

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, Douglas Stephens

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett who was excused. Lola Beatlebrox arrived later in the meeting.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

November 2, 2016

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the minutes of November 2, 2016 as written. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Beatlebrox was not present for the vote.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Bruce Erickson stated that the next Historic Preservation Board meeting was scheduled for February 1, 2017. The January meeting was cancelled due to Sundance and other matters.

Director Erickson reported that the Planning Department had received an application to fill the vacancy on the Historic Preservation Board. The candidate was recommended by the Museum and would be interviewed.

Assistant City Attorney McLean realized that the HPB had not had their Annual Open Public Meeting Act Training for the year. However, because she only realized it today, she was unable to meet the 24 hour noticing requirement to put it on the agenda for this meeting. The Board could anticipate the training on February 1, 2017. She would email the Board members a summary of the rules so there would be some communication in 2016 on the Open Public Meeting Act.

Ms. McLean pointed out that the majority of Board Members have had the training in the past.

Chair White stated that for personal reasons, he would like the Board to consider choosing another Board Member to replace him as the Chair. Ms. McLean stated that it would have to be an agenda item in order for the Board to vote. The Staff would put it on the February agenda.

Planner Grahn noted that today was National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day and it was important to remember the built history from that era. She noted that Salina, Utah had recently opened a new museum about a former CCC Camp and German POW Camp. There was also a documentary about it on KPCW that evening.

Planner Grahn remarked that the Topaz Internment Camp was also in Utah, and there is a museum about it in Delta.

Planner Grahn reported that the Historic Preservation Awarded was being presented next Thursday, jointly with City Council. The painting by Cara Jean Means depicting 562 Main Street would be unveiled. Planner Grahn noted that the plaques they discussed were not done, but they would be delivered in May during the larger National Historic Preservation Month celebration. She encouraged the Board members to attend the presentation next Thursday.

CONTINUATIONS (Public Hearing and Continue to Date Specified.)

1. 336 Daly Avenue – Relocation – Significant Garage and Chicken Coop. The applicant is proposing to relocate the existing historic garage and chicken coop to the south side of the property.

Chair White opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair White closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Stephens moved to CONTINUE 336 Daly Avenue to February 1, 2017. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

NOTE: The public hearing on 336 Daly Avenue was re-opened at the end of the agenda to hear public input from a member of the public who had missed the public hearing.

Regular Agenda – Discussion and Possible Action

1. 664 Woodside Avenue – Historic District Design Review – Material Deconstruction of non-historic stacked stone retaining walls, 2009 wooden staircase, 2009 standing seam metal roof, c.1900 extant chimneys on the east and west sides of the house; c.1940 Bricktex siding; c.1900 stacked stone and c.1920 concrete block foundation; c.1950 porch railings; seven (7) historic doors; c.1920 wood windows; and foundation of garage.
(Application PL-16-03330)

Planner Grahn stated that this property is unique because it was previously owned by the City and a historic preservation façade easement was recorded on the property. In addition to the HPB review, this application would also be reviewed with the City Council to make sure it meets the intent of the preservation easement. The application was currently under a Historic District Design Review. Planner Grahn noted that the City Council approved the plat amendment for this application last week; however, the plat had not yet been recorded. Recording the plat will be a condition prior to obtaining a building permit.

Planner Grahn reported that the house was built in 1885 and was occupied by a family with 12 children. By 1900 a wing was added to the house to make an L-shape design, which was common at the turn of the century. As tastes changed and families grew, many times a wing would be added to the house and it would change from being a hall-parlor into a T-shaped cottage. Planner Grahn stated that the house shape primarily remained throughout the years, but originally there was a building that consumed the entire side of this house, as well as the neighbor behind it. She pointed out differences in foundation that the Staff believes substantiates that determination. Planner Grahn was unsure if the foundation was added or just replaced. She stated that the wrap-around porch was introduced before 1929. By that time the original building had been replaced by the house that exists today, and the National Garage known as High West. Planner Grahn presented a photo from 1941 showing that the house had remained the same.

Planner Grahn presented a site plan. She noted that the highlights in red were existing concrete and stone retaining walls, a pair of stairs that the City installed in 2009, and other non-historic improvements that the applicant was proposing to remove and rebuild. Planner Grahn indicated areas on City property that would be regraded and repaired as development of the house occurs. The existing standing seam metal roof will be replaced with architectural asphalt shingles. Two new dormers will be added on the back of the building and below the ridge of the roof. The dormers are fairly small and in scale with the small house.

