

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Butte Silver Bow Council Chambers
5:30 P.M.**

January 11, 2022

Members Present: Steve Hinick, Mitzi Rossillon, Tracy Miller, John Riordan, Jennifer Petersen, and John Weitzel

Excused Absence: Bobbi Stauffer

Staff: Karen Byrnes, Interim HPO

- I. **Call to Order:** The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM
- II. **Roll Call:** One member excused, and a quorum established
- III. **Reading/Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Hinick motioned to approve the minutes for the September 14, 2021, meeting, Ms. Miller seconded the motion. The voice vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Mr. Hinick motioned to approve the minutes for the October 5, 2021 meeting, Mr. Riordan seconded the motion. The voice vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.
- IV. **Public Comment – Items on Agenda:** None
- V. **New/Old Business**
 - a. **Demo Review COA: 57 W. Platinum** – Mr. Hinick spoke how Karen gave the commission the opportunity to visit the site and he didn't make it, but he has driven by it several times. Karen gave the commission a brief overview of the property. Mr. Riordan said he didn't have any questions, but he thinks the people that did the walk through on this property would agree that the demolition is needed to make this property safer. It's a neat old house and I think it will really help that neighborhood with the plans that Keith and his wife have. Mr. Hinick said it's a bit of a worker's cottage. He knows that the previous owner took pride in his wood butchery, and I think that is a up and coming neighborhood. It has a lot of habitats for humanity type homes and people are taking a good look at this area. I don't have any objections to the demo. I just ask that whatever you do on the building that you bring it to the HPC to review. Ms. Rossillon moved that they approve the demo COA as presented for 57 W. Platinum and with any modification to the lot in the place of the two demolished pieces come for design review should that be considered an option by the property owner; Mr. Hinick asked for a second. Mr. Weitzel seconded the

motion. Mr. Keith Brown, the property owner said we are new to town, and we've seen this has been on the market for a while. If you think the outside is quirky you should see the inside. It's a very entertaining house. It's a combination of good carpentry skills and an odd outlook on life. We are going to try to maintain and enhance as much as we can with what's there. Our plan at this point is to look into renting it as an Air B&B with a miner's cabin feel. Mr. Weitzel asked what happened to Mr. Smith the previous owner, did he pass away. Mr. Brown said as far as they know he is in a nursing home, but we are trying to meet him and see what his ongoing vision was. The voice vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Ms. Rossillon needed clarification from Karen and Keith both that there was a request before the URA for some other additional work and I want to find out whether it's something that is going to come before the HPC at a future date or if it is all going to be such things as interior work of which we have no interest. Karen said there is multiple aspects to the application that came before the URA this morning. Most of it is interior work, there is some exterior work that was included. Including the demolition and a new water service line that was placed. Nothing that really rides to the level of HPC review. Mr. Brown said the house needs pretty much everything. We are going to do all new wiring, all new plumbing, new kitchen, new bathroom, new flooring, new lighting. The whole works. Most of it is interior work. The demolition, landscaping, and gutters are the only exterior items. Our plan is to do gutters around the original house in the copper penny. Karen said any additional work that would come like siding or windows I would bring for review.

- b. **Design Review COA: 56 E. Mercury** – Mr. Hinick said as you have seen the demolition has taken place and now, they are planning a façade improvement. I think you've seen it in our packet. Karen gave the commission a brief overview. Kevin Sulsman, the architect is on the phone. Mr. Hinick said its my understanding that the savaged brick would be interspersed with the purchased brick so that it blends properly so you don't have just one section of old and a section of new that the masons would intersperse. I like the idea that the parapet wall having a nice metal cap. Do they have plans for landscaping or something or parking? Karen said she doesn't have the exact answer, but she does know that they have site plans for the yard work, the property around the building. Those site plans are being developed right now. They are working with a few different excavation companies on those and a storm water plan with Butte Silver Bow and an engineering firm so that it's all done correctly. I don't have those plans in front of us yet but when I do, I can bring those back to the commission. Mr. Riordan asked Karen to go back to the first photo that she showed them. He said that he thinks it is done nice but if he remembers correctly, we have one that is going to start construction over by Pork Chop Johns with a similar look. He said it all looks great, but he thinks it needs a little something, maybe some older lights, maybe something over the doors. Karen said she will pass that on and there will be a lot of opportunity to add. I think

