically the 3rd Street corridor, is the “Town Square” of the community. Maintaining its character and historic building fabric is essential to preserving this important asset of the community for all of its citizens, current and future.

Thoughts regarding renovation:

I agree with the portion of the applicant’s project narrative which states: “The most recent renovation and redevelopment on the south side of 3rd Street, with new lodging, dining, and wine tasting, has been encouraging.”

This is actually the continuation of a trend of renovation which has been essential to the preservation and progress of the historic downtown over the years. The three buildings in this application are poised to be the next to be renovated. If all three are renovated together as one project, there would be an incredibly beneficial economy of scale, not available when renovating one building at a time. This would also open the door for very creative possibilities for adding square footage, better escape routes, and shared amenities that will all help the project's bottom line. A creative approach re-envisioning all three buildings' interiors, while minimally impacting the massing, scale and character from the exterior, is a great opportunity for a successful project in keeping with the codes that are in place. It should also be noted that although seismic renovation is challenging, it is a responsible choice for safety and preservation, and smaller buildings are generally easier and more cost-effective to strengthen seismically than taller ones are.

During restoration and remodel projects, the code makes room for compromises to make the redevelopment of these properties more economically viable, while still honoring the requirement to protect, enhance and preserve the historic district and the existing historic buildings. For instance, when the Jameson Hardware building was recently renovated, one very narrow neighboring building was removed and replaced as a part of the same development, with great care given to creating a very block-specific two-story massing that blends seamlessly with the adjacent buildings. The end result is maintaining the scale and pattern of the original historic fabric, while combining a small percentage of new construction with a much larger percentage of historic restoration.

This is a much different approach than the complete erasure of the historic buildings along an entire block facing 3rd Street, and replacing them with a massive singular building, both taller (in feet and stories) and wider (in continuous parapet height and in repetitive façade articulation) than any other historic building in the district. When new construction is proposed in the historic district, to achieve the purpose of the design standard is to build in a way that reflects the historic built environment and the main street qualities that exist, creating buildings of similar height, massing, scale and configuration to the adjacent existing historic buildings. This is not too much to ask of new construction in the district.

Economic Report:

The economic report provided points out the return-on-investment advantages of new construction over that of renovation. The reasoning used would very likely have also shown that demolition and new construction would produce a higher return-on-investment than the recent renovation and seismic strengthening of the historic Jameson Hardware building. Yet due to the high desirability of historic 3rd Street, there was a team who stepped up to breathe a new life into that building, to the benefit of the historic district and the preservation of the City's heritage.

"News Register / Wild Haven Hotel" Design:

I have taken a look at the "News Register / Wild Haven Hotel" design concept provided by the applicants (Attachment 6). The approach shown is not the only type of renovation possible, which I think should be taken into account when reviewing the comparison between renovation and new construction. For instance, there appears to be a 9600 sq.ft. rooftop terrace included, which is an expensive amenity for a 13 room hotel. There is also a 6990 sq.ft. area included for hotel lobby / lounge and back-of-house, which seems very large. These functions are usually kept to a minimum to increase profitability. I know of larger hotels using much less space for those functions. If this is a result of the existing geometry of the historic buildings, maybe these buildings aren't a good fit to convert into a hotel? Or perhaps there is a way to incorporate guest rooms into the main floor? And just think of all of the other uses which would benefit from the large ground floor areas and open layout of these buildings. The cost for a different type of renovation would not be the same. Cost included in the "News Register / Wild Haven Hotel" renovation for replacing the entire floor and roof structure and adding a large roof terrace would not be required for a lighter renovation which updates the existing square footage, leaving the existing roof structure in place. A successful renovation of these three buildings will

require a lot of creativity and resourcefulness. I understand that it will be challenging, as most renovations are. But I do not think it is impossible or even unlikely that there are creative approaches for a successful renovation project here.

Application DDR 2-22, New Construction / Downtown Design Review:

For a new construction to be approved for this location, it needs to adhere to the Downtown Design Standards And Guidelines (Chapter 17.59).