Planner Grahn pointed to two chimneys on the house. The Staff found that the first chimney was more of a primary chimney that was decorative and was

intended to be seen on the east-west cross wing of the house. The second chimney is behind the eave on the back of the house. The applicant was proposing to reconstruct the first chimney. The second chimney would be demolished. Any salvageable material will be used to rebuild the first chimney.

Planner Grahn remarked that the exterior walls are currently clad in an asbestos Bricktex, which was probably installed in the 1940s. Historic siding can be seen underneath. The applicant had not yet done an exploratory demolition on this house. Therefore, a lot of what they know is based on assumption and what they see in other houses. The Staff will assess the condition of the wood siding once the Bricktex has been removed. For that reason, a condition of approval was added stating that the Historic Preservation Planner will make sure the severity of deterioration justifies replacing any of the material in kind.

Planner Grahn presented a picture showing the size of the transitional element that would be added to the north side of the house. It is beyond the mid-point and close to the back of the house. Planner Grahn stated that the foundation is partially stone and partially wood and concrete block. The Staff would work with the applicant in an effort to salvage some of the stone and reuse is on the foundation to keep its current character.

Planner Grahn commented on the wrap-around porch and, noted that the applicant proposes to brace the porch to lift it up. However, the porch floor has been modified over the years. Part of it is concrete because it sits directly on the ground. As it goes above grade, it turns into wood decking. The applicant was proposing to replace the wood decking. Planner Grahn was unsure whether the posts are historic, but the railing is definitely not historic. The applicant was proposing to restore the porch to a more traditional appearance, similar to what is seen in Old Town.

Planner Grahn noted that there are four historic doors on the building; two of which are on the front, with very ornate screen doors. The applicant would like to replace all of the doors on the site. The Staff thought two of the four doors could be restored and kept in place. However, they were asking the HPB to make that decision. The other two doors are in the back of the house and are not visible. Changing or modifying those doors would have minimal impact on the historic character of the site. The Staff was requesting that the HPB also discuss that issue.

Planner Grahn stated that the windows on this house were modified, but she was unsure when they were modified. Originally, the house would not have had the Chicago-style windows that exist. However, because the interior walls and siding have not been removed, it was difficult to say what ghost lines they will find. A condition of approval was added indicating that once the Staff determines how this house is put together, they will look at the windows and take measurements

from those ghost lines to determine what the original configuration was on the façade and the sides visible from Woodside Avenue. Planner Grahn noted that the red color indicated the windows that were proposed to be replaced. The blue color represented new window openings.

Planner Grahn pointed to the historic garage on the very southernmost part of the property. It is actually half into the neighbor's property. The structure is a simple wood frame garage. The applicant was proposing to clean up the garage, put a foundation underneath it, add a service door on the back, add windows, and replace the existing window. The Staff felt the proposed changes were appropriate because it would not destroy the architectural features or the historic character of the garage.

Board Member Hodgkins asked Planner Grahn to point out the garage on the site plan. Planner Grahn indicated the garage location and noted that it was partially on the 664 Woodside property, partially on the neighboring property, and partially on City property.

Board Member Stephens asked if the garage would be moved. Planner Grahn replied that it would remain in its current location. As part of the plat amendment process, the Staff asked the applicant to provide an encroachment agreement for the garage with both the City and the neighbor to the south.

Planner Grahn reviewed the doors again and requested input from the Board. She thought the front and side doors were either original to the building, or fit with the period of the building. Because the doors appear to be historic, Planner Grahn thought they should make an effort to preserve and maintain them. The kitchen door and the doors on the backside of the house are less visible and do not play as much into the historic character of the building. Planner Grahn noted that the applicant would like to replace all the doors for energy efficiency; however, the Staff encourages keeping the two she mentioned.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, stated that the door on the front is quite frail and thin, and it has a single-pane glass panel. It is the only one of the three doors that would be operable, and he felt it was important to make it as good as possible moving forward. Mr. DeGray explained that the other two doors will be faux panels, so the doors could be reused and integrated into the siding to appear as they exist today. Mr. DeGray stated that if the Board prefers to save the door, he was willing to make that effort to help move things along. He suggested a condition of approval where Planner Grahn would relook at the door and he could propose a method of preservation.

