



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 September 22, 2008

Commission Members Present Christopher Pooser, Chairman, Scott Chandler, Barbara Dawson, Steve Smith, Mara Truslow

Members Present Sarah Schafer, Matt Halitsky, Mary Elizabeth Watson, Nicki Heckenlively

DRH08-00295 / Matt Hanrahan / 1815 N. 10th Street

Requests Historic Preservation approval to demolish the structure and construct a three story multi-family dwelling on property located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

MATT HALITSKY: Here we see pictures of the existing home. It was considered noncontributing in a survey conducted in 1993. In an attempt to list it on the National Register in 1985 it was denied and in the spring of this year this Commission voted to maintain its status as noncontributing based on in appropriate changes made. Here we see a sketch of the proposed site design. The hatched area here represents the original home. As you can see the proposal is for a larger building. However, it maintains the general shape as well as the large setbacks from the corner. The building itself is proposed at three stories with underground parking and a large gable roof. The third story is set back from the other wall planes so that there is a wrap around porch on all four sides. These are some color rendering. There are some additional rooflines and on either side for added architectural interest staff has recommended additional design detail as conditions of approval that the applicant is amendable to just to provide that addition architectural interest. The proposal will require a setback variance from the rear property line as well as a rezone to R-3 which the commission supported by a motion at the prior hearing. Regarding the demolition and the design which is being considered tonight Staff recommends approval as conditioned.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: It looks like we had an e-mail in support of the proposal.

MATT HALITSKY: We did have an e-mail from John and Genie Swyers. They are in support of the application. They live across the alley.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: We will mark this as Exhibit 1.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: One of the site specific conditions of approval that you suggested is a more pronounced front entry. Can you shed a little light on what you'd be looking for?

MATT HALITSKY: We would be looking for a more pronounced either front porch or perhaps some steps leading up to a front entry. More defined that would say that area is the front entrance as opposed to one of several entrances around the building.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: To interpret that a larger...I can see what you're saying that it's a little larger, but not much than some of the side porches that are there. So you're not looking for anything specific just something that you'd ask the applicant to come up with to propose to you?

MATT HALITSKY: That's correct and they are open to working with us on the different conditions as far as the gable end.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I had a similar question in the site specific condition e. The third floor railing shall be more transparent. It appears that it is a stucco of some sort.

MATT HALITSKY: A stucco wall. That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What could you envision that being instead?

MATT HALITSKY: We were something along the lines of perhaps wrought iron. Something that would be more transparent. I wasn't necessarily thinking around the entire home, but just something to open it up so it doesn't look like a stucco wall around all four sides.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I also have a question about the condition of approval d. The contrasting treatment shall be provided on the gables ends to provide additional architectural interest. Can you elaborate on that?

MATT HALITSKY: Yes. We were thinking something along the lines of often times with gable ends you see a different shingle or (inaudible) or some scalloped shingles or something like that, that would provide some decorative interest. They were amendable to that as well. We're open to ideas.

SITE VISITS

Commissioner Dawson revisited the site prior to the hearing. Commissioners Chandler Pooser, Smith, Truslow did not re-visit the site.

APPLICANT TESTIMONY

CHAIRMAN POOSER: To let you know we went through the staff report in your absence and the Commissioners had several questions specifically with respect to the site specific conditions of approval that Staff has recommended. That's essentially what we've done. If there's anything you'd like to hear from Staff again. We can do that. Specifically, there are three site specific conditions of approval. The first is for a more pronounced front entry. There's was a question asked if he could elaborate on that particular condition. Same with respect to the contrasting treatment will be provided on the gable ends and also with the third floor railing. He explained his concerns there and what he was suggesting.

CORRIN OLSON (Applicant's representative): So you just had questions on the conditions as far as...basically we're all pretty familiar with the case. We submitted a design but it was not congruous. We're resubmitting a new design. We've altered it quite drastically. We put bays on...we're still keeping into consideration square footage issues for economic feasibility and for the eight loft units. We're very willing to work with Staff and the Commission on altering and implementing more architectural detail in that gabled end or whatever it might be working in cooperation with you guys. Also on the front entry porch making it larger so it's more like the Bungalow type porches that we and maybe enhancing that façade by putting the Twin Oaks and the address in a large type plaque above that entry to really focus you in on 10th Street being the entry. My main point that I was going to talk about is we've looked at this property, we've looked at using it in this new concept...these eight loft units in the North End creating dwelling space here, walking distance to our downtown core, Hyde Park core...a very livable environment. That is seen as part of the urban plan for Boise.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I'm wondering about the thought process that went into this new design. I thought we were pretty close on the last design. The three elements that the Commission had identified was the fenestration...the windows primarily. Some of those were incongruous with what is in the District. The roof form and then the materials...specifically with the steel. That to me just seemed like there were just some tweaks here and there.

