



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

Historic Preservation Commission

Worksession / Hearing Minutes of July 28, 2008

Commission Members Christopher Pooser, Chairman, Scott Chandler, Cathy Sewell, Barbara Dawson, Stephen Smith, Betsy McFadden

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

DRH08-00230 / Pat Bronken / 1601 N. 21st Street

Requests Historic Preservation approval to remodel the structure including but not limited to converting the garage to living space, relocating the front door, add on to the front and rear of the main dwelling, construct a chimney, construct a basement, construct a single-story, single-car garage and remove a tree on property located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: Presented the staff report with a recommendation of approval of the rear addition, basement, detached garage and the addition of the chimney and denial of the changes to the front door, front porch, garage, removal of the tree and additions to the front façade.

Since the packets went out I have received many e-mails supporting the application.

- Gary Reedy / *In support of the project.*
- Peavey Smith / *"The addition will improve the property and will help the day care business.*
- Liza Allis / *"It's a minimal 66 sq. ft. addition. The new entryway will help the parents of children that she takes care as they're coming into the house to drop of their children...giving them more room. The kitchen will be large so that the kids can help her do cooking activities. The basement will make more space for her family".*
- Debowden & Greg Bauer / *"The improvement will benefit her and the use of her home and are true to the neighborhood's character and current uses."*

- Gary Weiner / *“The new entryway will allow for easier dropping off and picking up of the children and a larger kitchen which will allow for easier cooking for and with the children. Space in the basement is for her children.”*
- Tracy Day / *“My daughter is one of her students. The small entryway and kitchen are problems to the business and working with the children and this will help that”. Only 66 sq. ft. will be added to the home and it will be a much more functional space for Pat, her students and her family.”*

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Can you show me the tree to be removed?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: It is here in the path of the driveway?

CHAIRMAN POOSER: This is showing a squarish window. Do you know the shape of the current window?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: I am sure it is a square window, but it is currently covered with ivy.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What are the proposed dimensions of the dining area and the garage?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: Internal dimensions of the addition? The addition is 4 ft. 6 inches forward.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Then the garage portion?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: That is 1 ft. 6 inches.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: With the proposed garage would that require a new curb cut?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: I believe they are using the alley.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: So there would be no new curb cut?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: That is correct.

SITE VISITS

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I noted the front of the residence.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I drove both streets and took note of the existing garage and where the additions are proposed to go.

COMMISSIONER POOSER: I viewed from both the street side and took note of the changes proposed to the front and rear of the home.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: I drove the alley and both streets paying particular attention to the changes on the front façade.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I noted the locations where the changes were to occur.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I noted the front façade compared to the proposal and the tree to be remove.

GREG DENMARK (Applicant's Representative): No objections to the Commissioners visiting the site. I will address each of these individually. I want to bring up the question about the front porch change. There is no front porch change other than the front door moving. The front door, with the way the house is situated, Page 18...right now when you go in the front door you are in the living room. We are trying to make the existing dining room into a gathering area. It isn't just for the children that come and visit. It's for function. The house itself is only 830 sq. ft. and I'm trying to make a designated area for the living room. The kitchen itself is in where the proposed dining area is now and it is a very small kitchen. It's a half-sized kitchen. It has a half-sized dishwasher, a three burner oven, a reduced sized refrigerator so it's not a very functional kitchen for anybody. Let alone somebody that runs a daycare. The proposed kitchen going in the dining area...the main reason we're putting it over there is just to keep the flow of the home and not put a big addition out the rear and not have the flow go through the house. Keeping a garage door on the front of the kitchen, while it might maintain some of the aesthetics is really not very functional. It wouldn't allow for insulation, it wouldn't allow for upper cabinets, a sink or anything along those lines. The dining room itself is low. The reason why we're proposing that 18 inches move forward is to raise it enough to have the floor all on the same level. The removal of the tree...if nobody wants to do that it's not a problem. It's been a nuisance tree. It's right on the sidewalk. It's broken multiple times...it's actually taken out a couple of the trees that are in the right-of-way and ACHD has had to come and replace those. Originally we were going to have the driveway go into the curb cut and whatnot and that was mainly for the removal of the tree. We chose not to do that. The front façade...structurally the gable ends are maintaining the same. That one where it's all covered in ivy right now...yes, it does get a tad bigger. Mainly it's moving forward, but it's going to be identical as far as all the same materials. In fact we'll probably use all the same gable end features and the window that's in there underneath that is a 3040. It's just covered in Ivy so you can't really see it. We're taking a window about that size and putting in the location of the garage door and removing the concrete strips in the yard and turning that into just a front yard. It seems like we're proposing a lot by saying that we're adding on to the front and the rear of the main dwelling but it's very minimal. Structurally it stays the same. Where the window is there will be a door and where the door is...it'll get framed in but at the same time it will still be there in case somebody ever did want to put it back to its original location. They could always pop it out and put the door back in.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I am a little confused about the existing door.

