

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 pm by Chair Leas.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Mark Leas	Allen Frechter	Susan Propper
Ethan Guerra	Steve Gerard	Elaine Gort	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, February 6, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the February 20, 2024 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Public Comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Hallberg Residence Addition (EM), 30 White Cloud, PL-2024-0014

Mr. Gerard: I don't necessarily want to call it up, but I do have a couple of questions. If you'd pull up the site plan; what is "Lot 1"? (Ms. Muncy: The applicant's property is Lot 1, the "Lot 1" just happen to fall on the square which is the location of an existing patio at the rear of the residence.)

Mr. Frechter: I've got one question on 13A and 13R, for snow stacking. It shows a 25% required, but it's only 17%. Is that correct? (Ms. Muncy: It should be 25%. The patio is not included in the snow stack area, which may be why the calculation is incorrect in the staff report, my apologies.)

Mr. Frechter: I was having trouble figuring out what the colors meant. There's no legend for the colors on this set of drawings.

Mr. Guerra: It took me a while as well. It's confusing.

Mr. Gerard: I was confused too.

Ms. Gort: You couldn't look at the existing and proposed. You have to go keep going back and forth. It's nice to put them next to each other.

Mr. Guerra: Since we're discussing the plans, is there a requirement for existing and proposed elevations? Because there were no elevations?

Mr. Guerra: I mean, I could pick apart the plans for the next half hour and I won't, but I did notice that, and I actually drove up there this afternoon just to confirm what I was seeing on the plans.

Ms. Gort: There are elevations on A3.1 (Ms. Muncy: That's actually just the proposed elevation, the ridge height is changing a bit. It's going up a couple feet.)

Mr. Guerra: Just a housekeeping thing, in your report you do propose an addition, because this is enlarged entry, a new bath, and new attached garage, I cannot tell if there's an attached garage there because of the color coding. Is it just storage? (Ms. Muncy: It has a garage door, but it is a garage storage area.) OK.

With no call-ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Demolition By Neglect Code Changes

Ms. Muncy presented an overview of proposed code changes that will include demolition by neglect provisions. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission support the proposed code changes?
2. Does the Commission believe the time frame within the landmarking section should be based on fifty years or older or on the Town's period of significance?
3. Does the Commission support extending the existing penalties listed in section 9-11-12 to all historic buildings instead of just landmarked buildings?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Truckey: Maybe just I'll add a couple of things to what Ellie said. Thank you, Ellie. We wanted to make sure that the Commission and Council understood this is going to affect a number of additional historic properties, not just the landmarked. This will potentially quadruple the number of properties subject to Demolition by Neglect regulations. We still think it's justified to do that because they're all historic properties, but we did want to make the Council aware of the expanded scope of this.
- Mr. Leas: So Mark that's a potential of additional landmarked structures?
- Mr. Truckey: No, this is regarding the requirement to avoid the demolition by neglect. Right now, it's only landmarked properties that we can hold to that standard. I think Ellie just mentioned it, the enforcement and penalties. We can withhold any permits for a period of one to five years depending on severity of what they're doing. We're also proposing to extend this to all historic properties and not just the landmarked properties. We think it makes a lot of sense. Regarding the period of significance, I think Ellie pointed out the pros and cons. The one obvious pro if we keep it like it is that it allows someone to voluntarily landmark their property. We've had discussions about changing our period of significance because any property that's fifty years or older is potentially eligible. But the end of our period of significance is set at 1943 because that is the end of the mining era. By leaving the landmarking to 50 years or older gives us the opportunity for someone to voluntarily landmark their structure to get some free basement density out of the deal. And we're OK with that. The flip side of that is there may be some properties out there that we may not be enamored with, like the split-level malls. At some point it's an architectural style that we look back on and John Gunson and some of these architects from that time period, that's what they were designing at that time. We can't necessarily argue just because we may not love the design.
- Ms. Propper: I'm new to this historic preservation concept and I know that you just went through some of this, but I'm a little unclear on what the practical effect of going from period of significance versus 50 years is. (Mr. Truckey: There's a lot of properties that could be eligible for landmarking if we continue the current 50 years.)
- Ms. Propper: I thought the idea would be to go back to the period of significance. (Ms. Muncy: Yeah, it's something that we're bringing to the Commission's attention to verify that this is still our goal and what we want to move forward with.)
- Ms. Propper: In the definition of stabilization. I was not clear on why you're proposing to take out repair preservation. And just saying that stabilization is providing weather protection and or bracing. Wouldn't repair for preservation include stabilization?
- Ms. Muncy: Part of it was a rewording the stabilization definition because we are expanding it really broadly, currently it only applies to landmark properties, which are mostly primary structures that people are living in and in expanding it to secondary structures, the maintenance of those structures may not include preservation or foundations in basic stabilization. Additionally, we have the "as approved by the town" as a wording in there because many secondary structures don't even have a foundation, so having them add a foundation is like an excessive level that may be harder for them to achieve. I

