

Posted: _____



Town of New Castle
450 W. Main Street
PO Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647

Administration Department
Phone: (970) 984-2311
Fax: (970) 984-2716
www.newcastlecolorado.org

Agenda

**New Castle Historic Preservation Commission Special Virtual Meeting
Monday, December 28, 2020, 6:30 PM**

Due to concerns related to COVID-19, this meeting will be held as a virtual meeting only. The public is invited to attend.

[To join by computer, smart phone or tablet click HERE](#)

**If you prefer to telephone in:
Please call: 1-346-248-7799
Meeting ID: 709 658 8400**

Follow the prompts as directed. Be sure to set your phone to mute until called on.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Meeting Notice

Conflicts of Interest

Citizen Comments on Items NOT on the Agenda

Items for Consideration

- A. Discussion: New Castle Museum Engineering Report**
- B. Discussion: 2021 Budget**
- C. Information Item: Certified Local Government Annual Report**
- D. 2021 Webinars and Virtual Work Shops from History Colorado**
- E. June 15, 2020 minutes**

Adjourn

December 16, 2020

Mr. Dave Reynolds, Town Administrator
Town of New Castle
P.O. Box 90
New Castle, Colorado 81647

**RE: New Castle Museum
116 North 4th Street
New Castle, Colorado**

Dear Dave,

Following our field investigation (almost a year ago now), I am providing this letter to provide recommendations regarding the concerns and observations made during our investigation. Our concerns chiefly have centered around the continued brick deterioration of the north wall for the building. Before I discuss those recommendations, I wanted to discuss the observations made for the Historical Society back in the fall of 1997 and draw a comparison to the observations we have now made 22 years later.

Since the time of the 1997 investigation and report, there has been little change to the structure. I have attached the report from that investigation and note that the concerns and observations made then are certainly still applicable today. From the second page of that report, it was noted that “The main areas of concern for the building, like the other “clay brick” buildings of comparable age centers around deteriorating clay brick units. Continued evidence of this deterioration exists on the south side of the north wall and the south side of the south wall.” Also noted were “Extensive cracks were observed in the south wall of the building, being attributed to damage from a vehicle colliding with the south wall of the building a few years ago. “Finally, “The roof structures of both portions of the building appear to be performing adequately. Minimal deflection was observed in the roof over the main portion of the structure.”

We recommended with the 1997 work that the exterior brick masonry walls and their related deterioration are the areas of greatest concern for the building. Here 22 years later, and as per the purpose of the 2019 investigation, the exterior brick masonry walls remain as the major concern. Many of the bricks (and mortar) are now beginning to deteriorate to a point where their replacement to avoid excessive voids in the wall is a must. As we discussed in the field, we need to now begin to initiate a program to start replacing the bricks and tuck pointing the mortar.

It is difficult to determine how much of the wall can be replaced at any one time as the age of the structure and the full inspection of the structural integrity of the wall are difficult to assess without removing stucco, deteriorated bricks and mortar. If it is desired to save the brick wall, we would recommend that prior to beginning any work or on the wall that a temporary post/beam support condition be provided so that stucco can be removed and the extent of the repair can be determined.

Assuming the repair will proceed, the recommended course of temporary support would be to set the post/beam support line at a distance of no more than 3’-0” from the inside face of the brick wall. The beam to support the rafters and collar ties would be constructed of a multi ply beam consisting of three (3) 2x8 (Hem Fir #2 or better)

nailed together with 16d nails at 12" o.c. in an alternating spacing to avoid splitting. The existing rafters would need to have a 2x4 cripple board screwed to them (minimum of two #9 by 2 ½" long) to allow each rafter to bear down onto the 3 ply 2x8 temporary support beam. The support beam would need to be supported by a nominal 6x6 post to a 3 ply 2x12 plate (12" long) that will bear directly on the concrete floor below. We would recommend installing a Simpson Post Cap on top of the post to attach to the beam (using #8 x 1 ½" screws) and post. Framing clips or a Simpson Post Base could attach the bottom of the post to the multiply 2x12 plates and two ½" x 8" expansion anchors could attach the plates to the concrete. We have attached a sketch to help graphically describe the above narrative.

Note that we have designed the temporary support for the brick wall repair to accommodate the dead load of 15 psf and a live load of 20 psf. Thus, we would recommend that any work performed would be scheduled such that the structure not be exposed to snow loading (ie., performed in late spring to early fall time frame).