GREG DENMARK: Where you see the big window...that is the only living space in the house. The only place where you can put the sofa and the TV. This allows that to become a living room without the traffic in and out of it.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: It appears there are some setback issues....are you going in for a variance on that?

GREG DENMARK: Yes. We will go in for the 3 ft. 6 inch setback on the side where the garage is now. We'll come forward 1 ft. 6 inches so I'll have to get a variance for that and also on the rear where the stairwell going to the basement is.

COMMISSIONER POOSER: You'll have to get a variance for the side setback?

GREG DENMARK: Yes, that side setback is at 3 ft. 6 inches.

NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: Structurally they may be small additions, but you can see in the plans how currently that smaller gable that comes out here will pop out to where it's almost even with this. We're going to lose the garage door here and then the door is going to change position. The house is going to look radically different from what it looks like today. It's such a unique structure and such a good example of a Tudor style so to go from that to something where these two elements are almost full in (*inaudible*) and this is no longer a garage...the house will no longer be contributing after this project is done and the lot is a fairly large lot and there are other things that could be done to the house that would not affect the front in such a radical manner.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Are all the proposed changes to the front, would each of them individually render the house noncontributing? If you just took them one at a time would those in and of themselves render it noncontributing?

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: I never considered it like that. Certainly each one of them brings the historic integrity of the structure...it's going to take a hit every...changing the door is a big deal. Bringing the secondary gable out to the front and making it almost equal with the primary gable is a big deal. Removing the garage doors is a big deal. It's hard to say without seeing a picture, but certainly each one by itself would be very damaging to the historic integrity of the structure.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

GREG DENMARK: Julie mentioned that the lot is big and it is but it also has a lot of very mature trees so it would not be allowed to move backwards. That Sycamore itself...the root ball alone probably covers most of that backyard. By adding any addition to the back would probably kill that tree. As far as the date that it says on the staff report that the house was built...it says 1936 when in actuality it wasn't actually constructed until after World War II. We have pictures showing that. I understand it's the style of the home but it was built in multiple places in the North End and other people have the same house without the garage on it and it still maintains that same look. I don't think it changes it that much. Moving that one dormer forward doesn't change anything in the sense that it's not changing room pitches. We're not changing

materials or anything along those lines. We're just asking to move it forward to get a little bit of square footage out of the deal. I understand that moving the front door is in questions but at the same time everywhere I've read it says that the front door should be located adjacent to the street. It is somewhat confusing to not see the front door from the street when you see that from most every other house in the North End.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: I'm seeing a discrepancy in the photos verses what I interpret are the proposed from elevations.

GREG DENMARK: The ridgeline?

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Yes, on the front. When I look at the proposed front elevation the gable that would be moving out is not a whole lot smaller than the existing one. When I look at the photo there's a substantial difference in size. We're not reducing the size of the larger one?

GREG DENMARK: No. In fact, the ridgeline is off on these drawings. These side elevations...the roof pitch is actually at a 12/12 and the front gables and the rear gables are all at a 16/12 and I'll make that adjustment when I do the working drawings to show that the ridgeline will actually be less. That main gable will not get touched a bit. That smaller one does get a tad bigger in width.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: How about height?

