



Historic Preservation Commission AGENDA CITY OF BOISE

Commission Meeting

Monday, December 16, 2019
6:00 PM

City Hall - Maryanne Jordan City Council Chambers
150 Capitol Blvd
Boise, ID 83702

Chair

Cindy Montoto

Vice-Chair

Ericka Rupp

Historic Preservation Commission Members

Commissioner

Danielle Weaver

Commissioner

Noah Richter

Commissioner

Anthony Shallat

Commissioner

Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria

Commissioner

Jillian Moroney

Commissioner

Devin Koski

Student Commissioner

Xavier Suarez

Our Vision: To Make Boise the Most Livable City in the Country

Pursuant to Idaho Code Section 74-204(4), all items on the Agenda marked with an asterisk * are action items that require a vote. Identifying an item as an action item on the Agenda does not require that a vote be taken. All Consent Agenda items will be enacted by one motion, unless a Commissioner or citizen requests the item be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in the normal sequence of business.

BOISE, IDAHO

Historic Preservation Commission Agenda

City Hall - Maryanne Jordan City Council Chambers, 6:00 PM

December 16, 2019

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. MINUTES ACCEPTANCE

- *1. Historic Preservation Commission Minutes / November 25, 2019

III. CREATION OF CONSENT AGENDA

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- *1. **DRH19-00502 / Robert Musheno**

Location: 1011 W. Resseguie Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story garage with a second level accessory dwelling unit. The project will increase lot coverage above 35%. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

Ted Vanegas

- *2. **DRH19-00529 / Jay Curtright**

Location: 1110 N. 20th Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing one-story non-contributing single-family structure and to construct a one-story single-family structure. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

Ted Vanegas

- *3. **DRH19-00535 / Cooper Kalisek**

1723 W. Eastman Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a roof over the main entry of a contributing structure. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

Ted Vanegas

V. ADJOURNMENT



**BOISE CITY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 25, 2019**

I. CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Valderrama-Echavarria, Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter
ABSENT: Rupp, Suarez, Weaver, Shallat

II. MINUTES ACCEPTANCE

1. Historic Preservation Commission Minutes / October 28, 2019

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Noah Richter
SECONDER:	Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria
AYES:	Valderrama-Echavarria, Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter
ABSENT:	Ericka Rupp, Xavier Suarez, Danielle Weaver, Anthony Shallat

III. CONSENT AGENDA

2. **DRH19-00492 / Carolyn Coffman**

Location: 1810 N. Harrison Blvd.

Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing detached accessory structure and to construct a one-story garage and attached accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Cindy Montoto
SECONDER:	Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria
AYES:	Valderrama-Echavarria, Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter
ABSENT:	Ericka Rupp, Xavier Suarez, Danielle Weaver, Anthony Shallat

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. **DRH19-00487 / Sarah Inouye**

Location: 1419 N. 7th Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct an addition to the side and rear of the house, and to extend the covered patio. A basement is also proposed. The project will increase lot coverage over 35%. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

Ted Vanegas (City of Boise): As you see on the aerial map this is a contributing corner property and a substandard lot. The property is located at 1419 N. 7th Street in the North End Historic District. The style is Vernacular Queen Anne and it is a contributing structure constructed in 1905. As previously stated, the project encompasses an addition to the south side and rear of the structure as well as an expansion of the patio. A basement is also included.

You'll note on the bottom of the screen lot coverage is proposed to be increased from 26-percent to about 39-percent.

This is a site plan submitted by the applicant. It is next to the blurry aerial on the left and you kind of get an idea of the expansion that will occur. You'll see the outline of the expanded patio here and then the addition comes out to the side and toward the back.

These are some renderings provided by the applicant. They show more 3-D detail of what is going on with the house. Let me go back and give you a reminder...this is the front elevation of the Queen Anne house. These are the proposals. As you can see, the addition is stepped back which is what the Commission likes to see.

One item I addressed in my report and that I was going to put in the conditions wasn't added. It was this second porch area. I would like the Commission to take a look at that. In the report I discussed that it potentially conflicts or competes with the main entrance of the structure which you can see there. That is the main entry with a porch and then the addition. Though it is stepped back it does sort of have an uncovered porch or patio area right here that may conflict with that main entry on the contributing home.