Once the temporary support is in place, work on the brick wall can commence. We would recommend starting at the bottom and replacing no more than 3 bricks (horizontally) and 2 bricks (vertically) at a time as to assure that removal of the bricks will not cause other unintended bricks to fall. This will certainly be an iterative process that the contractor will be able to adjust his removal and replacement scheme proceeds.

For those bricks that will remain, but are soft and still have their shape intact, we would recommend applying a sealer to the surface of the bricks after the repair and replacement is complete. The type of sealer should be breathable such as a siloxane-based brick sealer. The sealant would be the last portion of the work performed after repair, replacement and tuck pointing is completed.

After the wall repair is completed in its entirety, we would recommend that if stucco is proposed to be placed on the wall again that the stucco itself be installed properly and consideration be given to whether the Historic Society is interested in the extra expense to apply it as well as paint it. Note that due to its brittle nature, stucco will be more sensitive to cracking and thus hairline cracking in the stucco should be anticipated. Some newer stucco products do have fibers and are more elastic and less sensitive to cracking as the standard cement/sand stucco products are.


As you review this letter along with the letter from 1997, the recommendations from the 1977 letter still remain important to follow. Monitoring drainage and assuring that the building envelope from the exterior remains sealed from direct moisture intrusion would be important.

As was noted in 1977, the roof rafters for the structure do not have the capacity to carry the 40 psf roof snow load for the New Castle area. If it is desired to strengthen the roof structure to accommodate the snow loads, we would need to provide a further evaluation of the roof structure during the time frame that the work is being performed. It is likely that the roof structure could be strengthened without removing the existing rafters. It is anticipated, however that providing "sister rafters" to the existing would be necessary with the potential for needing additional ridge and possible collar tie/ceiling joist support would be necessary. Removal of the existing ceiling finishes and insulation would be necessary to accomplish this. Also, concern over the potential for asbestos and other hazardous building materials/practices would need to be evaluated at that time.

I hope this letter serves its intended purpose and would encourage you to contact me with any questions you may have upon your receipt and review of this letter with its attachments.

Respectfully,

SGM



Jefferey S. Simonson, PE
Principal, Town Engineer

September 9, 1997

Ms. Lisa Cain, Town Administrator
Mr. Mike Blair, Town Planner
Town of New Castle
P.O. Box 90
New Castle, Colorado 81647

RE: Building Structural Survey
New Castle Museum (Old Town Hall)
116 North 4 th. Street
New Castle, Colorado

Dear Lisa and Mike,

Please let this letter serve as a report regarding the observations and conclusions made during the field investigation performed on July 30, 1997 by Edna Sample and myself on the above referenced building.

GENERAL

This field investigation was performed in response to the Agreement for Building Structural Survey between the Town of New Castle and the property leasees, New Castle Historical Society. This report, as a whole, is based upon the cursory review of the structure along with subsequent preliminary calculations on certain structural elements and should not be construed as a detailed structural analysis.

GENERAL STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION

The New Castle Museum building located at 116 N 4th. Main Street is a wood framed roof and brick masonry building founded on what appears to be a concrete foundation. The building is of single story construction. The original building was built in 1893 with a masonry (8" concrete masonry units) addition built onto the building some time later.

The roof consists of wood framed elements utilizing 2X6 members spaced at 24" o.c. for the rafters with collar ties of undeterminable size (no access to attic gained). Typical construction practices in this era of construction utilized 2X4 members running with the rafter members serving as ceiling joists. The wood framing is most likely of native spruce grade. The roof elements span a distance of 12'-6" (25'-0" building width) to the roof peak (ridge board).

The roof over the addition is also of wood framing, consisting of 2X6 rafters spaced at 16" o.c. The span of these rafters is 10'-0". This roof is in a shed type configuration, bearing on the 8" concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall to the east and the brick wall to the west.

The floor structure for both the main portion of the building and the addition consists of concrete slab on grade construction.

COMMENTS AND/OR CONCERNS RELATED TO OBSERVED STRUCTURAL PERFORMANCE

Drainage, in general, appeared to be adequate although the condition observed on the north side of the building was less than favorable for standard drainage requirements under today's modern codes. The distance between the building and the adjacent mobile home was minimal and the space between the two buildings left the feeling of a "shaded/damp" area with minimal exposure to the sun. Evidence of repairs to "past problems" exist in that a concrete wall cap was built (approximately 3 ft. high) to, presumably protect the north wall of the building from further deterioration from water damage.