As stated in the City's staff report: *"The replacement plan project must not only meet the minimum standards of Section 17.59, Downtown Design Guidelines, McMinnville Municipal Code, but it must enhance the overall historic sense of place of downtown McMinnville by replicating the form and design of the building stock on Third Street."*

The building proposed is much taller than the two existing historic buildings on the same block, and has a much different massing and configuration. I would not consider these similar, which is what the guidelines require.

The proposed corner building appears to be 5 or 6 stories in height, depending on where it is viewed from, which exceeds the code required 2-story massing for corner buildings. This requirement reinforces an important pattern in the district: Along 3rd Street, in the six blocks between Baker Street and the train tracks, I have counted 16 "Significant Contributing" historic buildings on street corners. 13 of these are or appear to be 2-story buildings. The ordinance calls for the repetition of the primary historic pattern which exists.

Waiver

Flexibility is allowed through the Waiver Process, 17.59.030.D:

*"A **guideline or standard** contained in this ordinance may be waived as part of the design review process when it can be demonstrated that the proposed design satisfies or exceeds the downtown design goals and objectives of this ordinance. If a waiver is requested, the applicant must explain in their application how the proposed design satisfies or exceeds these goals and objectives. A request for a waiver to the standards of this ordinance shall be reviewed by the McMinnville Historic Landmarks Committee, as described in Section 17.59.030(C)(2)."*

The waiver process is an important part of the Downtown Design Ordinance because it allows some flexibility in how to accomplish the purpose of the Chapter. The purpose is defined in 17.59.010:

"To provide for the protection, enhancement and preservation of buildings, structures, and other elements in the downtown core which contribute to its special historic and cultural value. Further, it is not the purpose of this ordinance to create a "themed" or artificial downtown environment. Rather, its purpose is to build on the "main street" qualities that currently exist within the downtown and to foster an organized, coordinated, and cohesive historic district that reflects the "sense of place," economic base, and history unique to McMinnville and the downtown core."

Based on the updated design submitted, I believe it would be very difficult to show that the height and massing of the proposal builds on the "main street" qualities that currently exist. If the purpose is to "foster an organized, coordinated, and cohesive historic district" I do not think this is achieved by departing so far from the patterns of building scale that exist and unify the district.

For instance:

No 6 story historic buildings currently exist. The tallest historic building appears to be 4 stories. The 5th story penthouse level on the Hotel Elberton is nearly invisible from the street. The proposed building does not build on "main street" qualities that currently exist related to building height and mass. Instead, it exceeds the visual height of any historic building by two stories. My opinion is that this drastic change

of the scale and density will have a detrimental impact on the character and experience of historic 3rd Street.

No wide stretches of tall historic buildings currently exist. There are only 3 historic buildings facing 3rd Street which appear to have 3 or more stories (Hotel Elberton, Cooks Hotel, and the Masonic Building). The “main street” quality that currently exists along 3rd Street is of mostly one and two story buildings, with an occasional taller building. The widest of these three buildings is the Masonic Building, which has a roughly 80’ width facing 3rd Street with a parapet elevation of roughly 44’ above the sidewalk. Adjacent is a single story building which serves to break up the overall street facing façade, so that the tall building mass does not extend beyond 80’ long along 3rd Street. The proposed Gwendolyn Hotel building has a 180’ width facing 3rd Street with a 5th floor parapet that is roughly 65’ above the sidewalk facing 3rd Street. This is more than twice as long and twenty feet taller than other historic building masses that face 3rd Street. The proposed building does not build on “main street” qualities that currently exist-related to building mass. My opinion is that this drastic change of the historic scale will have a detrimental impact on the character and experience of historic 3rd Street.

No historic buildings with prominent upper-story offsets in their massing currently exist. The setback of upper floors is a very prominent feature of the proposed building’s massing. Yet the “main street” pattern which currently exists is of simple volumes which have their entire street-facing façades built at the property line. This is particularly noticeable at the historic corner buildings, which display very proud, simple building masses and a single parapet line which caps the singular building mass. The proposed building’s setback of the upper floors, and the construction of a smaller amount of the façade to the property line does not follow the “main street” qualities that currently exist. My opinion is that this drastic change of the historic building massing and configuration will have a detrimental impact on the character and experience of historic 3rd Street.

