



## Planning & Development Services

Boise City Hall, 2nd Floor  
150 N. Capitol Boulevard  
P. O. Box 500  
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Phone: 208/384-3830  
Fax: 208/384-3753  
TDD/TTY: 800/377-3529  
Website: [www.cityofboise.org/pds](http://www.cityofboise.org/pds)

# Historic Preservation Commission

## Hearing Minutes of May 12, 2008

Commission Members Present Jennifer Stevens, Chair, Scott Chandler, Cathy Sewell, Barbara Dawson, Betsy McFadden, Bonnie Burry, Stephen Smith, Katherine Forsythe

Members Present Sarah Schafer, Julie Archambeault, Teresa Sobotka, Nicki Heckenlively

---

### **DRH08-00107 / Anika Smulovitz / 916 E. State Street**

Requests Historic Preservation approval to construct a rear addition with unfinished basement on property located in an R-2H (Combined Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

**JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT:** Presented the staff report with a recommendation of Approval with the condition that the lot coverage will not exceed 33%.

**COMMISSIONER DAWSON:** Does the 33% proposed include either one or all of the storage buildings that are to the rear?

**JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT:** Staff did not do any calculations or figuring so getting rid of one of the storage buildings might be a way to bring the lot coverage down. That would be fine. Tightening up the addition itself would be a way to do it. Staff did include all of the storage buildings when figuring in the lot coverage.

**COMMISSSIONER McFADDEN:** This is more or less a typographical error...on Page 1 of the staff report there may have been a cut and paste issue there.

**JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT:** Yes there is. The legal on the first page was incorrect. I believe the legal on every other page is correct.

**COMMISSIONER McFADDEN:** Okay.

**CHAIRMAN STEVENS:** For the public's awareness if anybody's following along on Item 2, on that front cover page the first sentence under summary is incorrect.

## SITE VISITS

Commissioners Dawson, Chandler, Stevens, McFadden and Burry visited the site prior to the hearing. Commissioners Sewell, Smith and Forsythe did not visit the site.

CHAD VINCENT (Applicant's Architect / Representative / Renaissance Remodeling): We do have a lot coverage issue. We have worked hard on this project to figure out how to get these homeowners into a better situation with their home. They have a small child and they are currently in a two-bedroom. I know it says three-bedroom on the Ada County Assessor's site, but it's a two-bedroom, one-bath home without a real laundry room. We really tried to minimize what we were doing here. We have a 336 sq. ft. addition going on here with very little waste. We do have a hallway that takes up about 40 sq. ft. that we could probably redo the whole addition to gain that 40 sq. ft. but it's...as you can note on the addition it's because we're eliminating a back door and are having to recreate another back door so there's a double entrance into that back addition. We feel that we've really minimalized the affect that we're trying to do. I did visit with Julie at first and I talked to these people about doing a second story addition because of the lot coverage and it was relayed to me that was probably was never going to be approved just because of the situation. We went back to a rear addition. We did the calculations based on the Ada County Assessor's site to come up with an addition that was under 34%. When I did the final measurements for these plans the Ada County Assessor's site did not have the smallest of the storage units in there which is about 80 sq. ft. If we took that out we were right where we needed to be. We're differing on the percentages. I've done this a thousand times trying to get it into my head where exactly that we're at, but basically we're doing a very small master suite addition. Part of the issue...note that the bathroom is very basic at 5 ft. deep. The bedroom is very basic at 12 ft. wide. The closet and the stairs that you'll note in there...one of the things that we're going to have to do with the basement is when we touch those stairs we have to bring them up to code. Since that back area has no room...the stair right now are basically a ladder to get down so we had to put code stairs in there which if we ate from the closet we did not add to the addition much, but we ate from that closet, bathroom and the bedroom and this will create a three-bedroom, two-bath house and we feel very confident that we've done a very thorough job in trying to figure out how to do it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You're saying if I'm hearing you correctly, that the applicant would rather eliminate one of the storage buildings and maintain the floor plan that you have?

