



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

DRH08-00331 / KELLY & RICHARD FELDMAN / 1714 N. 11th Street

Request Historic Preservation approval to construct a cantilevered rear dormer, remove an aluminum garden window and replace it with a casement window and remove and replace all of the roofing on property located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

MATT HALITSKY: Presented staff report with a recommendation of approval with conditions.

- a. The proposed casement windows shall be single or double hung with a mullion pattern to match that existing on the home.
- b. The proposed dormer shall rise no higher than the existing roofline and not cantilever out as proposed. The dormer shall be set back from the existing wall plane.

SITE VISITS

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

TAD JONES (Architect / Jones & Jones Design Studio): Let's start with the addition of the dormer on the back. If you go to Page 19 where the elevations are the ridgeline of the proposed dormer does match the existing ridgeline of the house. If you look at Page 20 the south elevation is the one that he was concerned about. That may be some kind of optical illusion with the existing chimney there. If you draw a line from that ridge of the dormer over to the existing ridge it does line up. Just to clarify that the dormer is not any higher than the existing ridge of the house. To give you a little bit of history on the design process of this house, the dormer in the original design came out from the back wall line 8 ft. and then we had columns back there. Because the scale of this house is

very small it didn't really fit with the scale of the house so we started pulling it back. Then we got to the point where the client was actually wondering how far out could we cantilever it out if we didn't have to do columns. They really didn't like the look of the columns. Just to give you a little history of how this developed. Now we are cantilevering out only two feet which gives us space upstairs for a small closet and a small bathroom up there. After reviewing the staff report I did take a look at the upstairs floor plan. I think we can actually get it to work if we pull the line back to the existing wall line that's down below on the first floor. If we could now go back to Page 32 in the first paragraph towards the bottom it says that staff recommends as a condition of approval that the dormer be set back from the existing wall plane...we would go to the point that we would align it with the wall plan and I have looked at the upstairs floor plan and I think we can get it to work, but if we bring it back from that wall plane even further it defeats the purpose of what we're doing as far as how the floor plan lays out. I see where Staff is going with this from what it's going to look like from the back and one thing I would suggest that we could possibly do and we've done this on a couple other projects is do a structural fascia that goes in front of that dormer so even though those wall lines are aligned you still get that break with the roof coming down.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: Can you explain that?

TAD JONES: That fascia line you can see down at the bottom of the roof...that would extend all the way across and then the wall line of the dormer up above would be flush with the wall line down below. You'd have just a little piece of roof that runs across. That's the effect that Staff was looking for when they asked us to move the wall line back further into the house, but again that's really not feasible when you look at the layout of the floor plan. The next thing I'd like to talk about is the windows. When you look at this house almost all the windows on this house have been replaced. It's kind of a little bit of a hodgepodge of different designs. When we went into the house and did our architectural survey of the home some of the only original windows in the house are the ones that are upstairs. They're wood windows. The rest of the windows have been replaced with vinyl windows and then wood trim on the interior. You can also see there's a little window box which is made out of aluminum on this elevation here just to the left of that door which really doesn't go with the style of the home at all so what we're proposing and also those windows upstairs are the old style French casement windows which are also called shutter style windows where the hinges are on either side and then there's no astragal in the center so you can swing them open. In my opinion those windows have some of the original character of the home so we were trying to use that same window in more places throughout the home. One suggestion was in the kitchen where that window box is was to replace that window with the same type of window that's in the upstairs gable and then there's a window that's in question on the front of the house and we would also like to switch that out so it's similar to those windows up above. When we presented that idea to the client we were upstairs in the gable looking out...you can actually look out and see the hills of Camel's Back Park. One of their concerns was the grid pattern in those existing windows and they asked if we could take the grids out. Basically what we end up with is a French casement or shutter style window up in the two end gables of the house and since we want to match those in

the kitchen we end up with those same types of windows in the kitchen. On the interior of the kitchen I think it's worth noting that the proximity of that window box and the window that we're suggesting to replace on the front are really close to each other so I think that it's important to have those windows be of the same style. I know Staff is recommending single or double hung windows, but really the only single or double hung windows in this house are vinyl windows that have been replaced. There's also on the very front of the house a bow window that has obviously been added at some time. It's an Anderson window. What we're trying to do is bring it all back to somewhat original. That gives you a little bit of the design process and what we've gone through on the windows.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: The casement windows that are up in the gable and the attic now. Are those original to the house?

TAD JONES: They look like they're original to me. They've got the old brass hardware on it. They're wood windows and they are pretty much the only wood windows...that one window that we're talking about replacing in the kitchen looks to me like it's an original window also. It's single pane. It's not in really very good shape. Pretty much it's the only one left so having the other ones...there's more of them. I think they have a little bit more character than that one does. My feeling is to lean more towards the French casement shutter style windows that are in the upstairs gable. That window is typical of the windows in the North End.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: On the photographs I'm looking at the one that says, 'north elevation'. It's showing one of the upper windows there looking at both the front and side elevation on that it appears as those measuring the ridgeline height in that...that window as I'm to understand it is a casement style. No astragal in the center and the sash swing in on these?