To **enhance** the existing historic buildings, it is important for new construction to be at similar height, massing and configuration, so the new buildings relate to the historic buildings and “foster...a cohesive historic district that reflects the sense of place”. A building so much more massive than the buildings on the same block, and wider and taller than any other building in the district, and of a massing and configuration dissimilar from any historic building, does not enhance the existing buildings or build on the “sense of place” unique to McMinnville or “the main street qualities that currently exist”. The cohesion of the district is very important for the enhancement of existing historic buildings. The common density and common scale of the buildings is an important part of that cohesiveness.

To **protect and preserve** the existing historic buildings, it is important for new construction to be at similar height, massing and configuration. The existing historic buildings on this block are one and two story. The potential waiver request is to allow a six story building. Allowing this waiver could invite other owners of historic buildings to demolish rather than invest in the upgrades and renovations needed to protect and preserve the historic buildings of the district. A streetscape altered in such a way does not preserve and protect “the main street qualities that currently exist”. The main street qualities that currently exist include smaller scaled historic buildings along the 3rd Street corridor. A building designed to meet the design standards and guidelines would do a much better job achieving the purpose of the ordinance than the building that is proposed.

Thank you again for your careful consideration of these applications.

Sincerely,
Nathan Coopridner,
McMinnville native, residing in Portland, Oregon

CORNER BUILDING MASSING - PATTERN OF DISTRICT

*There are 3 historic buildings of 3 or 4 stories which face 3rd Street.
Note the pattern of very simple building massing and single cornice at top of building.*



Masonic Building



Hotel Elberton



Cooks Hotel



The jogs and offsets in the proposed building massing is not similar to any other historic buildings in the district



Jameson Hardward Building



Odd Fellows Hall

“Buildings along Third Street represent several phases of development but have a marked cohesion by virtue of their density, common scale, materials and overall design elements. While ground story storefronts have been altered over the years, distinguishing features of the upper stories are intact and provide visual continuity.”

MID-BLOCK BUILDING FACADE - PATTERN OF DISTRICT

“Buildings along Third Street represent several phases of development but have a marked cohesion by virtue of their density, common scale, materials and overall design elements. While ground story storefronts have been altered over the years, distinguishing features of the upper stories are intact and provide visual continuity.”



PROPOSED MASSING

The proposed building is much larger than the surrounding historic buildings



surrounding historic buildings appear tiny compared to proposed building



The proposed building massing is much larger than the Jameson Hardware building, one of the taller historic buildings in the district,

MAP Architecture

Ernie Munch Architecture Urban Planning LLC
111 SW Oak Street, Suite 300. Portland, OR 97204

20 November 2022

Heather Richards, Planning Director
Members of the Historic Landmarks Committee.
City of McMinnville, Oregon

Regarding: Proposed Gwendolyn Hotel at 909, 911 and 919 NE Third Street.

I am writing as a friend of McMinnville and an admirer of what the city has achieved with its long-term commitment to its NE Third Street Historic District. I am not a resident of McMinnville, nor do I have a business in your city. I am neither associated with the proposed Gwendolyn Hotel project, nor any other project in McMinnville.

I was the architect for the restoration of, and the addition to, the Jameson Hardware Store across the street from the proposed project. Several years ago, I toured, with a structural engineer, two of the three buildings proposed for demolition. I would like to share with the Committee what we learned while working on the Jameson Hardware Building and from observing of the two buildings at 609 and 611 Third Street. I would also like to share my opinion of the currently proposed project.

When approaching this site, and McMinnville has many like it within its historic district, it is useful to define the community's values and goals by asking the following questions: What of historic value remains? What has been lost? What can be preserved? What can be restored? What can be reclaimed? What of historic value can be restated? What should be given up for the sake of moving ahead. Is there a good fit between the proposed building program, the site, and the values of the community as expressed by the goals for the Historic District? Is the proposed financing adequate?

Scale and authenticity matter. However, historic values are not just in the architecture. Sometimes the events, and people associated with the buildings are important to the McMinnville's collective memory. Each of the buildings in McMinnville's Historic District has a story, or several stories intertwined. This includes those buildings which are now under consideration for demolition.

Finding the stories and historic values lost requires researching old writings, records, and photos.