Chair White referred to the door shown on the lower right-hand elevation, and asked if it was an existing door, and whether it was similar to the front door. Mr. DeGray replied that it was similar in size and design, but it would be a faux

door. Chair White clarified that the only operable door would be the front door. Mr. DeGray answered yes. Board Member Beatlebrox asked about the condition of the door that will be a faux door. Mr. DeGray stated that it appears to be the one that was used the most to enter the house. He recalled that it was in fairly good condition.

Director Erickson asked if the doors could be switched. Planner Grahn thought they could be switched if it that would help. Mr. DeGray suggested that Planner Grahn visit the site again to look at all of the doors and determine which ones should be kept and which ones could be moved around. He noted that all the doors were decorative, and were the same four-panel with the two top lights.

Board Member Stephens asked if the operable door would be the main entrance to the home. Mr. DeGray stated that it was actually the master bedroom. Mr. Stephens agreed with Mr. DeGray that a 100+ year old door can be repaired, but if it is used often, they would need to take it apart and re-glue it.

Planner Grahn suggested that they echo the condition used for the foundation for the doors. She drafted the condition to read, "The applicant shall work with the Historic Preservation Planner to determine whether or not the doors on the historic house can be salvaged and re-used as operable doors, or as a faux door veneer as part of the rehabilitation".

Chair White had read the Staff report and he complimented the Staff and the Architect on the plans for this house and how they intend to do it. Board Member Beatlebrox was comfortable with the proposal presented. Board Member Holmgren concurred.

Board Member Hodgkins commented on the windows and asked if Planner Grahn intended to look at the windows to see if any were historic. Planner Grahn explained that when the Bricktex is removed and they gut the interior, it will be easier to see when a window is added and what the original opening might have been. When that is uncovered, the Staff will measure the window and Mr. DeGray will add a supplemental addendum to the historic preservation plan and physical conditions report showing what was uncovered. The Staff would also measure to determine what type of replacement windows should be used to return it to its original appearance. Planner Grahn clarified that the intent is to restore the original openings.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the material deconstruction of non-historic and non-contributory materials at 664 Woodside Avenue, pursuant to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report and as amended to have the preservation planner review the location and placement of the historic doors. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 664 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 664 Woodside Avenue.
2. The site is designated as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance map analysis, the house was likely constructed c.1885 by Caroline K. Snyder. After her death, her son Frank Snyder constructed a gable addition to the north, converting the house from a hall-parlor to a cross-wing or a T-Cottage by Addition. It is unknown whether the original one-story dwelling depicted in the 1889 Sanborn map was demolished and replaced by a cross-wing house in 1900 or if the cross-wing form was created by an addition.
4. The —T-cottage by addition was created by adding a cross-wing to one end of the rectangular cabin. The T-shape or cross-wing cottage was a popular house form in Park City during the 1880s and 1890s.
5. By 1929, the porch was extended to wrap-around to the east (rear) elevation of the structure and a new concrete block foundation was constructed along the north elevation.
6. The house remained largely unchanged in the 1941 Sanborn Map.
7. On September 7, 2016, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application for the renovation of the historic house and construction of an addition to its north; the application was deemed complete on September 26, 2016. The HDDR application is still under review by the Planning Department. The applicant is proposing to remove a c. 2009 wooden staircase constructed by the City, stone retaining walls, non-historic fences, a boulder retaining wall associated with a Water Department drainage pipe, and additional improvements that are located in the Woodside Avenue right-of-way as well as a concrete retaining wall along the east property line, shared with High West. The proposed exterior changes to the non-historic improvements in the right-of-way and within the property will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural

features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

8. Currently, the original roof form is covered in a standing-seam metal roof that was installed by the City in 2009; heat tape was added in 2012. The applicant is proposing to remove the standing seam metal roof and install a new architectural grade shingle roof. The proposed material deconstruction is required for the rehabilitation of the historic house.

9. The applicant is also proposing to construct two shed dormers on the east (rear) elevation of the house in order to provide additional living space in the attic. The proposed changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site.

10. There are two existing brick chimneys on the house. The first is on the east-west cross gable where the hall-parlor form meets the stem wing. The second chimney is on the east (rear) elevation of the house. Both chimneys show signs of damaged bricks and mortar deterioration.

11. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct chimney #1 as a faux chimney in its original location and utilizing its existing bricks. The proposed material deconstruction of Chimney #1 is necessary for the restoration and reconstruction of the chimney.

12. Chimney #2 will be demolished. The proposed demolition of Chimney #2 will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work. The exterior walls are covered with asbestos Bricktex siding that was likely added c.1940 when low-maintenance siding became popular. The historic drop-novelty siding exists beneath the Bricktex siding; however, it is unclear how much of the siding is salvageable. The proposed work is necessary to restore the original wood siding.

13. On the north elevation of the house, the applicant will be removing approximately 4.5 feet in length of the wall to accommodate the transition element to the new addition. The removal of this historic material is necessary in order to rehabilitate the building and construct the new addition.

14. The foundation appears to have been constructed in two parts, supporting the theory that there was no foundation beneath the north addition prior to 1900 and that the foundation was constructed after the livery was removed c.1927. This is substantiated by the use of a stacked sandstone foundation on the south side of the house, beneath the original hall-parlor form. The north side has a cement block foundation, and cement block would have been readily available in

the 1920s. The proposed work of adding a new foundation is necessary for the rehabilitation of the historic house.

15. The existing posts may be original; however, the railings were likely added after 1950 to replace the original railings. The porch floor consists of concrete and 1x wood flooring. The applicant proposes to brace the existing porch roof and temporarily lift it with the house when the foundation is poured. The applicant will evaluate the existing roof framing and repair and replace the structural members as needed. The applicant anticipates constructing a new wood porch floor once the house is set on its new foundation. The proposed work is necessary in order to rehabilitate the historic house and restore the porch to its c.1907-1920 appearance.

16. The applicant's Physical Conditions Report notes that there are seven total historic wood doors on the house. The applicant proposes to create faux doors on the south and west elevation as these doors will no longer be the primary entrance to the building. On the east (rear) elevation, the applicant proposes to remove an existing door which has been permanently closed and install a new door to the north. The door on the basement level will also be removed. It is unclear if these doors are historic to the house or if they have been added over time. The proposal is necessary to rehabilitate the house.

17. The window openings seen today were likely introduced in the 1920s in an effort to introduce more contemporary bungalow-inspired elements into the house. Any traces of original window openings are likely concealed beneath the Bricktex siding and the dry-wall and paneled interior walls. The windows are in varying degrees of poor condition with evidence of broken glass panes, wood rot, boarded window openings, and a missing window at the attic level. The proposed changes to the existing window configuration are necessary to rehabilitate the historic house. Any modifications to the original and/or existing window configuration on the east (rear) elevation will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

18. The garage was designated —Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory and is in overall good shape. It is a wood frame structure with no foundation; however, it does have framed walls and roof with plywood sheathing. The applicant intends to maintain the existing structure and place it on a new foundation. The proposed work is required for the renovation of the garage. The applicant's proposal to temporarily relocate the structure will mitigate to the greatest extent practical and impact to the historical importance of other structures located on the property and on adjacent parcels.

19. The applicant also proposes to remove an existing window on the east (rear)

elevation of the garage and construct a new window opening and construct a new service door on the east half of the garage's north (side) elevation. The proposed changes will not damage or destroy the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic site and are not included in the proposed scope of work.

Conclusions of Law – 664 Woodside Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and regarding historic structure deconstruction and reconstruction.

Conditions of Approval – 664 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 16, 2016. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where the historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they will be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material and finish. Prior to replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Historic Preservation Planner that the materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.

3. Following removal of the non-historic Bricktex siding, the applicant shall update his Historic Preservation Plan with a conditions report of the original wood siding. Deteriorated or damaged historic wood siding shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration or material defects requires replacement, the applicant shall demonstrate the severity of the deterioration to the Historic Preservation Planner for approval of its replacement in-kind.

4. The applicant shall work with the Historic Preservation Planner to determine whether or not the stone on the foundation of the historic house can be salvaged and reused as a veneer for the new foundation. If the material is found to be in such poor condition that it cannot be salvaged, the applicant shall reconstruct the foundation with a stacked stone veneer matching the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish.

5. The historic door openings, doors, and door surrounds visible from the Woodside Avenue right-of-way shall be maintained and preserved.

