

MEETING OF THE HAILEY ARTS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 12, 2022 at 3:30 PM
To be held at Hailey City Hall and virtually via GoTo Meeting

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/686570877>

You can also dial in using your phone.

(For supported devices, tap a one-touch number below to join instantly).

United States: +1 (872) 240-3212

One-touch: tel:+18722403212,,686570877#

Access Code: 686-570-877

Present: Michele Johnson, Susan Giannettino, Carol Waller, Toni Whittington, Joan Davies, Gwen Mesce, Kristin Anderson **Staff:** Robyn Davis, Cece Osborn **Guests:** Errin Bliss, Mark Howland

Call to Order

3:30 pm Johnson calls the meeting to order

New Business

- 1) Discussion and Review: Errin Bliss, of Bliss Architecture, has submitted a plan set for an addition to the Emmanuel Episcopal Church in Hailey. This structure is a historical building, nationally registered and recognized by the Idaho State Historical Society. Errin Bliss will present his drawings (Design 2) and scope of work for the building. Mark Howland will elaborate on the process with the Church, and offered his drawings (Design 1) for discussion of the Church's decision. HAHPC will review and provide feedback as it pertains to the Design Standards outlined by SHPO -- **Action Item**
 - a. Robyn Davis introduces Errin Bliss and Mark Howland.
 - b. Errin Bliss
 - i. Bliss provides background and status of the project
 1. The Church wants to provide ADA access to the sanctuary.
 2. Howland, a local architect and patron of the Church, completed Design 1 a number of years ago.
 3. Church asked Bliss to provide Design 2.
 4. The Preservation Programs Manager at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)—Dan Everhart—spoke out in opposition to Design 2. However, he has not provided detail to substantiate his opposition and, in his role at SHPO, he has no authority over the Church's design decision.
 - a. Everhart did express opposition to the courtyard in Design 2, however Bliss doesn't understand or perceive the courtyard to compromise or negatively impact the historic preservation of the Church.
 5. Church would like HAHPC's opinion on Design 2.

6. Bliss and Howland are working together to achieve the Church's goals, however he is committed to Design 2. If the Church decides to go with Design 1, Bliss will not be the architect because of structural concerns.
- ii. Bliss' analyses of Design 1 and 2:
 1. Design 1
 - a. Although the design appears simpler, structurally Design 1 is more complex and problematic. Specifically, he is not supportive of the following aspects of Design 1:
 - i. The addition sharing a primary wall with the Church
 1. Compromising the historic preservation and structural integrity of the entire structure
 - ii. The addition roof resting on the Church's roof and both draining into the courtyard
 2. Design 2:
 - a. Priorities:
 - i. Preserve the south wall of the historic church
 - ii. Do not compromise any structural integrity of the church-- as it relates to the south wall, roof, and effects of inadequate drainage in the courtyard
 - iii. Façade of the historical Church
 1. Bliss considers it to be one of the most beautiful in Hailey.
 2. Aiming to preserve the façade and its symmetry with the mountains
 3. Wants to complement and accentuate this beautiful façade in Design 2 of the proposed addition, with:
 - a. Similar geometry of the arches
 - b. Fenestry and shape of the window void
 - c. Aesthetic of the doors
 3. Implications:
 - a. Pine trees will need to be removed on the south side of the property, regardless of the design choice
 - b. Drainage into the courtyard
 - i. Both designs propose snow drainage off the gable roof into the courtyard
 - ii. Design 2 proposes a flat roof with internal drainage
- c. Mark Howland
 - i. Summary of the process with the Church
 1. This has been a long process, going on for years.
 2. There is a question as to whether and when the Church can secure money for the addition.
 3. This is an early stage in the process, perhaps neither of these designs will be the final design.
 4. The Church needs HAHPC's feedback on Design 1 and 2, especially to decide how to respond to Everhart's opinions.
- d. Questions and Comments from the Commission:
 - i. Michele Johnson
 1. Clarifies that the primary intention of the project is to provide ADA accessibility to the Church. Answer is yes.
 2. She asks: if at all, where is the building ADA accessible?

- a. Howland: almost everywhere besides the main sanctuary. In order to currently access the main sanctuary, one must go up a narrow staircase.
 - ii. Toni Whittington:
 - 1. Design 2 adheres to SHPO standards, it does exactly what SHPO encourages people to do. It:
 - a. honors the historical structure of the Church with a complementary yet distinct and subordinate design;
 - b. addresses an important need and provides ADA accessibility without compromising the historical nature or integrity of the Church.
 - 2. The addition would add to the character of Hailey
 - iii. Susan Giannettino and Kristin Anderson vocally agree with Whittington. Johnson and Joan Davies nod.
 - iv. Kristin Anderson:
 - 1. there are structural concerns with the historic structure and existing drainage problems in the courtyard. These are good reasons for the Church to not pursue Design 1 but instead Design 2 or another design that proposes an addition that is separate and largely structurally independent from the Church.
 - 2. The courtyard in Design 2 is not a problem, it addresses the current need for better drainage in that location.
 - v. Whittington:
 - 1. Question: does the addition have a flat roof?
 - 2. Bliss: Yes, as to capture and redirect rain and snow away from the courtyard and into internal drainage.
 - 3. Anderson attests the the effectiveness of internal draining from flat roofs.
 - 4. Comment: The proposed roof in Design 2 will have to bear some of the constant shedding from metal gable roof of the historic structure.
 - vi. Johnson:
 - 1. Summary of the commissions' comments:
 - a. **The Commission is supportive of Design 2, the Commission finds Design 2 to comply with the SHPO standards and welcomes the Church to pursue the project— notwithstanding Everhart's opinions.**
 - i. Davies: this is not the first time that SHPO has been vague with their feedback and 'left people hanging'
 - ii. Davis: Everhart was invited to attend this meeting and clarify his concerns.
 - b. This is an exciting project, it's exciting that the Church is not interested in tearing anything down but they want to enhance their historic structure and provide accessibility for everyone.
 - 2. Closed the topic with the Commission's stated support of Design 2 and no motion.
- 2) Updates on 2022 Priority Projects (if any):
 - a. Phone Booth Revitalization
 - i. Open discussion with the commission:
 - 1. Review of location, current use, and intention of the phone booths
 - a. Location: Elm Street and Main, southeast and southwest corners
 - b. Current use: Crossing guard's protection from the elements