Finding what of value remains requires careful investigation, assessment, and documentation of what remains today. Dealing with an historic site requires both experience and a commitment to history. History tells us where we stand in time and place. It holds meaning.

Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-ArchPlan.com

Experiences with the Jameson Hardware Building

The Jameson Hardware Building, at 608 NE Third Street, was a substantial building with most of the original detailing in place. It was called out as the best-preserved building in the Historic District. However, it was listed as a Secondary Contributing Resource. The building required both an investment to heal the effects of long deferred maintenance and an economic use to justify that investment.

It was possible to preserve and restore the brick façade on the north and west facades. The original, deteriorated wood windows and storefronts were faithfully copied and replaced with the view that they survive for another 100 years. The original interiors were not preserved. The second floor and roof supports were entirely gutted and reconfigured to allow for compliance with modern codes, accessibility, proper egress from all three levels, a full seismic upgrade, and its new role as a high-end boutique hotel. A small steel canopy at the hotel entrance and a corner blade sign were added to the building's exterior.

However, the narrow structure next door, at 618 Third Street, was not really a building at all, but a roof lodged between the two adjacent buildings. It had a pieced-together back-alley wall and street façade, which was a bad knockoff of its earlier, Dutch colonial style neighbor to the east. It was poorly constructed during the Depression Era with what we now politely call "recycled materials." It had been incorrectly classified as "Craftsman Style" and of the two structures it was designated as the Primary Contributing Resource. The building was inconsistent with the historic district's goals and guidelines and would never have been approved by today's Historic Landmarks Committee. The committee granted us permission to replace it.

Thanks to a ca.1919 photo shared by Michael Hafner, (Reproduced on pages 50 and 100 of the Gwendolyn staff report), there was an image of the first building to occupy the site adjacent to the Jameson Hardware Building. It was one story and appeared to be a plain-faced brick building, with Victorian Italianate proportions, cornice, and decorations. Its storefront was the embodiment of McMinnville's current design guidelines, mostly clear plate glass, with an indent at the center to protect the entrance, and an upper ribbon of prismatic transom windows.

The replacement structure carefully copied that original storefront from the photo so the historic value and pedestrian scale could be restated. Artistic/economic license was taken to stretch the storefront to fill the space between the two adjacent buildings and to add a second story so two guest suites could be added for the adjacent hotel in the Jameson Hardware Building. The cornice and finials were matched to the originals. Lightweight thin brick was used to simulate what turned out to be the original, flat, sheet metal siding which was embossed to simulate brick.

The builders, former owners and residents lives were also researched, and their stories documented.

In short, work on the Jameson Hardware building was an exercise in historic preservation and adaptive reuse of an authentic structure. The addition at 618 NE Third Street, which appears as a separate building, is a careful restatement of lost historic values and scale.

This approach can be applied to the Gwendolyn Hotel project across the street.

Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-archplan.com

609 NE Third Street, The O’Dell Building

The original building and its brickwork are documented in historic photos and still exist beneath the 1950’s applied stucco surface. It is doubtful that the stucco can be removed without damaging the brickwork beyond repair. Its Third Street façade and one bay on Ford Street could be carefully demolished while documenting the detailing and color of the original brick work, the original storefront and original windows which have survived. The documentation and photos could be used to recreate or restate the original building, an Overland auto dealership. This “restated” façade could be used to add seismic reinforcement for the storefront of the O’Dell building and adjacent structure at 611 NE Third Street.

Saving all or parts of the remaining brick walls of the O’Dell building would lend authenticity to the hotel’s interior. The Historic Landmarks Committee could allow a recreation of the “Overland” sign pictured on the 1917, photo to appear on the facade. (1904 is the date of the O’Dell building not the photo.) With all due respect to the developer’s Aunt Gwendolyn, “Overland” would better tell the story of the beginning of McMinnville’s automobile era and go well with the restored Overland touring car parked in the hotel lobby.

611 NE Third Street

The second story of this building’s facade is sufficiently extant to merit preservation. The lower portion of the façade can be restored to its original condition based on historic photos and remaining fragments. Again, preservation the remaining brick walls of this building whole or in part are opportunities to lend authenticity, character, and credibility to the project.

