

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DOWNTOWN RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY KICKOFF MEETING MINUTES
February 12, 2025
City Hall – Conference Room #6**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Walter Burns, (Chair)
Anneliese Miller, (Vice Chair)
Doug Harro
Sandy Emerson
Shannon Sardell
Dan McCracken
Stephen Shepperd

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director
Traci Clark, Admin. Assistant

Commissioners Absent:

Anne Anderson, (Secretary)
Rick Shaffer

12:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Burns at 12:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Bill Breese introduced himself and stated he is here from the Hayden Historic Preservation Commission. He would like to make it a point to come to these meetings, so he could learn more about the process.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Chairman Burns introduced Dan Everhart and Alexis Matrone from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). They are here for the kickoff meeting today with our consultant Diana Painter.

He would like the members to start thinking of preservation month which will be in May. He would like to have a subcommittee and have the commissioners volunteer for that item.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Ms. Patterson, Community Planning Director, provided the following comment:

- There will be a regular HPC meeting on February 26, at noon.

ONGOING PROJECTS:

Downtown Reconnaissance Survey Kickoff

Chairman Burns introduced Diane Painter as the consultant who will be working on the Downtown Reconnaissance Survey. He noted that Ms. Painter, Commissioner Shepperd, Ms. Patterson, and he drove around this morning to look at the survey area.

Ms. Patterson noted that the agreement with Ms. Painter and SHPO calls for the boundaries of the survey area to be refined. The consultant, Commission and staff would like help from SHPO to further refine the boundaries of the survey area and get a feel of the scope of work. Ms. Patterson noted that the contract

says "at least 200 properties" will be surveyed, but there are more than 200 in the boundary. So, the survey area needs to be reduced. Ms. Patterson outlined a possible way to reduce the survey area based on what they saw on the drive. For example, it might be more realistic to cut off chunks of the survey area just based on some changes that have happened with the Johnston Building and Momos being demolished. Instead of capturing some of the buildings and going all the way to 1st Street, they thought maybe we can start at 2nd Street and go north from there. We were trying to figure out our northern boundary - if we wanted to go to Indiana or Wallace on the north side or if we wanted to just look at the alley north and Coeur d'Alene Avenue as the northern boundary. On the south, we thought instead of including the properties along Front Avenue because all of them are new except for the Roxy Theater just south of the alley that this could probably be done as an individual nomination at a later date, and if we stopped at the alley here, we could reduce the number of buildings quite a bit as well.

Chairman Burns stated we need to decide if we are going past 8th Street or not because there's a Motel there from the 50's and 60's era. We need to keep Ms. Painter's area continuous. The 200 buildings we want are the area that are most important. He would like to start at the south end and move north. Everything along Sherman up to Second Street is important.

Mr. Everhart suggested adding the bank on Front Avenue and the Roxy theater on the other side of the street.

Ms. Patterson replied that the group did want SHPO's input on whether or not to include the Roxy building or stop at the alley.

Commissioner McCracken asked would it save Ms. Painter time and does that actually save us that much time to cut out a bunch of areas that's mostly new buildings?

Ms. Painter suggested that it would be best to cut out an area if it makes the survey boundary clean. For example, if you could remove the new buildings, and keep a continuous boundary. You're going to have to have a phase two because of the number of buildings in the Downtown, so some areas can be surveyed at a later date. You have to figure out a productive way to divide it up.

Ms. Patterson asked Mr. Everhart if the boundary should include everything on Front Avenue and then clip out more properties from the north and west.

