

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

June 14, 2022

Members Present: Steve Hinick, Mitzi Rossillon, Tracy Miller, Bobbi Stauffer, John Riordon, and John Weitzel

Excused Absence: Jennifer Petersen

Staff: Kate McCourt, HPO

- i. **Call to Order:** The Historic Preservation Commission Meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM
- ii. **Roll Call:** One member absent, and a quorum established.
- iii. **Reading/Approval of Minutes:** Steve Hinick motioned to approve the minutes for the May 3, 2022, meeting of the HPC; Mr. Riordon seconded the motion. The voice vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.
- iv. **Public Comment – Items on Agenda:** None

Basin Creek Caretakers House Project Update:

Ms. McCourt gave the commission dates.

- BSB only received one bid, John Snider, Ltd. will be remodeling the exterior of the Caretaker's House.
- Awaiting a second bid with the correct number of windows.
- Ms. McCourt is turning in the Quarterly Report to SHPO tomorrow (June 15th).
- Ms. McCourt is still pending work on the Nation Register nomination.

v. Staff/Member Report:

- Ms. McCourt first thanked the HPC for pushing the meeting back one week due to her busy previous month thanks to a cultural survey she wrote to assist BSB for a potential Federal grant.
- Silver Lake Walter System Cultural Resource Survey was turned in successfully; it looks like the next step will be a Memorandum of Agreement between SHPO, BSB and EDA should the grant come through.

- Ms. McCourt was asked to represent BSB on the Mother Lode board by the Chief Executive.
- 210 S. Jackson St (previously given as COA in the packets as a design review) will no longer be on agenda this evening, as the project is pulled this month for URA funding.

vi. Presentation: Sam Atkins, Foothold: Sam Atkins, President of Foothold gave a presentation about his company that is based here in Butte at the Industrial Park. They build small affordable sustainable homes for SW Montana. Foothold was tasked with building a home for vacant lot on the corner of Jackson and Platinum Streets in Butte. The home was to be the “Tamarack” model, the largest that they provide, 1000 Sq Ft. The owner of the lot was hoping to create affordable, long- term housing for visiting professionals in a central location in proximity to the hospital and other central work places.

Mr. Atkins showed photos of his shop and the process in which his houses are built indoors, while describing the features that the homes contain, including appliances and energy efficiency. He then showed the site plan, set back from the streets. He showed the elevation images and specs for materials for the two bed, two bath, two car garage house. He closed with explaining that the house would, while perhaps not meshing with the styles that span the district, be cost effective and high quality in materials. Mr. Atkins explained why the roof pitch cannot be steeper (due to shipping as one module) but why that might be an issue.

Mr. Hinick asked about specifications of roof pitch. He then spoke to the group about the history of the shed roof, explaining that the period of the shed roof started in the 1960s, in California. “Bold diagonals, with a counterpoint.” Mr. Hinick stated that it is a bold look for the uptown.

Mr. Riordon said that he was impressed with the product. “You can tell that it is a quality product” and said that he felt Butte could be getting ahead of places like Bozeman that don’t have any affordable housing, he wished Mr. Atkins success.

Mrs. Miller asked about what it “turns into for a purchase price” for affordable housing. Mr. Atkins answered that the owner is paying \$200,000 for the house because of the way the market is now going, but that affordability is a tricky conversation, as it is all relative to the buyer. He said that his goal is to build houses that his staff can afford to buy for themselves. Mrs. Miller stated that the average price today is \$275k so that he was well within range and the project was well overdue, and ahead of its time as well. She asked what siding would be used, to which Mr. Atkins answered LP Smart siding, smooth in texture, white in color from a local source.

Mr. Weitzel asked about the second story “pop-out”, would it not trap ice and snow, weather -why not just make a second floor? Mr. Atkins said that he was thinking in terms of the limitations of his factory and making the building in three modules was the best was to do it, and by using the best materials, the houses are built to last. Mr. Weitzel then asked about ADA compliance- to which the answer was that a single-family residence does not trigger ADA compliance.

vii. **New/Old Business:**

- **Design Review COA: INFILL: Foothold's "Tamarack"- design home on Platinum & Jackson St-** Ms. McCourt reintroduced the project, giving it support. She said that the company is inspiring and much needed in Montana. She spoke to Mr. Atkins about the shed roofline and told him without doubt that it would likely be a problem. They spoke about an alternative roofline- a small gable, which is slightly preferable, as an alternative. She showed the elevations, spoke about how the materials are sound; real wood, LP smart siding- Foothold will work with HPC on materials. Lastly, the eclectic nature of the neighborhood and the fact the house would face the side street rather than main thoroughfare, warranted the HPO's recommendation of approval.