that they wanted to get this in front of the commission and get numbers to the cost of doing this. They wanted approval on this stage so they could put numbers to it so that they could start costing it out and look at funding sources. Kevin spoke to the commission to explain the placements of the windows and doors. Ms. Rossillon said I'm coming to this to the point of which I want this to be something that looks, even though we are transforming a building that the north wall was never exposed because it was added later that would be appropriate for, the type of repair shop that it was. I'm going to comment on the materials and the things that I think should be preserved and finally I will have questions about some of the materials, the specific items that are going to be used, and the fact that I don't think they weren't specked out from the quote from Triple S that we received and so there is some ambiguity in my mind about what's appropriate or what material is actually going to be used. I will start on the north wall because that's an interest to the commission. The windows in the wall that is set back are too small. What is trying to be presented is something that would look appropriate as a historic building that was an auto repair and if not that's what should be the guiding principle. These windows are 3x4 and at a minimum. I think they should be the 58x62 window which is the largest window in the west wall. I get that determination in my mind from looking at the wheel alignment building, and it has windows that fill the space and are of historic scale appearance and that is what I would like to see in this building. The architect gave feedback, we had considered larger windows however if you look at the west elevation you can see that the head height of the north most wall is significantly higher than the windows on the west side, that is because there is a significant drop in grade and the ceiling elevation also follows that same line so the head height of the windows on the back north wall are essentially maxed out at being very close to the ceiling elevation on the interior of the building. The reason it looks small is due to scale because the roof slopes from the front to the back. If those windows were to be enlarged, they would then go up into the attic space not in the open auto shop space. Karen said that is one of the points that they clarified on our review of the project. Karen said they would basically be false windows if they were to enlarge them. Ms. Rossillon said she gets that, however on the west elevation there is a window that is set down lower in the wall it appears to me. Can you explain, as a matter of fact when you look at the existing it looks like it is down two feet essentially in the interior floor. So, are you telling us that sort of window could not be put in because of the distance from the floor or what is the explanation about that? Kevin said you're asking about lowering the window. He said lowering the window they become more susceptible to damage. Hr. Hinick asked, the door on the north side in the setback wall, is the head height 7 foot 4? There was some discussion on the door and windows. Ms. Rossillon said in addition I believe that the brick lintel that is on the three windows on the north side on the setback wall is unlike anything else that is there. I don't think it is appropriate, as a matter of fact if were talking about making something look bigger without it actually being a larger window,

and I still would be interested in considering that further, but it seems that some metal surround would be able to address that issue. The window wouldn't have to be brought down, it would have a metal surround so it appeared that the window was larger, and it wouldn't have a lintel that is inconsistent with every other façade that is on that particular drawing that you provided for us. Aside from that I'm talking about the person door that is in the bump out on the north side that is between the window and garage. Is that a full length 7-foot window, is there a transom? I don't know what's there until I know it's there so I can't say whether or not that is something that I would support. To me it is going to be a tall window and have a window transom in the top of it at a minimum. Kevin said the window and door head opening was what was existing there. Mitzi said is there going to be a man door with a transom? Because there is no drawing, and I can't see the detail of it, so I just want clarification that there's going to be a transom. Kevin said yes, a transom could be incorporated there, right now it's just boarded in. Karen wanted to clarify from the drawing if that was specked as a metal man door with a transom or just a tall window? It's just hard to tell. Kevin said that was the intent was a metal door with transom. Ms. Rossillon said if there is some consideration of some black metal surrounds on the windows to make them bigger that the similar thing be done with the doorway because it's naked there. I have many concerns about the rear. This isn't the rear of the building; it is the rear but to people in the community this is readily available from the street and so we are looking at a façade that is high visibility and we have expectations about high visibility on a rear façade or at least I do. So that is a couple things, I'm not convinced that removal of all the window openings is something that is desirable and for example I can't tell from the scale but the 2 or 3 that are on the east side I would like to see large windows such as the 58x62. I would like to see them at that location to preserve some of the original design elements. If in fact these large garage doors are to be put forward. I don't see any specked top windows for those garage doors. Are there going to be top windows? Also, about the pictures and what is specked out I don't know what to think. Kevin said it was agreed to put windows in the garage door top panel. Ms. Rossillon said to clarify then are there going to be like windows in the garage door on the north wall. Karen said I don't think they are planned for the north wall, but she does think they should match. Mr. Hinick asked if there were existing windows in the door now? Kevin said no and Mr. Hinick said then why do we want them and asked Mitzi why she wanted them. He said why do we want windows; it has no bearing on the historic quality of a second façade of the south and trying to make them be the same on the north, I don't know why we would do that and secondly this is a warehouse now. It is no longer a crib; the historic value has been destroyed in my opinion. I think the effort that they are trying to do is use materials that are compatible with the uptown area. Now if they didn't want to get any URA funding they could probably put metal siding on the whole thing but at this point I really think they made a pretty good effort to try to make this thing a little better. Trying to redesign this thing via committee is