Mr. Everhart suggested including these two or three older properties to the intersection of Fourth Street and Front Avenue. Those are older properties. You need to make a line that cuts through the alley between Front and Sherman, but also sort of just quarter that block and come down and make a clean intersection on the north. In this Phase One, we should incorporate most of what you would consider the commercial heart of the city. As we get up to the north at the top of the map, further north towards Wallace, Garden and Indiana – it seems to get a little spotty. If the City wants to draw lines to reflect the fact that we cannot afford to survey everything at once even if it's commercially zoned, that is what he would suggest. As a visitor when he drives through Downtown Coeur d'Alene, he considers Sherman, Lakeside and even Coeur d'Alene Avenue to be the Downtown area. Once you get on the north side of Coeur d'Alene Avenue you get to this weird zone in between residential and commercial and maybe even slightly industrial. He doesn't disagree that there are commercial properties along 4th Street north of Coeur d'Alene Avenue, but they don't feel like they are part of the Downtown District.

Chairman Burns stated he agrees that Coeur d'Alene Avenue and Indiana Avenue should be the boundary.

Mr. Patterson would like to determine if First Street or Second Street should be the western boundary?

Mr. Everhart would like to speak up regarding the public housing on First Street. SHPO has determined that this building is eligible to be listed individually. This is a tower – the first high rise in Coeur d'Alene – and because of the public housing and it started to grow the skyline back in 1974. He is just pointing out

that it's already been determined eligible. Now whether or not there's a reason to include that whole block in the survey, he doesn't know. If you find yourself having lopped off the top half of the district and you are not yet at the 200 properties, then why not just be comprehensive in going down to First Street. If on the other hand, there is still too many on the pile, then make yours meet Second Street. He thinks you've probably had internal conversations about this but he has had several conversations at SHPO. The property at Lakeside and Third Street, which I know no one's suggesting that we don't cover with the survey, but the former Depot at Lakeside Avenue and Third Street has been the subject of several conversations with the property owner and with others. He assumes there's no question that will be part of the survey area. Maybe the warehouses might have been associated with the rail corridor which you can sort of faintly see on the map even though there are no tracks there anymore.

Ms. Patterson asked about the Coeur d'Alene Resort Plaza Shops and removing those. They have been remodeled a few times over the years.

Mr. Everhart stated the Coeur d'Alene Resort and the Resort properties are sort of their own thing. They have their own historic context and sooner rather than later unless there's a major alteration to the tower, they're going to be eligible. I'd say leave them as their own thing.

Chairman Burns asked for further clarification from SHPO. Except for the apartment building on First Street, do you think it is appropriate to start at Second St.?

Mr. Everhart commented it depends on how many properties are encapsulated in the alley to alley configuration.

Chairman Burns asked about the Allied Welding building. It's historical and industrial.

Ms. Patterson stated this would be outside the boundary and would maybe be part of the Phase Two survey area.

Chairman Burns suggested it feels like part of downtown. We're talking about cutting out north and cutting off both sides of Coeur d'Alene Avenue and going from First Street to Eighth Street. Is that correct?

Ms. Patterson suggested to jog down the eastern boundary because of the way the map is drawn. We need to determine if this was included in the Garden District Survey area or not.

Mr. Everhart replied he does not think it was. He knows that the library/law office was definitely in the Garden District. He doesn't know about the properties on the west side of Seventh Street.

Ms. Patterson asked if we discover we have the ability to add some more properties, should we do all of the properties on Front Avenue on the north side just so that it's cohesive?

Mr. Everhart replied yes it makes sense. They are all newer properties.

Ms. Patterson said they wanted to make sure because there were a couple of properties when we were doing the Garden District that we wanted to include, but the National Park Service did not like that the two properties were outside the boundaries.

Mr. Everhart replied ultimately that we have to remember that this documentation of Downtown is to support the possibility of a later National Register Nomination for Downtown. While it would be nice to have the survey be comprehensive, these properties fronting Front Avenue are not going to contribute. If the ultimate goal is a nomination and we just can't squeeze these in, then he thinks this is what the commission should do. He suggests removing the area north of Indiana Avenue and really focusing on properties that have integrity. What we're really trying to do is whittle down to an eligible district. If you end up with a little less than 200 properties, then maybe you capture a few properties on the far west end.