- think we went with weather protection and ensuring the structural integrity more broadly.
- Ms. Propper: Bracing to me just sounds like you're holding it up. As opposed to taking more structural approach.
- Mr. Truckey: Stabilization; the intent is to keep the building standing. It's not to restore or even preserve. For example, we looked at the siding last time, stabilization would not be to that extent. That would be historic preservation; at that point is to make sure that that siding is preserved as much as possible. And then we splice in similar materials. Stabilization is really keeping the building from collapsing. Bracing, making sure there is a roof on it, and drainage are important aspects.
- Mr. Leas: Number one is to maintain the roof membrane because that will determine what the walls and everything else are doing.
- Mr. Truckey: And then drainage as well. But really there's only so much we're going to be able to tell property owners. I don't think we can apply this requirement to say you have to restore this to exactly what it looked like. We want to make sure the building doesn't collapse, primarily sheds. It would apply to primary structures as well, but we don't have that issue here in town really with the primary residences. It's the sheds that we are seeing some deterioration.
- Ms. Propper: Right. And that's all we want them to do? is to hold them up? (Mr. Truckey: Hold them up. Have a roof that's going to keep the elements out and have good drainage around them.) (Ms. Muncy: If the applicant wants to do more, they're more than welcome to. This is to set the minimum.) OK.
- Mr. Truckey: And we debated about foundations, even taking it out because it seems like it's a stretch. Breck History suggested we leave it in, and I think it gives us the ability if we really have a situation where there is a foundation that's failing, there is something that we can possibly require but that would be a stretch too, because then you're talking about a significant investment in a lot of cases when you're talking about doing that.
- Mr. Giller: Totally supported think it's smart, part of the cultural landscape, but with respect to questions, could we unpack #2 a little bit? The period of significance to 1943 is clear. Previously, Peter ran us through a bunch of pictures of houses, and we looked for significance in Post World War 2, construction really 70s and 80s construction. I don't know, Steve, you were here for that; I don't know if anyone else was. To summarize that, there was some sense that the early Ski Resort history has narrowed and could be a period of significance at some point. Is there a way to use the 50 year rule but keep it tied to the seven aspects of integrity, like location, setting, significance, and association? We would get the properties that are worthwhile or have merit. (Ms. Muncy: That is the way that it currently is. For it to be eligible, it has to be at least 50 years old and then it also has like a long list of architectural, social and geographical significance that it has to potentially meet.) (Mr. Truckey: And I think those are straight from the Secretaries Standards.)
- Mr. Giller: Here's my question, should we clarify question #2 to somehow include significance, so it's not mistaken as a blanket so the application to every 50 year old building? Would that be a motion or? (Mr. Truckey: It's just a work session, so we will take your comments.)
- Mr. Leas: And more with regards to that, what is the current Councils perspective on this issue of the 1943 versus the 50 year, what's their leaning? (Mr. Truckey: We haven't had that discussion yet, specifically at Council level. We did hear a couple of comments from Council members about losing that chalet home to a scrape on Wellington Road, which I think everyone's a little disappointed about. We've heard from Breck History recently that they're interested in looking at it. Mike, it's probably been 7-8 years since we did that exercise. There's probably a lot more structures now that if we were to come back

and take a look at that would now qualify under the 50 years and be interesting to see that. When I was suggesting earlier that we might look at this later this year, I think it it's about time to do that again, just a good idea.) But what I'm hearing from you is that will weigh in on it, and Breck History will weigh in on it. And then council will take a look at what everybody's perspective is? (Mr. Truckey: Correct. It's separate from this, but if we're going to change the period of significance, you know it's going to affect property owners. A number of them. And that obviously has to be something that the Council is willing to do. This would be limiting the ability to do additions or any type of revisions to those structures. So, it's not a step that's taken lightly.)

Mr. Giller: Yeah, that is a big issue nationally, but there's also the recognition that a lot of modern architecture is significant. Doesn't necessarily mean everyone loves it, but there are a lot of beautiful buildings built in the last half of the 20th century.