619 NE Third Street

The committee needs to ask if this building is misclassified. The 1923 structure has little to contribute aesthetically and may never have had. In that respect it offers an opportunity to design something which better achieves the Historic District’s goals without being constrained by the existing architecture and what came before. Nonetheless, whatever is done there should be done with the care, in scale and with materials which befit the historic district.

Observations on the Proposed Gwendolyn Hotel Project

Scale

The overall scale of the project does not fit with the Historic District. It is simply too big. A 5-6 story tall building should be set back at least ½ block from NE Third Avenue. Building elements more than two-story originals, at the 609 and 611 addresses, should be set back 20 feet from NE Third and Ford streets. The building height at the 619 address should be limited to 4 stories, in keeping with the capabilities of the local building materials used in McMinnville’s past.

This describes a smaller envelope fit for a smaller project program.

A smaller project would not visually overwhelm district and would have less impact on the city’s infrastructure. Parking resources, street capacity and other city infrastructure which have been carefully

Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-archplan.com

managed in the past, should be reserved in part to accommodate and encourage future projects and events elsewhere in the historic district.

Character

The proposed project does not give the impression of a boutique hotel. Nor does it reflect the character of the historic district. The design is composed much like a chain hotel which could appear in any city; a massive number of rooms, largely alike and strung along a single double-loaded corridor, with elevators and ice rooms centrally located. Downsizing and serious attention to the historic context and extant historic buildings can be opportunities to define a more compatible character.

Economic Benefit

The developer may well be correct in his description of McMinnville's position in the Oregon wine industry, and his forecast of the proposed project's economic benefit to McMinnville. If the City of McMinnville agrees, perhaps there is another more appropriate site that can be found the near, but outside of the Historic District, perhaps closer to Highway 99W and other buildings of similar scale.

Site Contamination

If the soil contamination in and around the O'Dell Building is a serious impediment to the proposed project or any other development of the site, it may be necessary to seek a monetary solution using one or a combination of the following paths:

- 1) Reduce the value of the property. There are some very large developed properties which have changed hands for a dollar because of environmental contamination. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality is involved drawing up a Prospective Purchaser Agreement, (PPA), which will help define the contamination encumbrance.
- 2) Find state and/or federal programs which have the resources to help communities overcome environmental problems and spur economic development.
- 3) Find and use local resources to leverage a cleanup and make the site shovel ready. McMinnville businesspeople long ago established McMinnville Industrial Promotions, a mechanism to offer shovel-ready sites to industries seeking to locate in McMinnville. Perhaps this model can be applied to commercial sites as well.

Process

Retuning to the Jameson Hardware project across the street. That project was driven by the owners' appreciation for what the City had accomplished with the Historic District, the owners' singular affection for the extant Jamison Hardware Building at 608-610 NE Third Street, and a vision for how their investment could raise the bar in McMinnville.

Design Review approval for the Jameson Hardware Building had been granted and significant construction begun before the owners purchased the smaller property at 618.

The proposed addition at 618 was presented to the Historic Landmarks Committee as 4 simultaneous requests:

Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-archplan.com

- 1) A request to change McMinnville's Historic Resources Inventory from classifying the structure at 618 NE Third Avenue as Contributory to classifying the site as Significant.
- 2) A request for a Certificate of Approval for Demolition of the structure at that same address.
- 3) A request for a Certificate of Approval for Construction.
- 4) A request for Design Review approval.

All four were founded on in-depth historical research of the two buildings and a schematic design/cost estimates for the addition at 618.

This all-in-one request was chosen to give the Historic Landmarks Committee the maximum possible assurance that there would be a replacement for the building that would be torn down. It was thought at the time, as it is now, that this was the only fair way to proceed and gave all parties the best shot at success.

Conclusion

The Gwendolyn Hotel is too large and is out of character with McMinnville's Historic District.

Development of the site faces significant environmental, infrastructure, and financial hurdles.

The Proposed project does not recognize or give credibility to the value of the extant historic buildings.

Granting demolition requests at this time could leave the City of McMinnville holding an empty site or an inappropriate design. This would be setback for their past efforts to establish a successful historic district.

