



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 October 13, 2008

Commission Members Present Christopher Pooser, Chairman, Scott Chandler, Cathy Sewell, Betsy McFadden, Barbara Dawson and Mara Truslow

Members Present Sarah Schafer, Matt Halitsky, Amanda Horton, Nicki Heckenlively

DRH08-00310 / SANDRA BEEBE / 1300 E. Lewis Street

Requests Historic Preservation approval to remodel the garage to house an accessory dwelling unit and remodel the main dwelling including but not limited to a rear addition, west facing dormers, and a new door on the east porch on property located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

MATT HALITSKY: Presented staff report with a recommendation of denial.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: All the references I see, maybe I'm missing something, indicate that the new siding which would be essentially of a vertical nature is wood, but is there any indication as to the finish? Is it rough, is it smooth? It would be painted I understand, similar to the other, but I'm curious...do you have any more detail as to what type of wood siding it is?

MATT HALITSKY: We do not.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I noticed on the application there was a request for the removal of a large Cottonwood tree. Was there any information about the health status of that particular tree in the application?

MATT HALITSKY: I'm reviewing the narrative letter right now and I don't see any. I can add that Cottonwood trees are rather a scrub tree.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I noticed in going through the report on Page 24 that you reference a Section in the guidelines when you're addressing the incongruous nature of the vertical siding and the contemporary design and you referenced Section 2.2.1, which I believe is out of the East End Historic District which addresses the new additions to be

similar in scale through the use of similar materials, roof forms, and solid to void relationships...I'm wondering if there is another section that addresses these that you...

MATT HALITSKY: That is an error. 2.2.1 is from the East End. However, there are similar guidelines in the section, Additions to Historic Homes. 4.1.3 deals with rooflines and in this case as you can see the eave of the addition is quite a bit higher than the other rooflines in the existing home. 4.1.6 deals with the use of similar materials. In this case I would take that to mean perhaps using horizontal lap siding as opposed to the vertical siding.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I have a question about the determination that the structure is noncontributing. When was the Warm Springs Historic District designated? Do you know the time? If the house was moved to the property in the 1970's would it have been before or after?

MATT HALITSKY: Evidently we didn't have any historic districts prior to 1979. So it would have been prior to it being a historic district.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: When you look in the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts in Section 2.1, it's got the map of the Warm Springs Historic District. It's got obviously Warm Springs but it's also got some jogs to the south towards the river. Would you have any idea why some of those lots on the backside of Warm Springs would have been included in the District?

SARAH SCHAFER: Typically what they did with the Warm Springs District, in my understanding, is they took what use to be all of one lot...so it looks like that back portion has been split off since the District has been in place and those are new property lines. All of those lots use to be much, much deeper lots along Warm Springs. My guess is the piece were talking about now that has the home on the rear obviously used to be part of the front part of that which was along Warm Springs. That home was sectioned off at some point since the District was put into place.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: I'm very familiar with the situation there. If you look at the map and you look at the parcel in question by the difference as to when the house was moved there that parcel was created well before the District was created. If you go toward the west you'll see five lots. One of them a flag lot with another one in there. Those were all split off prior to the formation of the District. All of those use to be a 600 ft. deep lot which would be similar to what was probably an original parcel where this was put on. There really isn't any consistency as to why this particular one on the south side abutting Lewis Street is in the District when all of those that are directly to the west of it are not. They were all lots that were in existence prior to the Historic District being created. It's somewhat unusual with this one on the south side being the only separate structure on it that is not associated with an adjoining parcel is in the District when none of the others that abut on Lewis Street that are not full lot at 600 ft. all the way up to Warm Springs. It's somewhat inconsistent with the rest of the District.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I would agree with that too. It is a little bit inconsistent.

SARAH SCHAFER: However, it's in the District and we have no other choice but to review it against the guidelines that we have.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: That's where my question comes from with respect to the finding that the property or the structure is a noncontributing property when we look at location and setting and feeling. There was some determination made that this house was there when this district was created. There's a reason it's there. It was part of the District so the fact that the house was there when the District was created and it is obviously part of the District if that changes how you view the setting and the feeling and the general location of the property with respect to the contributing or non-contributing analysis.

SARAH SCHAFER: I understand what you're saying. I'm not sure it would make a difference as to whether the structure was contributing or non-contributing. Because the structure was moved to the property at some point and this is not its original location that does have an affect on its location and its setting when reviewing the seven points of integrity.