You'll also note that the addition includes a sort of cross gable or side gable with a front gable as well. So, you have a gable to the side and a gable to the front generally matching the roof and gable style of the existing house. However, in my report I discuss on

this upper gabled section. I do have a recommended condition of approval that it be removed. Staff believes that this part of the roof competes with the rest of the original roofline and changes the view of the roof from the street. I have another slide showing the original house with this. You look at the original house with just two gables. One here on the front side and one over the entry and then with the addition the proposal is to add two more front facing gables. This one directly on the addition and this one further up on the roof. In the discussion you'll see that staff thinks that this competes with that roof too much and rises above these other areas of the roof...rises above the two other existing original gable lines. There is also some concern that the more you mess with a roof and the more you're adding in on a roof, the more you have to take away from the original roof and the more impact there is going to be to the original roof. There is some concern with the integrity of the original roof to stay intact and have as minimal alterations as possible on that area.

This is a foundation and roof plan. The reason I put this on here is that though there aren't any notes indicating so, typically when we're looking at construction plans usually submitted with building permits. if you're looking at a section that has a dotted line around it, it generally indicates that area is going to be demolished. We have the roof plan and the foundation plan both with the dotted lines around it so there is some concern by staff that there is going to be more done here with the roof and the body of the house than is anticipated.

This is a photo of the existing rear yard showing the patio cover. This is a photo of the side area where that side addition will go. These are some neighboring properties.

We do have a list of recommended conditions of approval with this application. Some of them are pretty standard and you've seen those before, but due to some of the concerns in reviewing the plans we've added a few.

You'll note that the underlined conditions are the conditions I'm more generally pointing to. *"The roof shall be redesigned to not include the upper added front gable"* as I talked about on those elevations. That should be removed to reduce that impact to the roof and to reduce the changes...the appearance of the roof from the street.

The other one is, *"Reduce the lot coverage to 35-percent"*. In the report I note that the expansion on the patio is a pretty large

contributor to that lot coverage. That would probably be the easiest way to reduce the lot coverage on the property. Generally, on substandard lots, especially corner substandard lots you're going to see a higher lot coverage with some projects where there's expansions involved. That generally involves living space and sometimes we allow that lot coverage...if the design is good to fudge a little bit above. In this case because that lot coverage is due to the patio cover staff believes that that can be feasibly reduced without sacrificing some of the living space that is being requested with this application.

Another condition, *"No part of the front roof elevation shall be demolished or removed"*. Roof demolition is only allowed on the portions of the roof essentially impacted by the addition, so I do add a kind of a sub-condition there that the submitted building plans need to be clear on what is being removed and what is being altered.

Then another condition. *"No part of the house shall be deconstructed or demolished during construction of the basement"*.

At the bottom you'll see if it is the wish of the Commission to add a condition to reduce that front entry. An entry could feasibly remain at that location but reduced in size, so it doesn't compete with the front porch on the house.

With that I'll stand for questions.

Commissioner Richter: Can you go back to the dashed...dotted line comparisons side-by-side. I'd like to hear this from the applicant or the applicant's representative, but generally these dash lines are more roof overhangs showing the line of the roof overhang of the existing house. Then the outside dash line on here is showing the width of the footing of the home. That is generally what they are notating. This is your footing width, and this is the overhang on the roof. Generally speaking, that's where we see those types of dash lines. Demolition stuff is usually blacked out or notated. There's actually a note that points to it that says, to be removed or demolished. If you look at the elevations of the existing house, you'll see that all of this kind of matches the roof overhangs and that is going to be the footing side. Unless the applicant tells me different that is generally what we see when we're reviewing construction documents.

Ted Vanegas: I appreciate that. I didn't see the notes on the plans indicating what it meant so there was just some general concern of what was going on there. Thank you for clarifying.

Commissioner Richter: Ultimately, I would like to have the applicant clarify that too.

Applicant Testimony

Sarah Inouye (Applicant): I want to start and let you know how we got to where we are today. My husband and I started talking about this project nearly three years ago shortly after our first son was born.

We have spent many hours walking around our neighborhood for inspiration. Combing through the Residential Guidelines and reviewing previously approved projects just to gain an understanding of what is appropriate. We've also spent time with your planning staff for guidance as well.