CORRIN OLSON: Where I went with that...because at the end of the meeting it was said the design didn't have minor tweaks that could be handled in a worksession so I took that as this needed to be a full redesign. I think that this balances quite well and I believe that the bays give it a nice kind of edge on the sides that don't make it as boxy. I've looked at putting in more transparent railings on the corners...stepping it up so that you can see through...that would be a thing that would be part of the conditions that I would like to work with anyone on in a worksession.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Is that the second floor balcony?

CORRIN OLSON: Second floor would be about 5 ft. in on all of the corners. They would be open railing and then on the top floor it would be 10 ft. on each corner...open railing...it gives it kind of a visual...I played around with it on my plans...you can see

through it so it gives it a little more visual interest.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: On the 3rd floor there's going to be some sort of patio?

CORRIN OLSON: Yeah...it's a wrap around patio. When I did that, I did it mainly to try and get a roof that is more pronounced. If I kept those walls all the way to the edge it creates that boxy form that we had before. Two, you can't really get the roof pitch or a predominant roof that you could see because it would be too tall. I shrunk that in, did a wrap around porch, which I think is a great feature for living as well... a garden patio up stairs.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: How wide is that and how much space is going to be offered...between the railing and the actual structure?

CORRIN OLSON: It's 6 ft. approximately...as far as the depth?

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Yes. The application also indicates that there were two proposals that were submitted to Staff.

CORRIN OLSON: There were. We had two proposals that we submitted initially because it was based on the design. We did that to throw out two different designs. I did one that was more Frank Lloyd Wright Prairie style...large...I did a really modern one too that I'd love to show you. It had a couple different styles of roof pitch. We ended up going with this one after talking with Staff. This is a blend between our old design that we presented at the first hearing and the implementation of the concerns of the fenestration...the window type placement, the varying roof structures...so with this you get hip roofs, 45 degree angles...you've got a little bit more variety...not in materials...that's where we're going with the last one. That's where we had the steel. This one has the stucco, wood timber and siding as its primary elements.

DAN EVERHART (NENA): As you'll recall in the last application I represented the North End Neighborhood Association. I am again representing the NENA in this particular application and as a brief rehash as to what has transpired since the last application when the application was denied apparently the designers went back as she stated to do a redesign and requested to meet with myself and any other interested members of the neighborhood association, which we did on the 10th of September. At the meeting on the 10th we discussed several details, but as I informed the applicant I thought that for the most part they had addressed the concerns that the neighborhood association had. They had addressed the concerns of roof, windows and walls basically. In presenting that revised design...they presented a design that had a hip roof instead of the gable roof that you see on the third floor. It was a much different perspective from the street in presenting that hipped roof design. I suggested to them that perhaps they treat the front porch a little bit, but present their application as proposed with that hipped roof design. When I saw the application I was surprised because I didn't think they'd changed the roof structure. The neighborhood association in consultation with myself have come to the conclusion that this particular roof structure design is not cohesive, compatible or

even attractive in the neighborhood. Rather the hipped roof design was something that the neighborhood association was willing to support. This particular roof structure is something that we're willing to oppose. The only other detail on this particular building and we're concerned with detail. As we mentioned in the last hearing we're not concerned with the size or the setback of the application, but rather the detailing of the application. This particular front porch, I believe, and again this is hard to...arm chair quarter back the design, but if it were me I would say that a building of this size and proportion needs a monumental entryway in order to give it some sort of depth and sense of proportion. I believe that this fall a little bit short of that and having this small entryway...which I see the argument that it could be confused with entries on other elevations. I'm not sure it would be that confusing, but for proportion sake and design sake this particular front porch detail could be rethought...the roof structure and the porch configuration are the two primary concerns of the neighborhood association. I will throw out there as I have on every other occasion that it is my opinion that this particular building does not need to be constructed. The building that sits presently there on the site is a perfectly workable building. It doesn't need to be altered. It doesn't need to be demolished. It is being used as it stands right now and I don't believe that the demolition is a necessity. That being said if this is the will of the Commission that a new building be constructed on this site then the present design with a few of the modifications as suggested by Staff and echoed by the neighborhood association would be the most appropriate design for the site.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: You like the hip roof on the basic structure we've been shown? Or is it something else that we haven't seen that you have seen?

DAN EVERHART: Actually that's it right there (referring to slide). This particular elevation or perspective illustrates the building as I saw it on the 10th with the hipped roof structure and a different porch structure. This porch structure I still believe to be inappropriate. It's too small in scale for one thing, but also it's enclosed. What you may not be able to see in this perspective is that the front doors of the building are on the front exterior of the porch. There's no recess...there's no actual porch structure, but rather the doors are accessed immediately from the outside of that small porch.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Is it the association or you own opinion that the building ought to be preserved because...