6. Following removal of the non-historic Bricktex siding, the applicant shall update his Historic Preservation Plan with a conditions report detailing the locations of original window openings. The applicant shall base any window modifications on the façade (west elevation) or secondary facades (north and south elevations) that will be visible from the Woodside Avenue right-of-way on physical, measured evidence uncovered during the demolition process. Planning staff shall review and approve the updated window configuration based on this new physical evidence.

7. The applicant shall update the façade easement to reflect the conditions of the historic house following the rehabilitation to the satisfaction of the grantee. The updated façade easement shall be recorded at the Summit County Recorder's Office.

8. The applicant shall work with the Historic Preservation Planner to determine whether or not the doors on the historic house can be salvaged and re-used as operable doors, or as a faux door veneer as part of the rehabilitation.

2. Annual Preservation Award – Staff recommends the Historic Preservation choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award, choose up to four (4) nominees for a historic plaque, and select three (3) members to form an Artist Selection Committee. (Application GI-15-02972)

Planner Grahn reported that the Board needed to choose their annual Preservation Award for projects that were completed in 2016 or earlier. She noted that last year the HPB spent time revising the program and introducing plaques for up to five awardees. A painting or another art piece is commissioned for the primary awardee. Planner Grahn presented a list of nominees and encouraged the Board members to add additional nominees if they had a particular project in mind.

Planner Grahn requested that three members of the HPB volunteer to be on an artist selection committee. The intent is to have everything completed and ready to present to the City Council in May, which is National Historic Preservation Month.

Planner Grahn named the suggested nominees. The first was 264 Ontario Avenue. This house had very few alterations; however, the house faces McHenry and abuts Ontario Avenue. Therefore, they were able to accommodate a substantial addition without detracting from the historic house. Planner Grahn commented on the actual work that was done as, outlined in the Staff report.

The second nominee was 81 King Road. Planner Grahn stated that per the Historic Site Inventory form, the house was clad in wood shake shingles. The

shingles were removed and the siding was repaired or replaced to match the original siding. The wood windows were repaired and replaced and an addition was added. Planner Grahn noted that the house is close to King Road, but she thought they did a nice job of finding a way to incorporate parking and still have an addition that blends well with the historic house.

The third nominee was 257 McHenry. Planner Grahn noted that this house had a Notice and Order in 2013/2014. It was in terrible condition. They had to remove a lot of the additions and the boards were rotted. There were multiple levels of wood siding, as well as asbestos siding, and boarded windows. The house was reconstructed and a new addition was added to the side. Planner Grahn believed it was a great addition to Old Town and it looks much like it did historically.

The fourth nominee was 1102 Norfolk Avenue. Planner Grahn reported that this project was a unique situation because the staircase was originally a right-of-way and a road. Prior to changes to the LMC, they were able to lift the house and rotate it. The Historic Preservation Board had also reviewed the historical significance of this addition prior to commencing the work, and found that it was not historic to the original house. She showed photos of what it looked like across Norfolk and what it looks like today. A garage was added with a transitional element.

The last project was the California Comstock Mill. Planner Grahn reported that Vail contributed \$50,000 as part of the conditions of the CUP application and the ongoing work to preserve the mine sites. The \$50,000 was invested in stabilizing the structure. Planner Grahn presented images showing what the structure looked like historically, in the 1970s, and its condition when they began work this summer. Clark Martinez with the excavation company, and a former Park City resident, craned out the salvageable members, removed a lot of the debris, and was able to start reconstructing the walls. Mr. Martinez also found an old crusher. The amount of work was significant, and the stabilization of the wood frame timber structure will help move forward with preservation. The Park City Museum has talked about investing funds to stabilize the stacked stone foundation. Planner Grahn explained that the stabilization also makes sure that it does not shift and push over the front piece. It was a large and complicated project.

Planner Grahn believed that as the Friends of the Ski Area Mining History continue to fundraise, there will be enough money to further work on the project. At this point they have done all they could do with the funds they had.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should have a painting of the California Comstock Mill when it is much more substantial. Planner Grahn stated that more work might be done, but she did not believe it would ever be restored to its

original appearance. Ms. Beatlebrox was pleased with the work that had been done.