The main areas of concern for the building, like the other "clay brick" buildings of comparable age centers around the deteriorating clay brick units. Continued evidence of this deterioration exists on the south side of the north wall and the south side of the south wall. Stucco has been applied in the past and perhaps is contributing to the deterioration by trapping moisture in the masonry wall construction between the stucco/brick interface.

Extensive cracks were observed in the south wall of the building, being attributed to damage from a vehicle colliding with the south wall of the building a few years ago. No evidence of recent movement in the wall (other than deterioration) was observed.

The roof structures of both portions of the building appear to be performing adequately. Minimal deflection was observed in the roof over the main portion of the structure. Recent provision of a metal roof has reportedly helped in minimizing problems previously experienced as they related to stucco and brick deterioration.

BASIC PERFORMANCE RELATED TO CURRENT CODE REQUIREMENTS

From a structural standpoint, the first areas of concern deals with the capacity of the roof structure as it relates to its ability to support the current snow load. As mentioned previously, the main roof of the building consists of 2X6 rafters on a 12'-6" span to the ridge board located at the peak of the building. Given the 40 p.s.f. snow load for New Castle, the anticipated bending stresses applied to the 2X6 rafters is 3100 p.s.i. This compares unfavorably to the currently code adopted allowable bending stresses of 1500 to 2000 p.s.i. for the wood material observed. Discounting the existence of the metal roof, the estimated capacity (live load) of the roof would be 15 to 20 p.s.f.

The addition portion of the building performs adequately in that the bending stresses on these rafters are on the order of 1300 p.s.i. given a full snow loading of 40 p.s.f.

To better define the exact snow load that each roof would require a more detailed analysis and materials testing.

The exterior brick masonry walls and their related deterioration are the areas of greatest concern for the building. The continued degradation of the individual brick units and mortar provide for questionable strength both from a bearing stand point and a wind loading resistance standpoint. No observations of recent movements in the brick were made although the stucco continues to "swell and buckle". Some of the brick units have deteriorated to the extent that one can crumble the brick in place. The fact that the stucco and the concrete wall cap along the north wall may "hide" other unforeseen problems is somewhat disheartening.

CONCLUSIONS

With our inspection and subsequent evaluation, we have noted a couple of concerns regarding the building which we feel must be addressed:

1. The roof structure over the main (older) portion of the building, would need to continue to undergo a continuing maintenance program of which monitoring the roofs performance would be a significant part. Inspection of the condition of structural members and nailed joints would be of primary concern. Also, assurance that the roof does not become overloaded by removing excessive snow off of the roof is recommended. It is most likely that the metal roof will "shed" the excessive snow loads from the roof but, continued observation is recommended. To better define the anticipated performance in relationship to modern design loads would require additional detail analysis and would provide the building's leasees a better understanding as to when the snow would need to be shoveled.
2. Continue monitoring the exterior brick walls and assuring that adequate drainage is provided so as to assure that runoff does not pond against the building and/or brick surfaces. The existing weathering of the brick is anticipated to continue and future mitigation and repair is recommended. Working towards eliminating the existence of the following conditions, such as : (1) the masonry being constantly in contact with saturated soils; (2) downspouts leaking; (3) there are heavy rains (poor irrigation practice); or (4) horizontal ledges are kept from being formed, will help mitigate further weathering damage to the brick. Under these or similar conditions the masonry units and mortar may become saturated and undergo freeze-thaw deterioration. Typically, mortar joints deteriorated due to freezing and thawing present a maintenance problem generally requiring tuck-pointing.
3. We would further recommend that the services of an individual competent in restoring structures containing the older "clay brick" be gained such that the brick walls can be properly treated to stop or retard their deterioration.

I hope this information serves its intended purpose. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

SCHMUESER GORDON MEYER, INC.