Mrs. Rossillion said that did not believe that the building was compatible enough for the historic district. She mentioned a new Habitat for Humanity building that was previously approved in the same neighborhood. She mentioned double-hung windows, the absence of metal brackets, and a full front porch might make the house more palatable but would still not make it appropriate to be within the district, and that she cannot support the project.

Mrs. Miller asked about the neighborhood, whether the buildings around the vacant are new construction or remodeled. Several have been remodeled. Mr. Hinich asked about the exposed concrete on the foundation and if there was a sand finish or scratch coat planned (answer inaudible). Mrs. Rossillon clarifies to the audience that the homeowner can build this home is they want without public funds- the only reason it is coming before HPC is because they are asking for public incentive monetary assistance. Mr. Weitzel asked about the factory-built porch- do they do anything after, accessory-wise, to make it look nicer? Mr. Atkins said there is a little bit of work that happens after the homes are set in place and explains the process- but not in the sense that Mr. Weitzel means. He said he could take it to the owner to see if she would revise or add additional details to her plan.

Mrs. Rossillion moved the request be denied. Mrs. Stauffer seconds. Motion passes, four-two.

- **Design Review COA: 101 W. Quartz St.-** Ms. McCourt gave some background on the North O'Rourke Annex building, the older of the two O'Rourke's which Butte is lucky to have remaining. They are replacing all windows with Anderson 100 windows and restoring the wood of the bays- washing, sanding, filling, repairing, and replacing in-kind where needed, and painting. They will be rehabilitating and painting all the character-defining metal accents on the building façade, such as the lion's head and canopy over the entrance and replacing the front door. Ronnie Estes, partner/owner of the building, represented Black Diamond Investment Group and spoke to the work they are doing and addressed questions from the Commission.

Mr. Hinick asked to clarify that the Anderson 100 window frames came in black, which was confirmed. They are leaving the original wood trim and stops from the original windows. Mr. Estes clarified that the plan was to paint the panels beneath the windows copper in color but was working on getting an estimate for actual sheet metal copper inserts.

Mrs. Rossillion asked about the windows that were provided in the packet- were they fixed windows? Mr. Estes clarified that they are double hung, to which she then asked about the multi-light panes and transoms in the original windows. Mr. Estes explained that he will not be returning all the windows to their original configuration, it is not feasible at this time for several reasons and while that is always preferred, Mrs. Rossillion made mention that she does love the project and, in this case, will not vote against it.

Mrs. Stauffer asked if the copper panels would look as bright as they do in the rendering, and Mr. Estes confirmed that this is just the way the artist created the sun placement in the rendering and it will look elegant.

Mr. Riordon commended Mr. Estes on the undertaking. Mr. Riordon made a motion to accept the COA for 101 W. Quartz St, Mrs. Miller seconded it. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Design Review COA: 615 S. Wyoming St.**— Ms. McCourt spoke about the background of the building- the Commission had already reviewed the project with a few changes, and a COA had previously been prepared. Keegan Hall attended the meeting to represent Fort & Home. They are replacing more windows than they previously intended- 17 in total- with Anderson 100 windows. They will repair all damaged fascia and soffits, repair and replace (where needed) all trim. One over one sash windows will replace the fixed double glazed picture window, per Mr. Hall. They will keep original window trim. They will replace exterior doors with fiberglass doors. They will also re-create doors from both windows on either side of front elevation that had previously been doors but had been filled in with brick to create windows.

Mrs. Rossillion asked for clarification about “diamond coat” siding- is it smooth siding or wood textured, because the Commission always specifies their preference for smooth finish siding. Mr. Hall stated that it might have a slight texture to it, but it does not have fake wood texture. She then for exposure, and Mr. Hall said there would be six inches of exposure. Mrs. Rossillion closed by saying that a Craftsman-style door would not be appropriate for a building of this style and age and gave a few specifications of doors that she thought would look better for the building.

Mrs. Miller brought up a concern: the house was listed on the market on this day at 275k after being listed at 100k less than a year ago. URA funds are being advertised as being part of the sale price. She asked Mr. Hall to speak about this. Mr. Hall said that they plan to keep working on it and keep increasing the price of it as they do. They just put a new roof on the building. Any new owner would continue the development plan with those URA funds. Mrs. Miller said that if funds are requested then a project is abandoned, it should be the new owner that asks for the funds, not

the previous one. Mr. Hall said that most of the work would be completed before a sale.