Chairman Burns stated it seems to him that we can start on Sherman and just moved north until we run

out of numbers.

Ms. Patterson asked Mr. Everhart how SHPO made a determination of the public housing being individually eligible.

Mr. Everhart replied it came to us as a Section 106 review. It is presumably there's some sort of federal funding or federal permitting associated with it. In fact, it might have even been a cell tower - an array at the top of the building - that might have triggered the review. It was a couple years ago and he thinks right then the building was 49 years old. The initial inventory dismissed it as not significant simply because it hadn't officially met the 50-year benchmark but we disagreed with the consultant on that and we said you're three months from the "50-year" age of this property and for these associations with public housing for its role in changing or beginning to change the skyline of the city, we found it eligible for those reasons. It doesn't need to be included in this district but it is an interesting development and change in the city's built environment and it helps to say this out loud. We don't have to think things are pretty for them to be historic or significant. We may in fact think they're ugly and they can still be significant. What matters is whether or not we can find some context under which it has value and if it does or does not retain any of its architectural character and he thinks for those reasons previously stated it does.

Chairman Burns stated we have determined we're going on both sides of Coeur d'Alene Avenue and from First Street to Eighth Street on the east side, capturing both sides of Sherman Avenue, and going to the alley to the south of Sherman, capturing the buildings on Front Avenue and Fourth Street.

Ms. Patterson stated there will be a public outreach in March with the neighbors at the Community Library with Q&A.

Mr. Everhart stated that he would like to be present for that meeting. This would be helpful for Ms. Painter to provide maybe 15-20 minutes presentation and then open it up for questions.

Ms. Patterson suggested inviting the neighbors and reaching out and inviting the Downtown Association and business and putting an article in the newspaper and social media. This will help get the word out.

Chairman Burns asked Ms. Painter if she is happy with what they have discussed today and if she has any questions.

Ms. Painter replied she was concerned about the boundary and she wanted to know, or get a sense of how people were familiar with the process. It sounds like from doing the Garden District that you've got a fresh lesson in your mind about how the process works. If we target what Mr. Everhart was saying about the public info meeting, which would be pretty soon, she thinks she can get the job done.

Mr. Everhart stated he wanted to talk about the role of the commission and your work as volunteers. He wants them to be careful not to overwhelm Ms. Painter with the obvious experience and knowledge around this table and figure it out as we move forward. Perhaps there's some way for you to convey your knowledge about some of these historic properties to Ms. Painter and maybe figure out how to collect some of that knowledge and present it to her. Maybe put it in a format that has some detailed information that she can just sort of cut and paste into the forms and at the same time you're keeping track of your time because that's part of your in-kind match, which I presume you're tracking here. She will not be digging into a lot into the history of the buildings. He thinks that this would be useful to provide a way to augment the documentation that Ms. Painter is tasked with because she is not tasked with detailed historic research.

Ms. Patterson wanted to point out during the Garden District survey that this commission did the nomination step and not the survey. It was a little bit different. If the public's worried, we're just evaluating properties at this point. This is not even for the national register nomination. That might be in the future or it might be a local district or something but it's really just for evaluating certain resources.

Ms. Painter stated that she will basically follow the template for providing documentation on each building in the survey area. She would like information on the building that was part of the story. That's something that would be part of your general background. Although you do have a good context already. One thing She did in Walla Walla when she did the National Register district for the heart of the district from the beginning of time because it used to be an Indian trail crossing the water. It never changed. She so impressed by that cities almost always change but in Walla Walla, it is still the heart of the city

Mr. Everhart replied the fact that this brick building built in 1920 was predated by a frame building, and that frame building housed a laundry for these two years but then before that it was an ice cream shop. This type of information is not going to be useful.

TRACKING TIME:

Chairman Burns reminded the commission to track their time.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Commissioner McCracken, seconded by Commissioner Shepperd, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

Submitted by Traci Clark, Administrative Assistant