Jeffrey S. Simonsen, P.E.

d:\osuite\mipro\docs\hist5.sam



Town of New Castle
450 W. Main Street
PO Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647

Administration Department

Phone: (970) 984-2311

Fax: (970) 984-2716

www.newcastlecolorado.org

To: Historical Preservation Commission

From: Bart Mendoza

Date: December 18, 2020

Re: Approved 2021 HPC Budget

Chair Rippy and Commission members,

The purpose of this agenda item is to inform the commission that the council has approved \$2,000.00 in the 2021 budget, and perhaps to prompt a discussion on how those funds may be utilized.



Town of New Castle
450 W. Main Street
PO Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647

Administration Department
Phone: (970) 984-2311
Fax: (970) 984-2716
www.newcastlecolorado.org

To: Historical Preservation Commission
From: Bart Mendoza
Date: December 18, 2020
Re: Certified Local Government Annual Report

Chair Rippy and Commission members,

The purpose of this agenda item is to share with the commission the History Colorado Annual Report that staff completes every year. The report is necessary to maintain the town's status as a certified local government.

Certified Local Governments are counties or municipalities that have been endorsed by the State Historic Preservation Office (History Colorado) and the National Park Service to participate in the national preservation program while maintaining standards consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.



Colorado Certified Local Government 2020 Annual Report

Federal Fiscal Year 2020: October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020

Due Date: November 1, 2020

Please save this file in the original PDF format, DO NOT PRINT AND SCAN.

Submit via email to erica.duvic@state.co.us

Name of County/Municipality:

Name of Commission Board:

Contact Name: Contact Title:

Contact Phone: Contact Fax:

Contact Email:

Contact Address:

City: State: CO Zip:

Website for your historic preservation program:

Provide a list of all local government staff members with duties assigned to your local preservation program and their job titles. Then, list the percentage of their job duties that are related to historic preservation and check each staff member that meets the [Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards](#). Please include any consultants contracted to perform designation, design, or tax credit reviews on a regular basis.

Name	Title	Percent	SOI Qualified
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Preservation Planning & Operational Documents

In Federal Fiscal Year 2020, were any of the following newly developed or revised:

- 1) Preservation Ordinance (including Amendments)?
- 2) By-Laws or Administrative Rules?
- 3) Preservation Plan?
- 4) Survey Plan?
- 5) Design Guidelines:
 - a. For the entire county/municipality?
 - b. For a specific district(s)?

Name of district(s):

Commission or Board

6) Provide a list of all current Commission/Board Members. Check any Commission/Board Members newly appointed in Federal Fiscal Year 2020 and attach their resumes and/or applications. Also, check all Commission/Board Members that are professionals in preservation-related disciplines and list their profession beside their names.

Name	New Member	Preservation Professional	Discipline(s)
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>

7) If 40% of the current Commission/Board is not comprised of preservation-related professionals, please describe your efforts to recruit. How does the Commission/Board seek additional expertise in the fields of architecture, architectural history or archaeology when needed?

8) Do the members of the Commission/Board represent the general ethnic diversity of the community?

9) List the **SHPO-approved** educational/training sessions attended by Commission/Board Members in Federal Fiscal Year 2020. Please list name of session or conference (list conference, not individual sessions when a conference was attended) and the name(s) of Commission/Board Member that attended.

10) What is your Commission/Board's regular meeting schedule? (i.e. First Thursday of every other month at 6pm)

11) Please list the number of meetings and dates held in Federal Fiscal Year 2020:

Regular Meetings	Special Meetings	Work/Study Sessions
Total Number <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto; background-color: #cccccc;"></div>	Total Number <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto; background-color: #cccccc;"></div>	Total Number <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto; background-color: #cccccc;"></div>
<u>Dates</u>	<u>Dates</u>	<u>Dates</u>

Historic Contexts & Surveys

12) List any **Historic Context Studies** completed in Federal Fiscal Year 2020.

13) List any **Cultural Resource Surveys** completed in Federal Fiscal Year 2020.

14) How many resources were **inventoried** in Federal Fiscal Year 2020?

Inventoried means any buildings, structures, objects, or sites for which the Commission/Board obtained information not previously held. This information may come from newly surveyed properties or properties nominated that had not been surveyed. Inventoried properties can be either eligible or non-eligible for listing.

Designations

15) How many contributing resources (buildings, structures, objects, sites) are **locally designated**? This count includes ALL listings since the Commission/Board was originally formed. For Districts, count all contributing buildings, structures and sites individually.