Mr. Guerra: Mike pretty much asked the question that I had I've long wondered about the 50-year designation. It's a moving target, which in some ways doesn't make sense to me. Some of the houses I've built are soon eligible and that bothers me. It sounds as if the staff supports keeping it as the 50 years as opposed to the period of significance, is that correct? (Ms. Muncy: Yes.) Why?

Mr. Truckey: It gives us the opportunity to landmark some interesting building, for example like Mike has alluded to, there are some good newer buildings that are out there, including ski area chalets, that we could get a landmark out of. And landmarking is a voluntary process; that's the way it's written in our code. The land owner has to come in and do that. We see landmarking happening two ways: 1) it's owned by the town, and so the town makes the commitment to landmark, or 2) it's owned by Private Citizen and almost in every case they're coming in for a development permit. They want to do an addition or something on the back. They want to put a basement underneath it. It's the quid pro quo. They get that, we get the Landmarking designation.

Mr. Guerra: The reason I've been uncomfortable with it for years is it seems that it muddies the water of historical significance. 50 years doesn't feel historically significant to me, maybe because I'm denying my age.

Ms. Gort: The ski area is historic now and so don't we have a duty to maintain some of those unique things from the early ski years? Maybe we can look at moving the year to somewhere in the 70s. I don't know if they considered that.

Mr. Guerra: But they tore down the Berghoff building.

Mr. Guerra: I asked this question and I really thought about this a lot today. And I didn't come up with any answers. I don't quite understand it. So, what I'm looking for is staff to explain what was the thinking of fifty years? (Mr. Truckey: 50 years is the standard established in the National Park Secretary of Interior standards. So anything that's fifty years or older can be eligible.) OK. That's a great answer that that makes sense to me.

Mr. Giller: When that was established, the big preservation movement was in the 60s, following urban renewal and all the demolition, like the arch grounds in St. Louis. They leveled the most historic part of St. Louis because it was considered urban renewal. A lot of that evolved into famous landmark cases, like Penn Station being leveled; the train station, which is a beautiful stone Beaux-Art building, and built Madison Square Garden, which is no one's idea of an attractive building. There were a lot of lawsuits and legislation that led up to that. But at the time it was roughly considered to be traditional architecture pre-World War 2 versus modern architecture post World War 2. And there was a lot of debate at the time. Should it be 25 years? Should it be 50 years? Should it be 75 years? But as time marches on, the question to contemplate is a building from the 70s, significant or justifiably historic. And I think the answer is it depends if it meets one of the seven aspects of integrity. And so, the Berghoff was one of the most significant buildings, I think in a lot of ways, especially in terms of

Breck. I also think Harry Teagues Riverwalk Center is an important building, and I know some people don't like how the bathrooms function in that building. But Harry Teague's a big deal, and that's a beautiful building. That's one I could see the town landmarking at some point. Mark mentioned that gorgeous Swiss Chalet house on Wellington that just sold for a couple million and I looked at the pictures of inside and out. On the inside that that House had Swiss chalet furniture and that house had more integrity than all of us combined. Another one is the Trollhagen across from the market on Ridge Street. I think that Swiss chalet one has merit and I'd love to see that saved. There aren't a lot of examples of post-World War 2 architecture: there's some beautiful houses. In terms of public architecture, Breck is a little lacking in that, so the ones that do exist there should be some efforts to try and help the owners protect those.

Mr. Guerra: So to further my question, so I understand. If I buy a house today, that's 40 years old. I've got no restrictions on it as far as historical. Then it turns 50; can the town then tell me that I have all these restrictions on it?

Mr. Giller: Should you choose to modify.

Mr. Truckey: Yeah. So through this exercise, no. Only if you voluntarily came in and said, I want to landmark my property because it just turned 50 years old. We'll probably have a discussion later this year about the bigger issue of should that period of significance change from 1943 to include newer properties that are 50 years old. If that happened, then yes, that could be on the table, but that's a discussion for another day. But I think it was good to get it out on the table today. So, when we talk about it again, we'll all have a little bit of understanding.

Mr. Guerra: Well, that's the problem that I have with it. I've always had with it. You can buy a piece of property that you can do whatever you want with. And then ten years down the line, you're forced into a situation.

Mr. Truckey: And the other thing is we'd have to have discussions about would it just apply within the Historic District, or would we go outside? But we have to be a lot of steps on that before we get to that point.

Mr. Guerra: Great. OK. Thank you. That was my question.