DAN EVERHART: I will fess up and say that it is my personal opinion that the building should be preserved. I don't believe there's consensus on the board of the North End Neighborhood Association. In fact I think there are a variety of opinions about that matter. Without perjuring myself I will say that I personally believe the building that exists currently does not need to be removed while NENA has not taken a particular stand on that topic.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Do you remember the earlier design?

DAN EVERHART: Yes.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: In your mind this is a better design than the earlier design?

DAN EVERHART: In short yes. If pressed I would say that what we were concerned with in the first application again were roof, windows and walls. In the first application it was almost impossible to distinguish that the building had a roof structure. It looked to be a flat roof in perspective and probably from the street you wouldn't see the roof structure at all because of the pitch and configuration of the roof structure. Actually having a roof visible adds quite a bit to the building and not a gable roof as I would reiterate. The second question was the question of the windows. The windows on the first application were varied in the extreme. There were differences in styles and configurations as well as in function and placement on all sides of the building. There was no symmetry to the building. Not that symmetry is necessarily a historic attribute, but it can lend an air of traditionalism I guess. Lastly the materials on the walls the rusted steel siding that was originally proposed was something that you don't see typically in the neighborhood so to get back to your question we have stucco and lap siding. This to me in the basic conforms more to the design guidelines in the window style and configuration, the wall material and the roof form. I believe it does conform and is more in keeping with the code as outlined in the design guidelines and while there are significant portions of it that I would redesign that's not really my job. To say whether it conforms with the guidelines is more appropriate and in this case I think that this structure comes much closer to conforming to the guidelines than it did before.

CHRIS GUIGON: I had a comment on a conversation with Corrin and Dan on the 10th. Going back to the roof structure and why it was changed from the gable to the hip there was a reoccurring notion that the building needs to stay as is and be remodeled. We made the changes that were required of us at the time and added the different roof structure so that when you're looking at the building it maintains the old building so you're looking at a morphing of what was there and the relationship to the history of what was there more so with that new roof structure. Also we did add a more pronounced entry and are very open to working with Staff on any of the changes that we can make working off the structure we have on here now. As a side note we look at this large lot, its importance to the North End. We look at this more as a transitional piece. There's modern parts in it and it has a lot of references to what was there and long term you can see this piece and relate it to what might be coming, what was there and it would fall really nicely into play with markers that we're thinking of putting in the sidewalk to tell the history of the actual corner and the lot.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Can you live with the hip roof like this?

CHRIS GUIGON: We could. Having the gable ends would add more to the square footage. The actual upstairs unit and making them more salable.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: How much more square footage?

CHRIS GUIGON: About 300 sq. ft.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Whys that?

CHRIS GUIGON: Lofts. In this particular layout it's more open so you have the ability to do longer lofts up in those areas.

MATT HANRAHAN (Property Owner): I'm not really comfortable presenting what I'm about to present here, but I think I need to get this on the record. I feel that Dan Everhart should be presenting his case as a representative of Preservation Idaho. He is the President of that organization. I don't think it's appropriate for him to come before the Commission representing the North End Neighborhood Association. He's not a member of NENA. He cannot be a member of NENA. He doesn't reside or work in the North End and according to the bylaws of NENA you have to either live or work in the North End to be a member. The president, according to the bylaws the President of NENA is the spokesperson for the neighborhood association. The President shall be the spokesperson or appoint someone who he deems appropriate, another member of the board to be the spokesperson. I want to get this on the record that I feel that Dan should not be provided so much weight as he has been in the past with his testimony. I think it would be entirely appropriate for him to appear before this Commission as the President of Preservation Idaho but I don't feel he is representing the neighbors of the North End. We have a lot of positive input throughout this whole process from various neighbors in the North End and much of it you've seen in e-mails, testimony and whatnot. I feel that Dan is more or so presenting his opinion and his position with Preservation Idaho rather than representing the thousands of people in the North End. If it's appropriate I'd like to for the record produce the bylaws of NENA and I also noticed on the website that there is no historic committee listed on the website and he is representing himself as the NENA Historic Committee. I don't see that anywhere on the website and I don't see his name anywhere on the website. Maybe he should be given as much weight as I am and maybe with my 3 minutes and he could have his 3 minutes through Preservation Idaho. He has been given entirely too much weight throughout this process in his own personal opinions. It is in his intent to (inaudible) throughout the process because he wants the building to stay there as it is. As long as he can throw up these roadblocks he will continue to do so. I'm not going to stand here and fault him for doing that, that's his opinion and he likes the building and he wants it to stay there, but I don't think he represents the majority in this case.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: We'll mark this packet of the Bylaws and Members of NENA as Exhibit 2.