SITE VISITS

Commissioners Dawson, Sewell, Chandler and McFadden visited the site prior to the hearing. Commissioners Pooser and Truslow did not visit the site.

HEIDI BEEBE (Applicant's Representative): I'm all prepared to argue that the design moves in the house are consistent either with the house or the Queen Anne style. If that's not necessary because the house is unusual in the fact that it's the only house in the Warm Springs District on Lewis Street...I guess if that's an option to not consider it then maybe I wouldn't go through the whole Queen Anne stylistic...

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I can't speak to the process of trying to get the property kind of cut off from the District, but it is in the District and so we're confined to that today.

HEIDI BEEBE: As you've all noticed the addition we want is not visible from the street nor is it visible from Warm Springs Avenue and it's not visible from Lewis Street. The goal of the addition is to create a better relationship between the house and the backyard. There was a previous addition in the back that has a very poor foundation, the top plates are exposed and it's not completely finished. There's a stair inside that's not built to code. The addition that is there which is a partially filled in back porch needs to be repaired and our solution to that was to take it off and start over. You can't see it in that elevation but the addition actually does wrap around the side so the strategy was to be very consistent with the style on the east and west elevations. We've mirrored the hip that faces the front of the house...the south side and left in that elevation on the lower elevation on the lower left is mirrored in the back. We have literally copied the hip roof from the front to the back. We've also kept the eave line of the front porch and wrapped it around the corners on either side. The idea was to create a glassed in porch effect

which is why there's a lot of glass that opens and looks towards the back yard. That middle section which does look a bit different than the other elevations where it's seamless...the 8 ft. eave you have in the front is carried around the corners and then it breaks where you have that gabled cross dormer that goes all the way to the ground. That element has the same roof pitch as the dormers on the east side of the house. It has the same width as the dormer on the east side of the house. The width of glass on the lower portion of it is the same as the glass in the existing dining room bay. It's not more glass. It's not a different roof element. There is precedent in the Queen Anne for vertical siding and I can show you some pictures of that. I'm also totally open to switching to a shingle that would be more consistent with a Queen Anne shingle like a diamond shape or a scallop or something. What we wanted to do with the siding was to use the Queen Anne idea of a mix or patchwork of shingles in the back to do something kind of fun back there that's not necessarily in the front but mimicking the spirit of a mix of shingles that is consistent with a Queen Anne. Some of the vertical lines that you see that run from the first floor windows up to the top are trim that's bounding areas of shingle. I have a picture of a Queen Anne house that has vertical bands of trim that are then bound in areas of patterns created by the shingles. Having the cross gable that runs to the ground is a massing element that is part of the Queen Anne hip roof and then a gable that comes out perpendicular to the hip. This is that form. The staff report says that the eave is out of alignment and that it is much higher than the existing eave. We have wrapped around the 8ft. eave of the front porch that comes around the sides. It does break but the eave height of the tall element is the same...it's actually 4 inches different than the eave height of other dormers on the house. It's an eave height that matches those other dormers. It's not like totally new. There's also trim between the windows. The windows on the first floor that were referred to as bank of windows...there is 6 inches of trim between each of those for structure. They are narrower than the windows in the front of the house, but they're the same width as the windows in the kitchen. The way the proportion was determined is that they have the same relationship from the floor inside to the seal and the same relationship from the ceiling to the top so it's true they are taller than the other windows in the house, but they draw on other elements of windows in the house. They're also deep set so they wouldn't create shadow lines and depth which is from my understanding of the Queen Anne is there was fear of a flat wall and there was every effort to make bays and pop-outs and trim to create a undulating surface so the windows are set back the same as it is on some of the front dormers. If you want I could...its actually just not visible from over there. In the side elevation the upper story is set back the same as it is on we'd be more than happy to make some changes if necessary but, I guess I would like to understand just broadly what...like if the footprint is approvable or the massing is approvable as a starting point. There are a lot of components to this project. There's also the garage. The strategy for the garage addition is...it's basically just an entryway and a dormer above and if that was to make it similar to the addition we're making to the house...the reason for the shed as opposed to another gable was just to make it a garage like addition as opposed to a house...making the garage secondary to the house. If that's considered to modern then we'd be fine to switch it to a gable. We could make that look perfectly nice.

COMMISSIONER MCFADDEN: You said you had some photographs of the siding that

you're proposing. I guess that's one of my main questions is for example with the garage where the shed dormers come up what is the siding that you're proposing for that versus the lap siding?