Mr. Gerard: Mike is right. We had these conversations early on in my career with the Planning Commission. And one of the things that we talked about is the difference between the 50 years and the periods of significance and whether a town would have two periods of significance. That's my recollection that we talked about that and concluded that, well, yeah, we think it could. So my question leading up to that is there's other towns that are like us, Telluride, Crested Butte, probably Steamboat Springs. Have we reached out to them at all to see what they're doing about demolition by neglect? Number one. Number two, how are they viewing this period of significance? From the mining area era and from the ski era, because they are different for those, and if we haven't done that, I don't want to make more work for Ellie, that would be, that would be a good contact to make. To talk about how they're viewing this issue.

Ms. Muncy: And as far as the period of significance we, we're very preliminary about this. So we haven't talked to any other communities about that. But for demolition by neglect, I did research code examples of that and found some from several other cities and towns within Colorado to reference.

Mr. Gerard: When we had one of our ski town forums, I remember, Crested Butte was having a real problem with the demolition by neglect and just rubbing their hands waiting to be able to tear down some of the historic properties in order to rebuild. Some new monstrosity, and that was a big point of concern.

Mr. Leas: If I remember that conversation, people were waiting up to the 49th year and then jumped in and did the demo so that they wouldn't fall into that category. Is that what you remember.

- Mr. Gerard: As well as real historic buildings much older than that were really falling apart. And we're historic, but not landmarked.
- Mr. Cross: As a point of information, Crested Butte approved in their new comprehensive plan for their community a changing of their period of significance as a goal for their historic preservation.
- Ms. Gort: I have a question about providing weather protection. Why don't we say in there to provide ensure longevity for siding. And add something about drainage around it. Because we just looked at that little house in town and they were saying that the bottom of it was rotting out because they didn't have proper drainage away from it. So, if we could work something like that into it, I think that could be beneficial. And the siding to me is, is, to me the most historical because that's what you see as someone walking around in it. There's nothing mentioned in here of maintaining it, you know, like it needs to be painted so it doesn't deteriorate.
- Mr. Frechter: Could you remind me out of this expansion, quadrupling the size of these structures, how many of them are in a state of what percentage of those would you say are currently in a state of neglect? I know in your last report there were two in the worst categories who would probably need immediate work. (Ms. Muncy: There are two that are in the worst condition of potentially not being maintained at all and are in danger of collapse. And then I believe there's somewhere around 12 that are poorly maintained.) So, there would be about 14-15 that would have an immediate financial impact if this code were to be changed. (Ms. Muncy: Yes, which is like part of another facet of this. We're working on a grant program to help those.)
- Mr. Frechter: That was, yeah, that was the next question. Has the town council talked about a financial assistance program to support this? (Ms. Muncy: We haven't yet. We are still working on getting some information together for that and we'll be bringing it to a town council meeting soon.)
- Mr. Truckey: We did this briefly, touch on it with the Council and frankly, we'd have to look if all the poor condition structures would all fall under where we would be out there saying you need to stabilize this today. We still must look at that a little closer, but Breck History is going to be helping us manage that process. So, they could work with the property owner and a contractor to come up with the solutions. Then we're going to propose some type of grant program. We did hear back from at least one of those property owners; they would like to do something, and it would be nice if they had some help financially to do it.
- Mr. Frechter: Following on with what Mike and Ethan, from what I understand, property owner requesting landmarking status, the granting of the landmark status is not necessarily automatic, and it has to meet the criteria with the seven aspects of integrity? Is that correct? Who judges? Who determines? Is that Town Council? Is that your department? Is that us? (Mr. Truckey: Yeah, we do. And we'll do an evaluation of the proposal. Then we'll make a report to the Council, and it has to go through readings with the Council.)
- Mr. Gerard: And we make that recommendation too. (Mr. Truckey: Correct. Thanks Steve. That's great point. If it's a project that's going through process and they're going to get free basement density, then the landmarking is part the staff report and the Commission will weigh in.) We haven't had many recently that I think you would have been involved in, but over the years we've had several where the staff shows the findings, we think under section A1, it meets these criteria. And we've even amended the criteria that we think a landmarking fits. Then we make a recommendation to the Council that they approve the landmarking.