DON PLUM: I am a member of the North End Neighborhood Association Board and I have been for six years and have been involved with the association for about 12 years. It is true that Dan no longer lives in the North End and it was a sad day when he moved out of the neighborhood. Many times we have used people to present information to the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning and Zoning Commission or the Boise City Council that do not live in the neighborhood. Typically they are financially compensated because they have been attorneys representing us. Up to this point and probably from

this point further, Dan's probably not going to be financially compensated. He probably wished he was though because of the time and energy he puts into preservation issues. The neighborhood association made a motion and approved Dan's representation tonight.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: One of these has a gable end on the proposal here and you've made as one of the conditions some modifications to the gable end. Just asking, in your opinion, in the modifications do you think It would be appropriate whether or not they provide any light or anything that possibly either some small windows or whether they be real or just decorative type of things be up in that gable and the reason I bring that up is after one of applicants who was speaking mentioned the attempt to replicate some of the existing features of the existing home and looking on Page 4 and Page 5, the photos that are in there I see what is apparently in the attic that there are windows up there. I'm wondering if you think that would be appropriate to have something up there whether they be true windows or something else in that gable.

MATT HALITSKY: That's a possibility. I would want to see it first. I will add that in Staff's opinion we liked the hipped design better, but it was our understanding that the neighborhood preferred the gable roof and that's why we evaluated the gable, but if that's not the case...I'm not quite sure at this point that the hipped roof is the better design.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

CORRIN OLSON: It's not really rebuttal...I just want to express that we're completely willing to work with minor alterations to the current proposed design be that if we need to put the hip roof back on and be done. If we need to make the wrap around porch more transparent...we really want to, in this and in this project, show the history of this property and what it went through and where it is now and where it's going to be in the future. We believe in change and this building is at its point and time life that it's ready to change. We're willing to increase the porch and we'd like to come to an agreement with Staff, the Commission and the community on a building that we can have at this lot into future for the next 100 years.

PUBLIC CLOSED

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: That's been an excellent discussion through the many hearings we've had on this project. It's gone through a variety of iterations. All of them one way or another improving on what we previously have been brought before us. The discussion regarding hip versus gable has merit. Myself, I don't find that one is necessarily preferable over the other. I do think that given if there is the potential for more living space with the gable than the hip that should be given some weight in our deliberations. In looking at the photographs at the existing structure on there you can look at part of it and say its gable and part of it and say it's a hip. It's a conglomeration of things as is typical of something that has been remodeled as many times as that has. What has been put in front of the Commission as far as the proposals and also the various conditions put on it by Staff have merit while what we see in front of us is not the final design it is close enough that we can render a decision on it and leave the rest of the

decision making that needs to be done on this up to the applicant and to Staff. Given that the first part of this requires a demolition of the existing I would like to make a motion.

CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE DEMOLITION ASSOCIATED WITH DRH08-00295 GIVEN THAT THE APPLICANT HAS MET FOUR OF THE FIVE FINDINGS. THEY HAVE MET FINDINGS A., B., C. AND E.

COMMISSION DAWSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Last time I was very opposed to taking the building down at all. However it's pretty clear to me that position is not practical reality and I can live with this design. I will be supporting the motion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: At the previous meeting we had something of a rezone motion before us. Do we need to reconsider that rezone or is that a later part.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: That was approved at the last hearing. I wish we would have fought a little bit harder for the initial design. I didn't think there needed to be a lot to be tweaked to get that through. In comparison to the original to this design this lacks, but if this is what is before us it is congruous. The issues with the windows have been resolved. They are more congruous with the District. The roof form whether it's a gable or a hip roof is more congruous. I wish the applicant would consider some more of the transparent railings on the balconies. I thought that was one of the better aspects of the earlier design and might bring some of that back. The entryway I'm not concerned about considering the site and the streetscape. It's going to be quite evident from that property the way it's configured at this point particularly because it's raised with that sandstone blocking. The entrance is going to be quite clear. I noticed on the original design the entrance was more modern in nature. I thought it worked quite well and I don't see an issue with having a more predominant entrance. I'll be in support of the application given that's what's in front of us.

ROLL CALL VOTE 5:0. MOTION CARRIES.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE DRH08-00295 WITH THE SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS AND STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ADDING TO THE END OF SITE SPECIFIC CONDITION 1.B., "THE DESIGN AND CONTENT WHICH SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY STAFF".

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Do we want to give Staff flexibility on the roof whether it be hip or gable?

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: The applicant has indicated their preference for the gable and with the condition that staff has put on it that some additional design be put to it. I'm very comfortable with it remaining a gable roof if that's their desire.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm fine with the gable roof. I look at the existing structure. I see the proposed gable roof as a reflection of its existence now and I can live with the gable roof.

ROLL CALL VOTE 5:0. MOTION CARRIES.