something that is somewhat difficult, and I appreciate your comments. The windows in the front, the primary façade now. They are hap hazard put there with no real reason. I don't see a real reasoning in that. It's not like there planking a door or making it look like a store front. It looks like a back of a warehouse, so I do agree with you on that but trying to pick a part a garage door that is going to be for a warehouse I don't know if that is a concern of ours. Mr. Riordan said I somewhat agree with you. It is going to be a warehouse and if you go along the back of the current business now where they are expanding, naturally a lot will be inside, but a lot will be outside and its going to be stacked between the garage door and the end. As far as having the large window in the rear that's a crime waiting to happen, that part of town hasn't been secure for a while. I admire Mitzi for following specks, but I have to agree with Steve that when the building was demolished that we lost the historical value that we had on Mercury Steet. These people are making an effort to come in and somewhat comply to match and get the job done with decent materials is something that we really need to look at and I think that there were somethings discussed that we really do not have any say in. Mr. Hinich said just to echo what Mitzi was getting at with those windows on the front. If indeed you had something above those doors to tie those windows together in a meaningful way, I think it would improve it. Ms. Rossillon said I know this isn't right, I will know it when I see it. I would like to respond to those comments, and I don't any problem. I wanted to go step by step of all the things I disagreed because I wanted to say the current configuration, I cannot support this particular design and I wanted you to know what my thought process regarding that and if you can approve it, that's why we are a committee. I'd just like to say two more things about the rear wall that have nothing to do with the garage doors. 1 is there is a ghost sign there and a ghost sign should be preserved. 2 I don't like the substitution of the metal on the back. With that said, the ghost sign I feel very strongly about. Staack's has already demonstrated in the building they had years ago came before the HPC that they considered and preserved the ghost sign that was up on their original building, and I think that we should expect no less here. Mr. Weitzel said he was looking at the front of the building and he said in his occupation that could be very easily remedied with signage or awnings. The windows being as narrow as they are I believe they could be wider not taller, probably 6 foot wide with a nice metal canopy or fabric awning. Start at the top of the window and go up and that would enlarge the window it's self and the appearance. The other thing to think about this time of year, that is the north side of the building and that never gets any sunshine during the winter. That's where all the snow and hazard build up. If that door is the entrance door for customers, then I think that would be a good spot for an awning to cover the sidewalks. That front façade could be very easily remedied with awnings and some classy signage and the same with the back. Mr. Hinick asked how the client feels about that suggestion as far as trying to enhance that north facade and accentuate the entrance way with either a covered awning or some treatment with the windows to make it a little more

appealing. Karen said she thinks that they would be open to that and those are good suggestions. I think they would be welcomed, and they are practical. It's something we will bring back to the owners. Ms. Rossillon said she would like to make a motion but doesn't know how they are going to proceed from here and asked Karen maybe you can give us some guidance. I feel that there are somethings that have been mentioned by some commissioners, myself included and Jennifer shook her head about the ghost signs so that didn't get in the record. I don't know where we go now, whether or not we say we're going to differ a vote until the client has had an opportunity to consider all those things or whether or not they want a vote on the plans as they have been produced and presented to us here. So, I'd like some clarification from staff. Karen said I don't believe I can give you clarification at this point given that I don't know what you've agreed upon to suggest back to the client. I think I need clarification from this body as to what you are going to require them to do or ask them to do as part of the design review process and then I could bring that back to them. If this bodies concurrence is that the windows be reconfigured on the front of the building, that awnings are added, that lightening is possibly added, and that the rear wall ghost sign is saved then I would have to bring that back to them for further design. I need to know what the motion is from this body before I can answer the question. Mr. Hinick moved that we approve the design with the following previsions. We would appreciate and expect that the ghost sign on the south façade be preserved. We would also suggest a more enhanced entryway on the north façade. The brick and trim are acceptable. Those are the two provisions I would ask that the owner comply with for approval. Mr. Hinick asked for a second. Mr. Riordan seconded the motion. Kevin asked for clarification on the stand-alone door. Hr. Hinick said yes that doorway, at least at that one maybe a lower seal height on that window to make it look like as what Mitzi was referring to as an indication as a possible retail or repair shop business. The rest I think are fine. So, I amend that motion to include an enhancement to the window adjacent to the new man door on the north set back wall. Mr. Riordan seconded the motion. The voice vote in favor of the motion was 5 members, one member opposed. Mr. Hinick asked Karen to ask the owner to come back with a sketch on how they want to enhance that doorway and I would like that attentively brought before us either formally or informally at our next meeting but the rest of it seems like a go.

- VI. Staff/Member Reports:** Karen said they have received a total of 17 applications for the HPO position. We are interviewing 6 applicants this week and John Riordan is sitting in on that committee with us. Once we are able to determine our finalists out of that 6, we will then ask them to complete an exercise we asked folks to complete when we searched for Mary when she was hired into her potion. We will ask them to do some hands-on work for us to get their good understanding of the job and go from there. Hopefully out of these 6 we get a few that we feel rise to the level to be finalist and go onto a second round of interviews. The position is still open and accepting applications

so on Thursday we may get some additional applications for consideration. We are not rushing this; we want to make sure we get someone in that fits the bill. I'm hopeful.

VII. Announcements: None

VIII. Public Comment – Items not on the agenda: None

IX. Adjournment: Mr. Hinick adjourned the meeting.