GREG DENMARK: It goes up about 8 inches to get to the same eave line as the rest of the house. Right now it's lower.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm not a contractor nor an architect but I have to think there is some way where that garage door can be retained and some sort of a false wall built between the current garage door and the new developed soon to be kitchen that would maintain the look of the garage without actually functioning as a garage. I've seen too many garage conversions in my day. Most of which are bad.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: This is the first time since I've been on the Commission that anybody has ever wanted to take out a front loading garage. There's been some objection to it. Usually it's the other way around with someone wanting to put one in where it's not appropriate. That's the only one thing I do find difficult to deal with. I fully understand and in most cases agree with Staff's thoughts. However, at the same time what is presented to us as far as a proposed home...if it were completed as proposed one would be hard pressed in the future to say that it's lost any of its integrity compared to what previously was there. I'd like to think that painting the garage door would be worthwhile although it's going to look a little strange if those parking strips are removed to have a garage door there especially since it would be logical that some sort of landscaping would be in front of it. As far as the front door it would be very nice to retain it but I can certainly see the reason for moving it. This is a very small house and for the

usability of the interior space it does make a lot of sense for what the applicant is proposing. I'm torn between wanting to side with Staff completely on this and wanting to side with the applicant completely. I'd like to hear some other thoughts on this.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: This gets back to my question from the previous application in regard to whether the City or the Commission wants to try and retain the historic integrity and historic resources of properties in the North End. Particularly ones that have not had any work done to them and are contributing, but also to maintain the historic integrity on that particularly character defining façade. As much as I think that what is proposed could be consider congruous with the District as far as setbacks, materials, texture, bulk, mass...this application certainly meets that. It's the question of whether or not we can lose that integrity. I obviously have some dilemmas with that. We certainly see it all the time, but it certainly sees that alley from what applicants want from even what City Council has indicated that it's providing...livable, viable, North End neighborhoods rather than preserving actual historic resources.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: My personal view on that question is that the North End is an evolving neighborhood. It has been an evolving neighborhood for the last 100 plus years and I hope it continues to evolve. As our society and lifestyles change our housing needs have changed. I personally view the changes that have been suggested to this home while they will change the character defining elements of the home are done consistently and they are congruous with our guidelines in my view. I would vote in approval of the application. I'm not concerned about the garage doors. I understand that it is a unique feature to this home. However, I believe there was testimony in the packet from the applicant that the garage is no longer useable. It was built for a time and it is not useable. I don't really see the futility of retaining the garage doors when it's going to be a kitchen. I do not have a problem with that change. As far as the change to the middle of the façade that is now to be the dining room...I don't have a problem with that. The form is similar if not almost identical to what is there. I'm having a little bit of heartburn over the front door because that...everything else as far as form is the same. The front door is a big change, but I'll probably get past it.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I concur with Chairman Pooser's thoughts on this. I side with Staff in that I see what they're saying about the garage doors and that's probably the one thing that gives me the most cause for reflection. I also agree with Commissioner Chandler that we've been working really hard to get some of these driveways out of front yards and now we're saying they can't take them out so that's a catch-22 there anyway. From my standpoint I feel that I can support this application as it is submitted. I would like to save that tree unless there is an arborist reason for taking it out. If it's sick or a hazard then it certainly it should come out otherwise if it can stay let's leave it. Other than that I support this application.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Taking what seems to be an unusual view from me I actually support Staff's suggestions in this case. I have serious trouble with the changes to the front of the house. The utility and the look of the garage can be maintained. It's something very unique in the neighborhood. A kitchen can be made out of that so I would vote to uphold Staff's denial of the changes in the front.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE DRH08-00230 AS PRESENTED WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE ELM TREE WILL NOT BE REMOVED UNLESS A PROFESSIONAL ARBORIST RENDERS A DECISION THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE WITH ITS LOCATION BEING CLOSE TO THE SIDEWALK WHICH MAY PRESENT A PROBLEM.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL VOTE 3:3. MOTION DIES DUE TO LACK OF MAJORITY.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The applicant brought out something that I had not noticed in my visit nor when I initially looked at these drawings and renderings. I did not realize at the time that I looked at everything until tonight that the eaves on this Ivy covered addition were significantly lower than the eaves throughout the rest of the house and that the application drawings proposed to raise those eaves up to the level of the other existing eaves...that really bothers me as a character defining façade.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: If they lowered the eaves would you be in support of the application?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I still like that garage door.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Was that a yes or a no?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No. However, I might support something that lowered the eaves and kept the garage door.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Can we possibly suggest a deferral? I don't think we're that far away from a workable solution.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: The door seems to be a big issue. I'm not a contractor, but I don't see the futility of saving the doors when it's no longer a garage. I understand the aesthetics of it. They're beautiful doors but this is no longer a garage.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We have a lot of fireplaces that no longer function as fireplaces but we still keep the chimneys.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: That's a little different. You can't park a car in there and it's going to be a kitchen. From an architectural standpoint is that doable? Can we keep the doors and still have a functioning kitchen?