- Mr. Guerra: I have a continuation of my question, this has been rattling around in my brain all day. And I apologize for being thick. Why are you asking us this question? I don't understand why I'm being asked. Does the Commission believe the time frame within the landmarking section should be based on 50 years or older, or the town's period of significance? I'm sorry. (Ms. Muncy: Staff went through the current code and wanted to verify that is where we are still at. For the most part, all of the properties we landmark are within the Town's period of significance. A lot of people forget that you can landmark something outside of the Town's period of significance currently. So, we just wanted to verify with the Commission that the 50 years is still what we're thinking and what our intention is. (Mr. Truckey: We debated it a little bit ourselves internally and we talked about the pros and cons and so then based on that, we kind of thought well, let's just confirm that with the Planning Commission as well.)
- Mr. Guerra: I'm sorry again, it's been rattling around my brain all day and like well wait, is there a problem with it? Is that why we're proposing to change it? (Mr. Truckey: We are not proposing to change it. It's 50 years right now.)
- Mr. Giller: I think question #2 could be clarified a bit. But just to continue that discussion, what might be landmarked in the town that was built after 1942? (Ms. Muncy: Currently 112 S Harris St. was built in 1949, and that's a landmarked property.) Is that across from the BGV Community Center? (Ms. Muncy: Yes. The Gallagher residence.)
- Mr. Giller: Yeah, that I remember that. Another example they're looking at or the Park Service and other historic districts are looking at the cultural landscapes and what's worth preserving? There it could be an old statue. It could be the first ski lift in Breck. I don't know if that still exists. It does occur to me that those have historic significance. I know they suck in some procedure. What's that procedure? As the town considers this as to the sort of non-buildings that that might also be worth being stewards of. (Mr. Truckey: That's in here still because we're carrying over that National Park language.) (Mr. Muncy: There's landmark sites, historic districts, and cultural landscape districts as one section. So, all of those have the potential to be created within Breckenridge.)

Final Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Frechter: Before these code changes, are voted on and approved and put in motion. I think that I would recommend to town council they also have the financial assistance program in place. Otherwise, I would expect there might be a lot of backlash. So, I support the code changes now. Thanks to this work session, I am now comfortable with the rolling 50 years as long as there is that review process and it meets the seven aspects of integrity. Yes, I agree about extending the penalties. That way there's both a carrot and a stick, though. It doubles the incentive to make this happen.
- Mr. Gort: On proposed code changes, mostly with a few changes, like protecting the siding and the drainage. I think the rolling 50 years is nice. I do think they should look at changing the period of significance, maybe 2 periods of significance, but that's not asked here. Just providing my opinion on that. I'm fine with question three too.
- Mr. Gerard: I do support the code changes with the addition that Elaine said, tightening up some of that to be as inclusive of the things that go wrong resulting in the demolition by neglect. I think it's helpful to the people who are applying the code to their building what it is they need to do to keep it in as good a condition as possible. #2, I think the 50 years is there for a reason. Mike has pointed out many of those reasons and I feel comfortable that this Planning Commission, at least as far as the town of Breckenridge, is concerned, and the town council, can think about whether a building is historic or not and can make those decisions to not allow bad properties to get landmarked. But I think that there are certainly things that are outside of our period of significance as it's now declared that are well worth saving and landmarking. Extending the penalties, yes,

absolutely. And as Alan has indicated, the stick and the carrots are always the best way to go forward with this. Maybe to quote Elaine from a past meeting, most of the people who own these properties have the wherewithal to protect them. I think this is Breckenridge, and there's hardly a square foot of property that isn't extremely valuable and people have the ability to do that. But still, I think being able to say we support it with our money helps us justify putting that onerous on the people that own those properties.

Mr. Guerra: Thank you, Ellie, and everybody else for clearing up my questions that were running around in my brain. I feel much more comfortable with it now, so I do support the proposed code changes. After the discussion on #2, I believe the time frame should stay at the 50 years and not go to the Town's period of significance. And I do support extending the existing penalties. Thank you.

Mr. Giller: Yes, I do support the proposed code changes. Very nice work Mark and Ellie. Period of significance; it's a tough one. I do think the town needs to start sort of the understanding and education and interpretation of the early ski resort days and in the 1960s. I could see some limited landmarking of significant structures in that period and granting those owners the benefits of that. Yes, we absolutely should extend this to all historic buildings or sheds in the period of significance if we really seek to be stewards. Thanks.