HEIDI BEEBE: *Presented Commission with samples.*

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Same color, but just vertical?

HEIDI BEEBE: The idea would be to go with a smooth finish, which is what's on the house and then painted to blend with the house. The house is currently beige with white trim so we would continue that through the addition. A smooth finish painted siding.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: That would include the same width of the panels just vertically. On the lap siding...6 or 8 inches.

HEIDI BEEBE: Would the vertical be the same as the horizontal?

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Yes.

HEIDI BEEBE: No. The vertical would be a narrower more thin proportion...like that...has a thin batten.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: What is the rationale for doing the vertical?

HEIDE BEEBE: The rationale was to do something that is in the spirit of the Queen Anne. The Queen Anne's had lots of different sidings. Every dormer had a diagonal, scallop or a vertical or a different kind of trim so the idea was to continue to use that spirit and to use a siding that isn't already on the house, but it doesn't have to be vertical siding. It could be shingles or there are an infinite number of choices for what that element could be.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: One other item which Staff noted as far as an objection were the fenestrations. As far as the windows on the north side where you have seven tall windows which do contrast significantly with those on the rest of the house...are you open to changing that fenestration pattern?

HEIDI BEEBE: Yes. The intent is to create a room that feels like a glassed in porch. I'm up to changing it. I wouldn't want to change it to a solid and void like the front of the house. I would like to keep it a glassed in porch. That would be appropriate for a backyard structure and also for an addition to a Queen Anne.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: You had mentioned that there were some examples in the Queen Anne style of having an addition like the north addition with a very high window height. Do you have an example of that?

HEIDI BEEBE: *Presented examples from the Field Guide to American houses.*

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Exhibit 1 is Page 98 from Victorian West by Lambert and Florin published in 1978.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: On Page 16 of the staff report which shows the north elevation one question would be is that it appears on the main addition that there aren't any roof overhangs on that portion. Can you clarify that and then the also the different hatch I take it represent different siding types and I'm wondering what that upper gable area which isn't hatched what material that would be? The first one was on the overhangs...if there are overhangs at that addition.

HEIDI BEEBE: It's true it doesn't have any overhangs on the sides. The upper area with the shingles would be a different pattern than the upper portion, but also a shingle between the vertical.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: And no overhang? Correct?

HEIDI BEEBE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Talking about the eaves?

HEIDI BEEBE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Because on the plan it looks like there's an overhang...Page 12 of our packet. Okay. I'm sorry I didn't understand.

HEIDI BEEBE: It overhangs towards the north, but there is an overhang showing on the east and west.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: On page 16 of the staff report which is the west elevation I wanted to understand...on this side where the new addition is going to be...and it looks like how I figured it the dormer has three windows...it looks like it's going to come straight down on the window to the left is where the line is going to be dividing between old and new. There is a vertical strip that is indicative of where that line is. Is that correct?

HEIDI BEEBE: Yes. One of those shed dormers is there...two of those shed dormers is there.

NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

NO STAFF REBUTTAL

HEIDI BEEBE: If there's an option to not vote and go to a worksession to make any modifications if it's going towards a no I would rather do that than start all over.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: I do have some significant misgivings in regard to the vertical nature of the windows on the north of the addition and what I would say is the complementary design on the garage of the same vertical type of design. I don't have a problem with the massing. There is question to why this is in the Warm Springs District, but that's not what we're discussing here today. I would like to comment on that I would guess they probably put it in because it was such a great looking old house, but other than that there's probably not a good reason for it given its location. I do think that the design needs some significant work with regard to how that north side of the house is just portrayed...the massing, the shapes and that type of thing. I don't see a problem with the overall...I would encourage the Commission to embrace a worksession with the applicant simply because I think they're part way there, but there needs to be some significant redesign on that front area before I would be comfortable with approving the application.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I don't have quite the issues as Commission Chandler does. I think the use of the various siding is more of a modern interpretation of the characteristics of a Queen Anne. The verticality that Commissioner Chandler is talking about does exist, but I think it's probably not exaggerated through the use of the rendering and the lines on the paper may not be so...once all is said and done it is on the rear side so I don't have too much issue with that. It's a great house as far as the integrity and the appearance from the street. The idea that they're trying to work in with the vertical windows on that enclosed porch may not necessarily be a characteristic of the Queen Anne although I think the Queen Anne has different shapes, forms and is basically all over the map. I do think that the use they're intending here sort of follows function here. I don't tend to have any real big issues with that. Same as the garage. I think it's a modern contemporary addition and certainly makes a real clean break from what's there. Also the use of the existing rooflines, orientation and the pitch exist here so I tend to disagree with Staff's report. Maybe a little question on the lack of overhang there on those east and west eaves on the addition. Other than that I'm inclined to support the application.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I'm torn on this one. I see where Commissioner Chandler's coming from as far as the verticality of the elements that are proposed and at the same time we encourage our applicants to show the old from the new. This would be a good example of obviously being able to see what was new, but still not being totally incongruous. I do think there's enough confusion on what the siding would be that it would be good to give the applicant one more shot at being a little clearer as far as what's vertical siding and what's shingles. I wouldn't mind seeing another option on those vertical windows down below. I think they look kind of commercial or something. I can't really put my finger on it. I guess modern would be the best term for it.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: My comments are in line with Commissioner McFadden and Commissioner Chandler. Initially I did have a problem with just the massing of the north addition. I do believe there could be some changes that could make it a little more compatible with the existing house. Perhaps an overhang that could match some of the