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: You could build a false wall behind the doors or build the doors themselves being a false front with something else behind it. It could be a bit of a challenge to make it work right but it certainly can be done. I agree with you that it looks strange because you're likely going to have vegetation in front of it in the future but it can be done. I wonder also the feasibility and I don't disagree with Commissioner Dawson's observations regarding the lower eaves on the gable coming out. I'm not sure how that would

work from a design standpoint. It probably could be achieved some how or other but certainly would work better as far as emulating the existing construction.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: It appears that they're just bringing those walls straight out. It doesn't seem like the eaves would need to change at all on that gable. That might be a drafting deal. Maybe that's part of the problem. The roof isn't drafted correctly anyway. I didn't notice that until Commissioner Chandler pointed it out that the gable to the far left goes all the way and meets the ridge of the main gable.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE DRH08-00230 AS PRESENTED WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT THE PROPOSED DINING AREA RETAIN THE EXISTING EAVE HEIGHTS AND THAT THE GARAGE DOORS BE RETAINED IN SOME FASHION AS FAR AS THE EXTERIOR OF THE AREA THAT IS GOING TO BE MOVED OUT WITH THE PROPOSED KITCHEN. THE ELM TREE SHOWN TO BE REMOVED SHALL NOT BE REMOVED UNTIL AN ARBORIST HAS MADE A DETERMINATION THAT IT'S IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE PROPERTY THAT IT BE REMOVED.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL VOTE 3:3. MOTION FAILS DUE TO LACK OF MAJORITY.

COMMISSIONER SMITH MOVED TO DEFER DRH08-00230 UNTIL AUGUST 25, 2008 TO GIVE STAFF AND THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO WORK TOGETHER AND COME UP WITH A PLAN THAT CAN GET A MAJORITY OF THE COMMISSION.

TERESA SOBOTKA (Legal): You can defer, but you have to give specific guidance on what you want to see during the deferral. If you want them to bring back a plan you'd have to advertise it, show it to everybody...you have this application before you...you don't have another before you. You could go to a worksession possibly and see what you can get worked out during a worksession.

PUBLIC PORTION REOPENED

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Mr. Denmark I'd be interested in your comments on extending the eaves on that middle portion that's coming out.

GREG DENMARK: We have no problem doing that. We can completely keep that lower. More in question right here is the garage door. That seems to be the big issue. That gable end is basically going to be identical to what it was and we can keep the eave lower.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: You mean on the garage?

GREG DENMARK: The problem there is that if you did that even if you were to bring the floor height up to the rest of the house...to the kitchen you'd be looking out of those garage door windows at about right here (*hand gesture showing height*).

CHAIRMAN POOSER: If the plans went forward and you extended it out 18 inches and maintained the height is there some way to replicate from what the windows...the garage on the new façade that we could find some resolution.

GREG DENMARK: We could do something that's a nonfunctioning façade that appeared to look like a garage door. It wouldn't be a garage door at all by any sense of the word. You're concerns are that it's going to look like an addition...an enclosed garage where you can see the stucco line or if the material is still there and they just side it in and that type of thing but it's going to be a whole new face and it's going to flow completely with the rest of the structure. With those strips gone and landscaping and once the trees or whatever plants are put in front of it you're not going to see it at all. Certainly I can create some kind of element that would appear to look like a garage door. The goal is to use that garage door on the new detached garage in the rear.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: Are you removing the front chimney?