Mr. Propper: I do support the proposed code changes. And now that we've discussed the 50 years, I do support keeping that. On extending the existing penalties, I think Alan's right that we need to have the carrot at the same time that we have the stick. But I think that the penalty needs to be a sufficient deterrent and I would want to see what that's going to be. I assume we don't have a concept yet on that, but we don't want people to just continue to let this happen. We want to encourage them to do the right thing here. I had one suggestion, just a wording suggestion on the definition of demolition by neglect. It seemed to me that 2 words were missing. So, where it's talking about maintenance repair to a point; I would add "at which" to the lack of maintenance reaches the threshold. That's it.

Mr. Leas: I agree with #1. And I agree with #3. However, with the caveat that has been discussed that Alan brought up that we have some incentive which is probably a Town Council issue. And #2, I wrestle with a little bit, and I think that Mike's discussion about the history of this whole process. Those of us who are older remember what happened during the 60s, and I watched it happen in Washington, DC, where urban renewal came through and developers tore down entire neighborhoods. They tore down the entire city of Rockville and all the historic buildings that were in it. And I could go on and on with examples of what happened up and down the east coast. It was an important movement when people said wait a minute, we're losing something significant here to our history. It didn't come as a tremendous hardship to the developers, who then learned to incorporate these historical elements into what they were doing and as a result of that, we ended up with some really nice historic buildings preserved in Washington. We have some historic facades that were preserved, and buildings were built behind those facades to accommodate the need for office space and residential space. And the whole problem once they went back to the drawing board turned out to be a big benefit because of the push for historic preservation. I think it's really important that we take this into consideration in the context of what we're trying to consider here. The 50 years versus the period of significance, the period of significance is kind of arbitrary because we don't have a definition of that, but I think that terminology. Along with the understanding of the importance of the history of this place can be perhaps a foundation for making future decisions and refining this definition at some point in the future to get a better understanding of everybody that needs to deal with us.

- Mr. Truckey: Just a couple of things. To Allen's and a couple of other points, we're going to bring this to the Town Council on March 12th. We're also going to at the same time bring that grants program to them. We hope that by the time probably before this is adopted, we'll know what we're going to do with those grants and hopefully we'll have something available soon. We can have both the carrot and the stick there at the same time. And then secondly, I just wanted to recognize Ellie has done an exemplary job on this and just lots of good research.
- Mr. Leas: Mark, I have one question that just came up as we're talking about current restrictions on demolition. I go back to the project that we looked at last time, that little shed house. As I look at it, that building is really in a difficult place. Financially there's not the motivation to preserve it because the owner is going to have to put too much money into it. If they sell it, the purchaser is also going to have to put a huge amount of money into it. So sometimes I think that the good judgment of the town needs to be we need to let somebody who has a good plan to create something there that resembles the history would be able to demo that before it completely goes away. Because it doesn't have a lot of historic significance, other than the fact that it's been there.
- Mr. Truckey: Yeah, that's a tough one. I think it still meets our criteria, it still meets that significance. But I totally understand what you're saying in terms of the financial challenges. I thought about where you are going to go and what I think of as maybe there's some places like that where we might consider extending the grant program at some time for situations like that.
- Mr. Leas: But the grant would be really significant, like in excess of \$1,000,000 and I don't see the town doing that. That's the point I'm making. When it gets to the point where the financial investment is prohibitive for either the existing owner or somebody to buy it, then what does the town do with this thing that's going to sit there. Eventually it's going to transfer hands because that woman may pass and pass the property back to her kids, but still the problem doesn't go away. I'm just bringing it up not for a solution, but I'm trying to point out a potential problem that the town and the regulations may end up wrestling within the future as we try to be cognizant of historic preservation.
- Ms. Gort: I have to say something. I think the property like that has huge historic significance because it shows the transformation of something into a living dwelling during a period of time when times were hard. I respectfully have the opposite view of you on that place. I think the people who own it don't realize how much of a gem it is historically. Maybe if they're not in the financial position to maintain it or at least keep the site protected, then they need to let it go to someone else who does.
- Mr. Guerra: I would say I think what Mark was getting at and I will echo it. Because we were discussing this that property. Because where it sits, it's theoretically worth a lot of money. But it's not really because anybody who can't afford it doesn't make financial sense for them to restore. And selling it, who's going to buy that? What kind of return can you get?
- Mr. Frechter: I think there are people out there for how much density you can add above and then add below. Hire Janet Sutterley. I think someone would go for it.
- Mr. Guerra: I'd also like to add to your comment, Elaine, that it has historical significance because it was changed into a dwelling unit. Is that part of the actual criteria? We can think it or feel it, but we always have to go back to what is written about what makes something historically significant.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.

Mark Leas, Chair