16) How many contributing resources (buildings, structures, objects, sites) were **locally designated** in Federal Fiscal Year 2020? For Districts, count all contributing buildings, structures and sites individually.

Please list. For Districts, list name with number of contributing resources in parenthesis.

Project Review

17) How many design review applications were considered by the Commission/Board for **designated** resources in Federal Fiscal Year 2020?

a. Total Reviewed

b. Review by Full Commission

c. Review by Design Review Subcommittee Only

d. Reviewed by Staff Only

18) How many design review applications were considered by the Commission/Board for **non-designated** resources in Federal Fiscal Year 2020?

a. Total Reviewed

b. Review by Full Commission

c. Review by Design Review Subcommittee Only

d. Reviewed by Staff Only

19) Did your County/Municipality comment or participate in any **Section 106 Reviews** as a consulting party in Federal Fiscal Year 2020?

If yes, list name of project or property and the Federal Agency initiating the review.

Narrative Questions

20) Did your Board/Commission develop, sponsor, or participate in any **public outreach, education, or interpretive events/meetings/tours/materials** in Federal Fiscal Year 2020?

If yes, please describe.

21) What CLG accomplishment/achievement/event in Federal Fiscal Year 2020 makes the Commission/Board most proud?

22) Describe any problems – operational, political or financial – encountered by the CLG in Federal Fiscal Year 2020.

23) Describe any planned/projected Commission/Board activities for Federal Fiscal Year 2021.

Attachment Checklist

*All documents listed below are **required** for a complete report unless listed as “if applicable” or “if adopted.” Providing a link to an online document, if downloadable, may be substituted for actual attachment of a document when available. Please include all documents as **separate attachments**.*

- No** *All* meeting minutes for Federal Fiscal Year 2020 (unless previously submitted)
- No** Sample of Public Notice announcing commission/board Meeting
- No** Sample advertisement for new commission/board members
- No** List of **all** locally designated properties (from inception of local listing)
- No** Resumes or applications for commission/board members appointed in FY20 (if applicable)
- No** Current preservation ordinance and amendments (if adopted during FY20)
- No** Current by-laws or administrative rules for the commission/board (if adopted during FY20)
- No** Current Preservation Plan or preservation chapter in Comprehensive Plan (if adopted during FY20)
- No** Current Survey Plan (if adopted during FY20)
- No** Historic Context Surveys completed in Federal Fiscal Year 2020 or date submitted to SHPO (if applicable)
- No** Historic Resource Surveys completed in Federal Fiscal Year 2020 or date submitted to SHPO (if applicable)

Please provide links to any online documents or dates when Contexts or Surveys were submitted to SHPO:



Town of New Castle
450 W. Main Street
PO Box 90
New Castle, CO 81647

Administration Department

Phone: (970) 984-2311

Fax: (970) 984-2716

www.newcastlecolorado.org

To: Historical Preservation Commission

From: Bart Mendoza

Date: December 18, 2020

Re: Upcoming Webinars and Virtual workshops

-
- [1/20/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Compass for CLGs](#)
 - [2/17/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Cultural Landscapes: Designation, Setting and Context](#)
 - [3/10/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Design Review Critique](#)
 - [3/17/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Evaluating Integrity in Historic Districts](#)
 - [4/21/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Preservation Law](#)
 - [5/19/21 Wednesday @ Noon - Preservation Advocacy](#)

1 **New Castle Historic Preservation VIRTUAL Commission Meeting**
2 **Monday, June 15, 2020, 6:30 PM**

3
4 **Due to concerns related to COVID-19, this meeting was held as a virtual meeting**
5 **only. The public was invited to attend.**

6
7 **To join by computer, smart phone or tablet:**
8 **<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7096588400>**

9
10 **If you prefer to telephone in:**
11 **Please call: 1-346-248-7799**
12 **Meeting ID: 709 658 8400**

13
14 **Follow the prompts as directed. Be sure to set your**
15 **phone to mute until called on.**

16
17
18 **Call to Order**

19 Commission Chair Steve Rippy called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

20
21 **Roll Call**

22 Present	Chair Rippy
	Commissioner Riddile
	Commissioner Copeland
	Commissioner Sass
26 Absent	None

27
28 Also present at the meeting were Town Clerk Melody Harrison, Town Planner Paul Smith
29 and members of the public.