McMinnville's Historic District should not fall victim to its own success by approving these demolition requests.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,



Ernie Munch, Architect

Member

MAP Architecture

Ernie Munch • Architecture • Urban Planning, LLC

111 SW Oak Street • Suite 300 • Portland OR 97204

Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-archplan.com



Figure 16: North facades of 618 and 608 3rd Street

"No 3 Main Street" Undated, Thought to be ca 1918-1920

Ernie Munch

(503) 936.1062

Ernie@MAP-archplan.com



Figure 14: Excavation of Taylor Dale Building Foundation, Undated thought to be 1917



Ernie Munch
(503) 936.1062
Ernie@MAP-archplan.com



ROSE OF THIRD STREET LLC



516 NE 3rd Street 503 •
McMinnville, OR 449 •
97128 3767 •

November 30, 2022

To: City of McMinnville Planning Department
attn: Heather Richards, Planning Director
attn: Historical Landmarks Committee

From: Marilyn Kosel, 3rd St. property owner
516 NE 3rd St.

Re: Historic Landmarks Committee public hearing / Gwendolyn Hotel

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for considering the extensive amount of information put before you in regard to the proposed Gwendolyn Hotel. City staff has done an admiral job compiling information, as has the applicant. As a private citizen, I feel at an extreme disadvantage in comparison. I appreciate this small opportunity to be heard.

My husband and I are long-term residents of Yamhill, County with many years spent living in McMinnville. We have restored multiple historic homes and commercial properties. We have always chosen restoration over demolition even when it's the harder or more expensive way. While we understand the potential positive economic impact the proposed hotel may have, we also understand the value and impact our existing downtown and its history has on the community. Once gone, it will not be regained. In my idealistic world, the proposed hotel would be built to scale on a vacant parcel or one with less historic significance. If this demolition and new build are to move forward we hope every possible preservation effort will be made, and proper scale will be considered.

Municipal code 17.03.020 calls for appropriate and orderly physical development. Our Mac Town plan sets forth goals and guidelines for economic development based partially on an increase in hospitality-based business. The proposed hotel is of a scale beyond what either intended as a single structure. Mac Town cites the development of underutilized or vacant parcels. Not demolition of existing historic structures to make way for new ones.

In 17.59.040(3)(a) code states "buildings should have the same massing and a configuration similar to adjacent or nearby historic buildings on the same block"; and 2) "buildings situated at street corners or intersections should be or appear to be, two-story in height." The applicant proposes setbacks and other measures to minimize the impact of the proposed structure. Even with setbacks, the structure will dwarf those around it as can be seen in the applicant's own graphic renditions. The scale of the structure will be visible from a broader range of views than stated.

(continued)



17.65.060(2-6) Outlines how re-developed properties are to maximize retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. And that measures will be taken to preserve historic features and elements. And that a re-constructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving structure(s). I have seen little evidence of the intent to do so in the application.

One property owner has stated restoration of the existing buildings is not feasible. Recent and current restorations of other downtown buildings would indicate otherwise. Several downtown buildings in similar or worse condition are currently or have recently undergone restoration. The owner states the current condition of the building is a serious detriment to restoration. It has been the owner's own choice to defer maintenance to this point. The buildings are not beyond restoration, the owner lacks the desire to do so. In staff findings, the buildings were not considered to be a significant or imminent public safety hazard. And the condition of the building is not a significant determining factor requiring demolition.

Though changing to a "hospitality" use would trigger significant building upgrades, if the County implements a CPACE funding program as mentioned by the applicant, these funds can also be used for seismic and safety upgrades. CPACE funding would make seismic retrofit of the buildings in question and many other buildings downtown more feasible. This is something we are hopeful will happen regardless of this outcome.

The property owner also stated the building(s) did not sell after ample time on the market. The McMinnville downtown market is strong when properties are priced according to CAP rates and condition. The lack of a sale indicates the asking price was higher than these commonly used factors warranted. The lack of a sale should be attributed to the building(s) being overpriced rather than solely on condition. If they had been priced according to standard methods, they would likely have sold quickly, as have multiple other downtown properties.

When reading past HLC decisions the amount of care and detail this committee utilizes in decisions is evident. We hope that you will exhibit the same care and thoroughness in this decision.

With Appreciation,

Marilyn Kosel
516 NE 3rd St.
McMinnville, OR
97128