CHAD VINCENT: We need to retain the floor plan that we have because there's really not room to take any room out of it. The way that we've designed it on the west side of the lot really gives them the widest open space on the east side of the lot. There are trees there that we're not taking down. We're not changing anything there. It's basically going over the current deck that they have now. It's just covering that deck. That's an option we can do. We don't want to do that. The house has no storage to begin with. If you took anyone of those buildings...it's a one-car garage at best is the biggest building there. They would rather not do that, but at last option we would. We did look all around

the property. We noted how many homes had been remodeled recently and how many were...I looked at percentages of almost every home within a four block radius and they vary all over the place from...I looked at 21 homes in that area. There was one that I chose that was larger compared to their lot like what we would be doing and there was one under 30%. Six from 31% - 33%. Four home from 36% - 39%. Eight over 40% and two over 66%. What we're trying to do isn't...there just small lots. They don't have a lot of choices. We can't go up in this neighborhood. We have to do it on the first floor. If we reduce the footprint of the addition and did not change anything else we couldn't get a master suite in there with an exterior door. A 250 sq. ft. addition is what we could put on there if we didn't change anything. I don't know if we could all measure our bedrooms, but they're over 250 sq. ft. It just doesn't work very well in that neighborhood. We have tried very hard to...I understand that it's more than normal.

CHAIRMAN STEVENS: Julie, in your staff report you wrote, "With a repurposing of the space". Was your suggestion mainly to get rid of that 40 sq. ft. hallway?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: That was the main idea.

CHAIRMAN STEVENS: If we did that...

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: And shrink that bathroom and the closet a bit.

CHAIRMAN STEVENS: Which still wouldn't bring us down to the 33% that you're recommending? Do you have any other thoughts?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: I don't.

CHAD VINCENT: Julie and I did speak about that and she did suggest that if we redesigned it we might be able to get less square feet of an addition. My clients enjoy their yard and that side of looking north out of their lot. In redesigning it we would have to switch everything around and that extra door would really be...we'd still have to have a hallway there. We still have to have an exterior door. There's no other spot. We did talk about that and I do understand the situation fully. We just don't see another way around getting even a small addition.

#### NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

#### PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

Commissioner Chandler: I'm sitting here playing with my calculator and just looking at the square footage that the addition comprises and what it would do as far as trying to achieve what Staff has recommended. Right now the addition is 24 ft. by 14 ft. 4 inches as I read the plans on Page 20. To bring it from the 36% as proposed down to 33% would make that addition 14 ft. 4 inches by 14 ft. which essentially you'd have the bedroom at a little bit larger than it is now 12 ft. by 14 ft. 4 inches, but you're eliminating pretty much everything else in order to achieve the lot coverage which given what the

applicant has to do with the stairwell would be fairly difficult to do so all you would be gaining is the bedroom and eliminating the rest of the addition or you'd end up with the rest of the addition and no bedroom. This addition is entirely on the rear portion of a long narrow lot and after looking at it from the street I do not see how this addition will be at the least bit visible from the street so consequently the increase in the lot coverage while it is beyond what is recommended will not be at all perceptible as far as anybody viewing from the right-of-way so consequently I would support the applicant as it is presented even though it is exceeding the lot coverage slightly. The applicant is putting forth a relatively modest addition onto a relatively modest home and I do not feel that it will be at all detrimental to the District by been slightly larger than what the recommended lot coverage would be.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL MOVED TO APPROVE DRH08-00107 AS SUBMITTED PER SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL DELETING 1.A. AND THAT THE LOT COVERAGE WILL REMAIN AS SUBMITTED.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER BURRY: I agree with Commissioner Chandler. I think the fact that this addition hugs the one side of the property leaving the other with what lawn they have left more open is really good. The other consideration is that you really cannot see it from the street. It's like they're really doing nothing so I fully support this.

ROLL CALL VOTE 8:0. MOTION CARRIES.