Mr. Riordon concurred with Mrs. Miller's concern about the idea of a building being for sale before public URA funds are even expended. He asked to make a motion to hold the project until we can research the situation of the property being put up for sale before granting funds. Mr. Hinick said that HPC is not here to grant funds but to determine the appropriateness of the project with the funds. Still the motion was put forth to put the project in abeyance by Mr. Riordon and seconded by Mrs. Miller.

Mrs. Rossillion commented that HPC approved the project in totality, so if another buyer comes in and decides not to complete the project (and leave the vinyl windows in for example), and "we are not supposed to insert ourselves in real estate transactions, but we can have concerns about whether a project will be finished."

Mrs. Miller concurred- making sure the funds go into the projects.

Mr. Hall interjected that the purpose of tax increment funding is to incentivize development in the opportunity zone, projects are approved for a specific scope, and then funds are issued on a reimbursement basis. Therefore, if the building is sold, if the work is not completed as proposed, the new owners will not get the funds.

Mrs. Rossillion called Mr. Estes back to the podium and asked him if the work had to be *completed* before he received a check from URA. In his previous experience, it was not; they submit invoices, URA paid them. Mr. Riordon asked for his motion to be withdrawn.

Mr. Weitzel spoke about his experience with making signs and the URA: the person pays him in full, he gives them an invoice, they go to URA, they get paid, he makes the sign.

Mr. Hinick commented on that the roof reminded him of a mansard roof. Mr. Hinick moved to approve the COA as submitted, Mrs. Stauffer seconded. There were five in favor, and one dissent. Motion carried.

- **Design Review COA: 635 S. Idaho St.-** Ms. McCourt described the project at 635 S. Idaho S. It is a 2-story walk-up built in 1901 of brick construction with a stone foundation. It is a masonry repair project mostly on the south side and southeast corner of the building (as the photos in the COA show). There are structural issues in the corner with brick and slab missing entirely beneath the threshold. Enclosed in the COA is a quote from Bishop Stoneworks for demo, joint grinding, custom mortar mixing and repointing work.

Mrs. Rossillion said that she is not familiar with the contractor but looked up their work on Facebook and saw few brick projects but nice CMU and stonework, and that it was good to have another masonry outfit in town. Mrs. Rossillion wanted to confirm that the custom mortar would be lime-based and of matching color, in a workmanship-like manner. Mr. Hall said that he spoke with the contractor about doing the project to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He did mention that the bottom front corner will be covered by the deck when it is replaced, so that the

contractor might use a different mortar because it is carrying a lot of weight. But on the other areas, especially exposed areas, lime-based mortar will be used. Mrs. Rossillion made a motion to accept the COA with the following conditions:

- Contractor will use a lime-based mortar of the same color and that the brick be the classic “soft Butte brick” and the work is done in a workmanship-like manner- meaning no mortar on brick faces.

Mr. Hinich seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Design Review COA: 327 S. Excelsior Ave – Mural Project** – This project is located on a blank wall on the backside of the currently vacant pharmacy building at 327 S. Excelsior Ave. Ms. McCourt explained that the building is not historic, but the funds came from a SARTA grant that was previously administered, and so the HPC was to review to make sure that the mural guidelines previously set in place were being followed. Ms. McCourt said that she believed that they were. The mural can be seen when heading east on Diamond St towards Excelsior Ave.

B.T. Livermore was there to represent the project. The artist, April Worley, is from Missoula.

Mr. Hinick asked Mrs. Stauffer, being a SARTA Board Member, about the project but she said that the project came through before her tenure on the board.

Mrs. Rossillion asked Mr. Weitzel about the quality of Benjamin Moore’s Regal Exterior paint, and he said that it was a good quality paint and would not fade for a while. Mr. Riordon asked about a theme. Mr. Livermore said that the artist was given the topic of water. He is also doing a mural in the parking garage and another at 109 N Montana in the alley.

Mr Weitzel commented that Mr. Livermore is a talented artist.

Mr. Hinick moved to approve the COA for the mural, Mrs. Rossillion seconded.

Motion passed.

Mrs. Stauffer asked about the status of a committee that was to review designs of murals. Mrs. Rossillion said that it was part of the Uptown Master Plan project and that when it is formed it will have a member of the HPC in it.

viii. Announcements: Mrs. Rossillion reminded the group about the Dust to Dazzle event happening this coming weekend.

Mr. Riordon Thanked the HPO for the work that she has done in her short tenure.

ix. Public Comment – Items Not on the Agenda: None

x. Adjournment: Mr. Hinick adjourned the meeting. 6:38 PM.