GREG DENMARK: It is nonfunctioning. It can stay if it needs to. It's totally abandoned at this point structurally. It can stay if you want it to stay, but it doesn't have to.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Do you understand the reason for wanting them to save that garage door isn't just to put a garage door there. It's kind of that particular garage door.

GREG DENMARK: I agree. Also two houses down from there they removed the garage door and they were granted under the historic guidelines a gable end and a big window and everything so we came forward with this thinking because of the minimal square footage that we can add to this that this would be a feasible area to use to add a kitchen.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

ANNE HOWIE (*not available at original public testimony portion of hearing*): I've known Pat for 12 years. She loves the North End and she is involved with issues that concern the North End like the Booth Home. She's known for her marvelous in-home daycare. I think the design that she has come up with is very modest and most of her square footage is in the basement. I've been in her house many times. My daughter goes to her daycare. Her kitchen is so small. She's got apartment sized cook top and fridge and the dining room has a table that's like this big and you can hardly walk around it and I don't know where else she would go with the kitchen addition. I'd love to see her be able to make her house more livable. She's been dreaming about this for a long time. She's been saving her money up for a long time. I hope that the garage door issue doesn't keep her from being able to go forward with these plans that she's been dreaming about for so many years.

STAFF REBUTTAL

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: I would like reiterate that all of these things that are being changed are character defining features and the Historic Preservation guidelines specifically state that we need to preserve historic character defining features. The Secretary of the Interior Standards that

we also go by state the same thing. The garage because it's not useful anymore doesn't mean that it's not an important character defining feature. It's unique. We don't let people do that anymore, but that doesn't mean that the historic ones are no longer valid.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

CHAIRMAN POOSER: My feelings on the garage door are that we are not operating in a vacuum. We want to have a neighborhood that is viable 50 years from now as well as today. It seems to me that keeping the garage door on a house that is evolving and in my mind the changes are congruous. In fifty years someone is going to walk by that house and look at the garage door that does nothing, has plants in front of it and it just seems like it's not fit. We need to look a little further into the future as far as our decisions go and maintaining the doors is just not necessary in my mind.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I'm going to echo what you just said. I guess a couple of other things I wanted to bring up is I feel that what they're doing to this house is modest and they could be wanting to do something really wild to it and I'd be the first one to be against that. But, what they're wanting to do here is reasonable and also I'm going to go back to City Council and how they've directed us that they do want us to be keeping these homes livable and viable and although I understand Staff's charge to bring up all the historic points and I completely concur with those as well I just feel that in this case that garage door shouldn't be a deal breaker.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: In talking about the neighborhood evolving who's to say that those garage doors couldn't sometime in the future be converted to a pair of French doors that open out to a patio off of a remodeled kitchen area. I view these garage doors much like the guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards view porches. They recommend keeping the frame work intact so there's still some sense of the previous use and the first use of the property. I'm not going to support the motion for approval. I'm sticking to my guns on denial or a deferral, but the Secretary of Interior Standards clearly state that for historic properties that the interior be reviewed for arrangement before additions are to occur. Julie made a good point about this being a character defining feature and that all these changes that are proposed, including the chimney which was not noted on the drawings have impact to that. I'm certainly not trying to halt the use. A daycare is not a typical use in the neighborhood...I should say historic use but, clearly some of these proposed changes reflect making that a more functional use and residence. I will not be supporting a motion for approval.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Commissioner McFadden has made a point that we should all consider through this and that is that we have various obligations whether they be to the Secretary of Interior Standards or guidelines, but also we have obligations to the City as the charge that we receive through the City Council. It would be not appropriate for us to consider the situations that have happened fairly commonly over the recent past and that is taking a look and examining which decisions we have made that have been overturned by City Council and what does that tell us and what direction does that point us. To me it's very obvious that City Council is first and foremost concerned with the livability of our historic districts and that we should be in support of that and if there's a deciding factor that has to be looked at that's got to be more important than I think we are giving it credence to. It's very easy for us to look at the

