

MINUTES

December 21, 2023
Historic Landmarks Committee
Regular Meeting

3:00 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Mary Beth Branch, Eve Dewan, Mark Cooley, Christopher Knapp, and John Mead

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Community Development Director and Adam Tate – Associate Planner

Others Present: Chris Chenoweth – City Councilor

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Action Items

- Certificate of Approval for Alteration: 806 SE Hembree St

Disclosures: Chair Mead opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if any Committee member wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. He asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to hear this matter. There was none.

Staff Presentation: Associate Planner Tate said this was a certificate of approval for alterations at 806 SE Hembree St. He discussed the subject site, project summary to weatherize the home, photos of the current house, proposed site plan, applicable review criteria, public agency comments, and conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

There was discussion regarding SHPO approval of the project and how that informed the HLC's decision. It was clarified the HLC could render a different decision as it was a review of the City's criteria.

Michael Figueredo, representing OHCS, was the technical lead for the weatherization assistance program for the state of Oregon. They had a programmatic agreement with SHPO to review historic buildings to make sure they met the requirements of SHPO. SHPO had reviewed the application according to the Department of the Interior's standards and said it met the requirements. He explained their whole house approach to weatherization and how they evaluated the whole house as a system that did a lot toward the building's durability. A choice to say yes to weatherization was a choice to say yes to preserving the building. He confirmed that unless they heard a no from SHPO, after 30 days it was an automatic yes. Most of the work was out of the public right-of-way and he thought that attributed to their approval.

There was discussion regarding the proposed conditions of approval, how the east façade window even though not on a primary street could be seen from the public right-of-way, specs for the sliding door, and how the applicant proposed to use the Cascade window series for replacement windows.

Applicant's Testimony: Kraig Ludwig, Energy Services Director at YCAP, the proposal included replacing the wood windows with vinyl windows. The estimate they had for the cost for the project was \$32,000. However, the price was outdated and they would have to reach out to the contractor to review any potential increase. They proposed to replace the existing sliding aluminum door with an energy efficient vinyl door. It was not just the preservation of the property for them, but also a focus on the energy savings and health and safety measures. The work would include attic insulation, wiring assessment, exterior wall installation, replacement of windows and patio door, installation of a ductless heat pump, minor plumbing repairs, and other minor improvements. They wanted to assist the occupants in energy consumption to reduce utility bills. They would like to start the project as soon as possible. They had limited funding resources to add anything to the project.

Committee Member Branch asked what was included in the application submitted to SHPO, especially regarding the wood windows being replaced with vinyl.

Mr. Ludwig said it did reference the aluminum windows would be replaced with white vinyl. There were a few wood windows that would be replaced as well.

Committee Member Dewan clarified the house was not listed on the national register, but it was on the local historic register.

Committee Member Branch asked about the method of replacement for the windows and door including the exterior trim. Mr. Ludwig said they tried to put the materials back on the house after replacement as is unless they were broken and then they would be replaced with the same kind of materials.

Committee Member Branch asked if the windows would have a grid or be clear. Mr. Ludwig thought the two awning windows would have grids. If there were additional requirements outside the scope of the program, they would remove that portion from the project.

Chair Mead said the north facing aluminum window had no crown molding and cap over it. Was it possible to add the molding when the new window was installed? Mr. Ludwig thought it was something they could see if they could do.

Chair Mead asked if the exterior siding would be drilled and plugged. Mr. Ludwig said the plan was to remove the siding to drill and fill and then replace the siding right back.

Chair Mead asked about the options for the heat pump. Mr. Ludwig said all three were possible for the Committee to choose from.

There was no public testimony.

Chair Mead closed the public hearing.

There was discussion regarding the HVAC system options. The Committee was comfortable with the installation approach. Committee Member Branch suggested adding a condition that any siding needing to be replaced would match the profile of the existing siding.

There was discussion regarding the windows. For the north façade windows, they discussed identifying what the materials were, how the windows had to be replaced with like material instead of restoring to the original wood windows, guidelines for rehabilitation for missing historic features, regulatory authority of what they could require based on the proposal, and not requiring the applicant to go above and beyond what was proposed.

There was consensus to accept the vinyl replacements on windows 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and slider door 5, because they were aluminum currently. It was suggested to add a condition that the new vinyl windows would have no grids because the existing windows did not.

There was discussion regarding the wood windows, 6, 16, and 17. There was consensus to deny replacement of these windows and to recommend interior storm windows to be used or repairing the existing wood windows.

It was suggested to add a condition for the applicant to take photographs before the work commenced.

The conditions to add would be: the siding that was pulled off for drilling would be replaced and any new material would match the profile and material of the removed siding, the white vinyl replacement windows would match the fenestration pattern of the existing windows with regard to grids, the exterior trim of the new windows would match the wood trim on the existing wood windows, and the applicant would provide exterior photographs of the project prior to beginning any work. The economic conditions criterion was not in play, but local criteria 17.65.060 subsections b and e was being used to deny replacement of the wood windows.

Committee Member Branch moved to approve HL 5-23 except for the replacement of the existing wood windows labeled as Windows #6, #16, and #17. The rest of the windows would be replaced with vinyl units with staff conditions and new conditions as stated above. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Dewan and passed 5-0.

5. Old/New Business

None

6. Committee Member Comments

Chair Mead said this was Committee Member Dewan's last meeting as she was moving to Ohio.

7. Staff Comments

Community Development Director Richards discussed staff recruitment. They were working on scheduling training for the committee.

Chair Mead said they had interviewed for Committee Member Dewan's replacement and the person would start in January. Committee Members Knapp and Branch had reapplied to serve on the committee.

8. Adjournment

Chair Mead adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m.