- c. Intentions:
 - i. draw attention to them
 - ii. use them to honor Hailey's heritage
 - 1. post historical photos of Hailey on their exterior
 - iii. add color to the photos for vibrancy
 - 2. Color of the phone booths, behind the photos
 - a. Intention for the phone booths to 'stand-out'
 - b. Davies, Giannettino, and Johnson vocally support fire-engine red
 - c. Anderson questions if they should be different colors or the same, consensus is that both booths should be the same color
 - d. Mesce proposes to open up the conversation, offers turquoise as another suggestion
 - e. Johnson motions for a vote of fire-engine red or turquoise
 - i. 5 in favor of red
 - ii. 1 in favor of turquoise
 - iii. 1 abstains
 - 3. Mesce agrees to choose a fire-engine red color with Impact Auto Body shop**
- b. Utility Box Public Art Project, Information and Costs
 - i. Staff update from Robyn Davis
 - 1. Ketchum's process:
 - a. contracts local artists for ~\$2,500 an art piece
 - b. In the past, Windy City Arts (WCA) used to provide the wraps at no cost
 - c. Now that WCA changed hands, they are no longer offering to wrap the electrical boxes and Ketchum is now using a company based out of Boise. Staff has not been able to connect with them yet.
 - d. Idaho Power has not allowed them to wrap any utility boxes, only Cox and ITD allow them to wrap their utility boxes
 - 2. To-do:**
 - a. Figure out who owns the utility box at Bullion and Main St.**
 - b. Ask Bengal Works.**
 - ii. Commission open discussion:
 - 1. Waller: have we decided on a design or an artist?
 - a. Answer, we are still in the process of assessing the feasibility and logistics of taking on the project.
 - 2. Johnson: About aesthetics, Johnson expresses support for a historic theme and recaps the prior consensus collect and colorize heritage/historic photos that include a diversity of people
 - 3. Giannettino: Let's organize a subcommittee to collect and compile acceptable photos, a Historic Photo Committee
 - a. Others agree that it is a chore, the City of Hailey's historic photo collection in the library is challenging to navigate
 - b. Davis reminds the Commission of the Ketchum historical library
 - 4. Johns and Mesce agree to collect and send photos to Robyn**
 - 5. Diversity theme:
 - a. Mesce: Mesce recently saw photos of the Chinese migrant workers in the Valley, she will pursue the source
 - b. Davies: We can include historical photos of Native American Indians

- c. Plaques for Existing Art
 - i. Choice of material: Stainless steel or brass
 - 1. Price difference is about \$50
 - ii. Do we want them all made from the same material, or should they be chosen selectively to complement the art?
 - iii. Waller: prefer standard look, all plaques the same color
 - 1. Davies agrees, in a previous similar project it was financially and logistically preferable to standardize the plaques
 - iv. Waller: without seeing what they look like, she assumes that stainless steel will look more modern
 - 1. Davies: Bronze can be made to look more modern
 - v. Davis: We don't have to decide today, shall we wait until we have samples and more information
 - vi. Giannettino: why are most brass? I'm not concerned with the aesthetics, I am concerned with getting the most sustainable, long-lasting material that weathers well.
 - vii. Staff will return with visuals and more information for the next meeting.**
- 3) Budget update
- a. Staff presentation:
 - i. So far, the Commission has spent little to no money
 - ii. We have estimates on the current projects, the money remaining is \$4,000. The Commission has \$4,000 to spend in a little over 2 months.
 - b. Whittington and Waller vocalize the need to spend all the money.
 - c. Johnson proposes to revisit priorities in order to decide how to spend the money
 - i. Open discussion ensues regarding project ideas and logistics: willow chairs in the preserve, Sage School mural, murals on the Hop Porter Park bathrooms, tile improvements at Hop Porter Park, and the process of creating an open-call for artists.
 - d. Hop Porter Park bathroom mural idea
 - i. Davis: the Commission is not required to launch an open call for artists, they can choose an artist. Choosing an artist generally takes less time, which is valuable in this case. The fiscal year ends at the end of September.
 - ii. Johnson concurs that the commission will choose an artist if they pursue a mural before the end of the fiscal year, no need for staff to initiate a public call for artists
 - e. Cement platforms or pavers for the phone booths may be needed
 - i. This could use up the remainder of the money
 - ii. Johnson will reach out to Del Angel Paving regarding pavers**
 - iii. Davis and Johnson will determine the size of the platforms

Old Business, In-Progress & Status Reports

- 1) Adoption of the Meeting Minutes from June 14, 2022 -- **Action Item**

4:38 pm Davies motions to approve the Meeting Minutes from June 14, 2022. Whittington seconded. All were in favor except for Anderson who abstained. At the time, Anderson was not yet officially a member of the Commission.

Adjourn

4:41pm Johnson motioned to adjourn. Mesce/Whittington seconded and all were in favor.