various guidelines, the Secretary of Interior Standards and Staff's done a very good job of analyzing this and I do still agree in most cases with Staff, but at the same time when push comes to shove on this I believe we're in a position that it's in our best interest and the City's best interest for us to approve this as presented with the modification made to lowering the eaves that the applicant has said is not a problem. I still don't agree with the idea to retain the garage doors because you can. It's putting a strange look on to the front of a house which Commissioner Pooser has said down the road is going to look like exactly what it was... *"There used to be a garage there"*.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER SMITH: What is the procedure for deadlock? I disagree with counsel's interpretation that we're required to change our vote because we're deadlocked. The fact of the matter is we have a 3:3 tie here and I don't think it's going to change no matter how many speeches we make to each other. I can assure you I'm not going to change my vote. Simply based on going back and forth and I know one other Commissioner is not so unless down at the end of the table there is going to be a change we're going to be deadlocked on this particular issues and I don't think we're required to argue back and forth about the garage door until one of us changes. With respect to counsel I disagree. At this point we either defer or we send it to a future worksession or we do something else, but the application as presented now has died for a lack of majority.

TERESA SOBOTKA (Legal): I had earlier said deferral or a worksession were certainly options for you. I simply mean you have to have a motion. You can't say we can't come with a motion. A deferral or a worksession is a motion.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: I don't understand what counsel means by we go to a worksession...tonight or some point in the future? How would that work?

TERESA SOBOTKA (Legal): We've had worksessions many times. What we do is set it over to a certain date and you may have other Commissioners there too with other ideas, but there's something about looking at it around the table and saying what about this and what about that, that often times...

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I don't see the purpose of a deferral. The information we have before is sufficient so I'm not really sure what that's going to get us. We're it...

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Unless somebody doesn't show and we get an odd number. Our other option is and I hate to suggest this as an option but would be to deny it and essentially telling the applicant that they have another form of redress which is not this Commission. Would the Chairman care to ask the applicant if they would care to have a worksession and come back with some other proposal...hopefully they have a feel for exactly what is going on up here which is deadlock.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Mr. Denmark I'll invite you back up and I would limit opening the public hearing to just you so you can provide some insight to your thinking and how you would prefer to proceed.

PUBLIC PORTION REOPENED

GREG DENMARK: It's hard to say. There are three of you that obviously don't like it and three of you that willing to give it a try. If you guys deny it we will go to City Council with it. That's our only option at this point. In the past the problem is that everything that we've done has always been about making these things look really cute from the street with disregard to making them livable. I think I have a good case in this case to go to the City with that and present it in that way.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Would you prefer to go to a worksession or would you prefer a denial. What we could do is approve...

GREG DENMARK: Would I be included in the worksession or is it just Commissioner members?

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Yes. It would be give and take between you, Staff and the Commission.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Much more informal.

GREG DENMARK: I'd be willing to do a worksession.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: We could trade ideas. Maybe there's some alternative solution that the Commission would agree to and that you would agree to. When is a good time?

TERESA SOBOTKA: We could advertise it so if you come up with something it could possibly be approved then but usually what we do is review a working document, they fix it up and bring it back to a hearing.

SARAH SCHAFER: That would be August 11th. We only have one item on the agenda so you could either do it at a worksession prior to that item or you could do it as a worksession after that item.

JULIE ARCHAMBEAULT: We actually have a deferral also.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: So we could do it as a 12:00 meeting? Do you have a sense as to the level of controversy that would be on those two items?

SARAH SCHAFER: I know one will be.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: 12:00 is a difficult time for everybody as it's the middle of the business day.

SARAH SCHAFER: Maybe it would work best to have him come in at 11:00. We do the worksession from 11:00 – 12:00 and then do the public hearing items that we at 12:00.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Is an hour enough?

SARAH SCHAFER: Usually it works.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Let's plan for that on August 11th at 11:00 a.m.

GREG DENMARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I wanted to mention to the applicant that when you do come in to that worksession make sure that the drawings reflect how you want the roof to be so the eaves are the right height so everybody knows and that the gables...the ridgelines...you know what I'm saying.

GREG DENMARK: They'll be correct.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER SMITH MOVED TO DEFER DRH08-00230 TO A WORKSESSION AT 11:00 A.M. ON AUGUST 11, 2008.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL VOTE 6:0. MOTION CARRIES.