30
31 **Meeting Notice**

32 Town Clerk Melody Harrison verified that her office gave notice of the meeting in
33 accordance with Resolution Tc 2020-1.

34
35 **Conflicts of Interest**

36 There were no conflicts of interest.

37
38 **Citizen Communication**

39 There were no citizen comments.

40
41 **Items for Consideration**

42
43 **Consider a Request from Oli Johannsson to Replace the Windows in his**
44 **Historically Designated Building at 303 W. Main Street - Also Known as the**
45 **Trimble Building**

46 Town Planner Paul Smith introduced applicant Oli Johannsson.
47 Mr. Johannsson greeted the commission and told them that his application was to replace
48 the double-hung windows on the upper level of his building at 303 W. Main Street. The

1 new windows will be double-hung and look the same as the old ones. He said they were
2 metal-clad and met current code. Mr. Johannsson said that the windows would be a dark
3 bronze.

4 Mr. Johannsson said that he would start with one window that will help determine the
5 existing conditions. He said he hoped he did not run into any unexpected problems since
6 the building was old. He said he hoped to replace the windows at the end of the summer.
7 Planner Smith screen shared photos of Mr. Johannsson's build which was also known as
8 the Trimble Building. In the photos he indicated which windows would be replaced.

9 Planner Smith said that the Existing Building Code considered Mr. Johannsson's proposed
10 window replacement an ordinary repair that did not require a building permit.

11
12 Planner Smith referenced the municipal code and said that in determining the decision to
13 be made concerning the issuance of a certificate of approval, the historic preservation
14 commission shall consider the following criteria:

- 15
16 1. The effect of the proposed work upon the general historical and/or architectural
17 character of the historic site, landmark or district;
- 18 2. The architectural style, arrangement, texture and materials of existing and
19 proposed structures, and their relation to the structures in the district;
- 20 3. The effects of the proposed work on the exterior architectural features of the
21 structure upon which such work is to be done;
- 22 4. The effect of the proposed work upon the protection, enhancement, perpetuation
23 and use of the historic site, landmark or district;
- 24 5. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for
25 Rehabilitating Historic Buildings in Section 15.44.400;
- 26 6. The conformance of the proposed work to the general standards of the zoning
27 district in which the historic site, landmark, or district is located; and
- 28 7. Such additional criteria, as established by the historic preservation commission,
29 which it deems to be in the best interests of the town.

30
31 Planner Smith said that it was staff's opinion that the replacements did not adversely
32 affect the historical character of the building nor the general standards of the zoning
33 district. Therefore, staff recommended approval of the application under the condition that
34 the replacements meet the minimum clear space requirements as provided in the 2015
35 International Existing Building Code, Section 702.5.

36
37 Chair Rippy and the commission felt it was a great project.

38
39 **MOTION: Commissioner Riddile made a motion to approve the request from Oli**
40 **Johannsson to replace the windows in his historically designated building at 303**
41 **W. Main Street - also known as the Trimble Building. Commissioner Copeland**
42 **seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

43
44
45 **December 16, 2019 minutes**

46 The commission made a correction to the minutes.

47 **MOTION: Chair Rippy made a motion to approve the amended minutes. Councilor**
48 **Copeland seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

1 Commissioner Riddile said that in the December 16, 2019 minutes there was a comment
2 that the museum volunteers should be invited to an HPC meeting, and although that was
3 likely not appropriate during a pandemic, she felt it was something for the commission to
4 keep in mind.

5 Chair Rippy said that Tow Engineer Jeff Simonson would be providing a report on the
6 museum, hopefully soon. He also said that he had spoken to the Talbots about possibly
7 using the old schoolhouse for storage of the museum items, and they considered a mid-
8 summer time frame, but with the pandemic things had changed. He asked Planner Smith
9 if there had been continuing work on the building. Planner Smith said there had not been.
10 Chair Rippy stated that storage space might not be available in the schoolhouse, and that
11 presented a problem regarding where the museum artifacts would go when work was
12 being done on the museum building.

13 Chair Rippy said he would continue to work with Engineer Simonson to get that report.
14

15
16 **MOTION: Chair Rippy made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Copeland**
17 **seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**
18

19
20 The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.
21

22
23
24
25 Respectively submitted,
26

27
28
29 _____
30 Commission Chair Steve Rippy
31

32
33 _____
34 Town Clerk Melody Harrison, CMC
35