TAD JONES: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: The ones that you are proposing to put in would they also then be without astragal and in-swing style window?

TAD JONES: They would be.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: If you were given a choice on the dormer would your preference be to cantilever out that 2 ft.?

TAD JONES: Working with the client...we give them a lot more space. Because it is such a small space the percentage that the 2 ft. gives us is a pretty big percentage in the size of that dormer. That cantilever gives you a lot more usable floor space. In that respect looking at it from usability, floor plan and space planning then I think it is probably preferable. In my opinion that if it aligns with the wall from an exterior standpoint it probably matches the surrounding homes and the nature of a North End home better.

NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY
NO STAFF REBUTTAL

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: In looking particularly at that south elevation where that gable roof appears to creep up over the existing roofline that overhang is exaggerated perhaps in this drawing I could certainly support the application with bringing the dormer into align with the existing rear wall plane and to have that fascia trim match up as the applicant has indicated would be possible.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I have the thought that the cantilever doesn't really bother me that much. I think it's exaggerated on an elevation like this where it looks like it's coming right at you, but really it's set back from the corner. I don't think it would look as top heavy as it does in the flat elevation so I just wanted to put that out there. Overall I support this application and I think what they want to do with the windows is congruous and I would support that too.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: I agree with Commissioner McFadden. In looking at the dormer and going through the guidelines I couldn't really find anything in there that necessarily indicates that it's not appropriate to have a dormer sort of extend out much like a bay window even though we're on a sort of story and a half here. In that sense it's only 2 ft., it's to the back and out of the way and it does look like it would gain some valuable space up there. I really don't have any issue with that. In regard to the windows I think our guidelines do indicate or recommend that it is appropriate to do single and double hung just because that's the primary window type in these districts, but with the casements here and the fact that it looks like they're going in the existing opening and they're not really any kind of radical modification much like some of the imagines that we show in the guidelines for what not to do I tend to support the windows as proposed.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I would not be in favor of the cantilever on the dormer on the back side of the house. As far as this massing I think it's incompatible with what's in the North End. I live near a house that has a dormer that cantilevers off the back of a house and when you look at it you can't help but look at it because it is an oddity in the neighborhood. I would be in favor of bringing back the dormer to the wall plane as the applicant had proposed. The height question of the dormer has been addressed. I'm also in agreement with the other Commissioners as far as the windows. I would be in favor of the changes to the windows as proposed.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER: I agree with everybody on the cantilever. I think it works really well and then I don't like it...I'm not sure which direction to go on that. From an exterior standpoint having the flush wall with the fascia coming across would definitely look better, but at the same time this is centered on the back of the house. This is not a corner lot and it would be impossible to see it unless you are around to the side of the house or in the backyard. I don't think it would be offensive if one were in the back

of the house because of the nature of it. At the same time the house would look much better if it did not have the cantilever. On the windows the applicant has made a good case for going to what appears to be the style of the original windows as opposed to the vinyl double or single hung whichever they may be that are currently in there. On the drawings they look like they've got an evenly divided into four lights, but the photos show that impression is not correct given how the horizontal...however they're divided. It's hard to say if that's an application or exactly what that is on that. I'm torn between the cantilever and I can see it both ways and consequently I'll defer to someone else as far as making a motion on this.

COMMISSION McFADDEN MOVED TO APPROVE DRH08-00331 AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT INCLUDING LEAVING THE FRENCH CASEMENT WINDOWS AND ALLOWING THE CANTILEVER DORMER IN THE BACK.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I'm going to vote against the motion because I don't like the cantilever. I don't think it's congruous with the North End and some of the roof forms and dormer forms that are existing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I too will be voting against the motion allowing the cantilever. You can see the dormer from Ridenbaugh Street when you're driving down before you make the turn when you heading west. I just don't feel that cantilevers going to look right.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL: As a comment...in going through the guidelines perhaps realizing that this is a little different situation here where it is actually a dormer I think the gable roof is certainly a form that we see in the District. In my mind I look at it as if they were to take this 2 ft. cantilever and drop it down to the foundation what does that do overall? What you can see from public right-of-way would probably just be that dormer section there. In my mind the cantilever is not a critical issue and I can't really find anything that necessarily would support not allowing that.

CHAIRMAN POOSER: I would just add that it's not the gable in an of itself it's just the fact that there is an overhang and the massing of it...that it comes off the roof...you just don't see a dormer come off the roof such as this as it is cantilevered here. That's the reason I'd be voting against the application.

ROLL CALL VOTE 4:2. MOTION CARRIES WITH COMMISSIONERS POOSER AND DAWSON VOTING AGAINST.