Board Member Bealtebrox liked the five candidates chosen by the Staff. She asked if the other Board members were comfortable with those five, or if there were others to consider.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the California Comstock Mill was actually in Park City. Planner Grahn replied that it was a unique situation. It is located on the Historic Sites Inventory as part of the Park City mining era. However, it is actually right outside the City limits and in the annexation boundary, as well as being in Summit County. It could qualify for the award.

David White, Lola Beatlebrox, and Puggy Holmgren volunteered for the selection committee.

Director Erickson believed the candidates selected illustrates how far they have come with the application of the Guidelines. They have four good candidates, plus the California Comstock Mill. He thought that was partly due to the work of the HPB and the Preservation Planners. Director Erickson noted that the entire ordinance was reconstituted on material deconstruction and half of the Historic District Guidelines have been revised. He believed they were beginning to see the results of that effort. Board Member Stephens noted that there were good historic projects coming forward that would be excellent candidates for next year.

Board Member Beatlebrox had a fondness for the Ontario project because she recalled the grant application process and how long it took the Board to reach a decision. The owners were very fervent in wanting to create something special, and as the project moved forward they did additional repairs they had not counted on. Ms. Beatlebrox liked all the projects suggested and it was hard to choose between them.

Board Member Hodgkins was impressed with the McHenry project because of its original condition, and the fact that the owner even considered a preservation project. For the same reason, he was impressed with the California Comstock Mill. He thought that was a good project to champion because of the amount of work. It would publicize that the HPB supports the mining industry. He asked if an award recipient had ever been mining related. Planner Grahn answered no.

Board Member Stephens agreed that the McHenry project has been ongoing for years. Mr. Stephens liked the idea of bringing some attention to the mining structures. Ms. Beatlebrox agreed. The Mine would be a different type of painting from the typical garage or house. Chair White concurred.

Board Member Holmgren was leaning towards the California Comstock for the painting. Chair White also favored the California Comstock.

Director Erickson stated that the Board could select all five of the named projects for the award, and nominate one of the five for the painting.

Chair White believed there was consensus by the Board to nominate the Comstock Mine for the painting.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to select 264 Ontario Avenue, 81 King Road, 257 McHenry, 1102 Norfolk and the California Comstock Mill for outstanding historic preservation work in 2016; and to commission a painting for the California Comstock Mill. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that she had sent the Board members an invitation to a Santa party she was having on December 17th. She requested that they RSVP to her email invitation. She clarified that it was a social event and City business would not be discussed.

Director Erickson stated that a member of the public wanted to comment on 336 Daly Avenue.

336 Daly Avenue

Chair White re-opened the public hearing on the Continuation of 336 Daly Avenue.

Delphine Comp, a resident at 61 Daly Avenue, saw the notice about this meeting a few days ago. Ms. Comp stated that she, her husband, and a few neighbors believe that relocating the structure would destroy it completely. If the owners want to do something with the structure it should be restored in its original location.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked why Ms. Comp and her neighbors think relocating the house would destroy it completely. Ms. Comp commented on the current condition of the home. It was falling apart and she did not believe it could be moved somewhere else and still be the same.

Chair White thought Ms. Comp would be surprised at what could be done if it is done correctly. Ms. Comp was also concerned that the historic house would be moved and replaced with a monster house. She thought it would open the door to having another monster house on Daly Avenue, which the neighbors oppose.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Chair White asked for an update on the McPolin Barn. Planner Turpen reported that she had done her final inspection earlier that day. She was not able to pass the inspection at this time because the north addition did not have the roof on. Once the roof is in place, she will be able to sign off on it. Planner Turpen was pleased with how it looks. The interior work looked good. The structural members that were installed blend in, but you can still tell the difference between the old and the new, which is very important. When all the work is completed, they would schedule an event where the HPB could see the results of what they approved and recommended to the City Council.

Planner Grahn presented a photo showing the steel beams and how much it opened up the hayloft in the barn. The floors were recovered with plywood. A new staircase was built, but the old staircase was preserved and stored, which matched the Secretary of the Interior standards.

Planner Turpen walked through the key points of her inspection and showed corresponding photos. Planner Grahn stated that Hogan Construction rebuilt all of the wood windows to match the historic wood windows.

Chair White thanked the Staff for the update, and expressed an interest in visiting the Barn at the appropriate time. Board Member Beatlebrox asked to see the painting. Planner Grahn replied that if the Board would agree not go upstairs all together as a quorum, she would take the painting out of the box so they could see it.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board