existing gables and how they flare out towards the ends. The fenestration I'm not comfortable with and I do believe that would need to be changed. It's not, in my mind, compatible with the house or the Queen Anne style the way that is existing. As far as the massing goes I'm okay with that. I would like to have a little more information on what is proposed for the siding. I don't have a good idea based on the renderings exactly what is proposed there. As far as the garage goes the massing is okay. I wouldn't mind maybe seeing a gable instead of a shed there and maybe having the windows a little more traditional than what's proposed.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Regarding the garage, I agree with your comments that a gable might be a little more appropriate than the shed roof that's there.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I want to identify one section in our guidelines under Design Guidelines for additions to existing buildings, Section 4.1.5, which reads, *'Consider use of windows that are slightly different in design or detailing to create a distinction from windows on the existing building'*. I want to note this is something that supports what the applicant is proposing on the addition.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Rather than putting a motion forward since we don't have a clear direction as to how the Commission is feeling on this, but I'm not comfortable that it would be approved and the applicant has indicated they would be open to a worksession to address some of these items or at least a redesign of some sort that would support entertaining that with the applicant as far as putting a worksession together, which would necessitate reopening the public portion of the meeting. I'm curious to know the Commission's support for a worksession.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I would be in favor of a worksession. The applicant has indicated a willingness to do it. As far as the massing were pretty close and it's just some of the details on the fenestration and perhaps even the paneling. Maybe the type of dormer on the garage.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I'm in favor of a worksession as well. I also just wanted to chime in that I do like the concept of on the back of the house of doing the glassed in porch look. That could be very nice back there. We're so close that if we just had a little more definition and maybe an option that might style it down a little bit and bring it back to the Queen Anne style a little...I see where Commissioner Sewell was talking about the slightly different windows which I think is a good way to go on this but we kind of overlook and we're going a little bit more than slightly here.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I too would support a worksession. What bothers me about the fenestration on the back is the ratio of the height to the width on these windows. They just seem odd on this home. Perhaps that gives the applicant some additional guidance.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I'm fine with a worksession.

COMMISSIONER TRUSLOW: I'm also in favor of a worksession.

SARAH SCHAFER: You need to open the hearing back up to find out when the applicant can come back for a worksession. At this time we don't have an October night hearing scheduled or a November noon hearing scheduled. You could ask the applicant if they could come back for a lunch meeting and we can set it two to three weeks out if you'd like. It's up to you and the applicant.

REOPEN PUBLIC PORTION

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Based on the discussion you've heard are you willing to enter into a worksession?

HEIDI BEEBE: That sounds fine.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: What would be a good time?

HEIDI BEEBE: Two to three weeks at lunch time is fine.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: November 3rd at noon?

HEIDI BEEBE: That sound alright.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: Even though it would be a worksession to work these things out...any suggestions or thoughts that you might have between now and then based on what you've heard here on a redesign could potentially get us through that worksession quicker picking up the thoughts of the Commission.

HEIDI BEEBE: All take your comments and come back with a couple of options.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO DEFER DRH08-00310 TO A WORKSESSION ON NOVEMBER 3, 2008.

COMMISSION McFADDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL VOTE 6:0. MOTION CARRIES.