This is our second set of final plans that we've had drawn up with multiple iterations. Initially we had hoped to bump out to the side like you see here and then go up half a story, but unfortunately, I don't know if you can see or not, but the pitch of our roof is too shallow to reasonably accommodate dormers without raising the height of our roof which is not considered appropriate so we switched gears and began new plans for building down. We were hoping not to do that because we do consider basement square footage less desirable, but we definitely understand the Commission's position on going up.

The reason I'm sharing this with you is I'm trying to demonstrate that we've been making efforts to work within and be flexible to the guidelines and the precedent that has been set forth by the Historic Commission.

Having said that, I would like to speak to three of the conditions for approval.

Gables. We discussed this with our architect and our builder. The gable is serving dual purposes. In order to mitigate drainage issues, "crickets" will be used on this portion of the roof so the gable hides this from street view. Secondly, we felt that it simply looks nice from a design standpoint and is congruous with the architectural style of the other gables. It is set back, and it is not higher than highest part of the roofline. We would like to keep this design element.

Ted and I did discuss over e-mail the secondary porch. I understand where his position is on this. We talked about...I can see where it can be competing with the front façade and I'm wondering if maybe we could just add stairs. Remove the porch, add just stairs so we'd have steps from those doors and if it would be reasonable to keep the gable, remove the porch so that it wouldn't be too busy or take away from that front façade at all.

I would like to discuss lot coverage. We are within the 55-percent limit required by the ordinance and we also exceed the minimum for open space. If you were to calculate just the solid building mass alone our home and the garage would only cover 33-percent. We think the back patio looks appropriate and it breaks up the house nicely. If you can see the back of it, the covering sets down from the main structure. You can kind of see where the house ends and that begins.

I understand that each project needs to be evaluated individually and we have seen projects go up. In our research we've seen projects go up as much as 42 (percent), but when we've looked at the averages for the area 39 (percent) is what we've been seeing. I'd like to ask the Commission to consider granting us the additional 4-percent for that patio. I believe what we are asking for is reasonable and we definitely want to work within these guidelines.

We'd like to have a four-bedroom home with an office. My husband works from home. We have two children and my father is 83 years old. At some point he will probably be under our care. We think our proposed addition looks great and I don't think it takes away from the neighborhood. I just wanted to say thank you. We've been looking forward to this project for quite some time and we're really excited. I grew up here in this neighborhood and went to school at Longfellow just a few blocks from where this house is and I'm looking forward to having my kids grow up here too. Thank you for your time.

Commissioner Richter: Can you give me a bit of clarification on where you got your lot coverage percentages? That 33-percent, is that not including the covered patio? Is that what you said?

Sarah Inouye: Yes, if you just think of it in terms of just solid mass...

Commissioner Richter: So, like four walls?

Sarah Inouye: The 33-percent is the home not including the covered patio and the garage.

Commissioner Richter: With the 39-percent that is included with the rear patio?

Sarah Inouye: Yes, the patio bumps us to 39.

Chairman Montoto: I'm curious. For the side addition with the steps, are you planning on using that as a second entrance to a home office or living...

Sarah Inouye: From our bedroom.

Chairman Montoto: From a bedroom. So, are you going to be accessing that from the front and that is why you want the steps there?

Sarah Inouye: Yes.

Chairman Montoto: So, are you going to have a cement sidewalk from the main sidewalk shooting off?

Sarah Inouye: No.

Chairman Montoto: No. It will just be...

Sarah Inouye: The front yard.

Chairman Montoto: The front yard, okay.

Sarah Inouye: I didn't address the technical question you had. I can't answer that because I can't read that, but it was never our intention to remove the roof entirely. From a technical standpoint I can't tell you how that reads because it was from a previous architect that we were using that drew that up. I'm sorry that I can't.

Public Testimony

Damon Noller (1413 N. 7th Street): I'm two homes down. I'm here as a neighbor in general support of the project and can vouch for the consciousness that they've shown trying to examine what is proper for the neighborhood and trying to meet the requirements of the Commission and that's a note to make.

Commissioner Koski: Ted, if you look at the picture that is up for the façade comparison noting on the existing home the gable detail shown on the left gable as you're looking at it with the window and those certain details, you're pointing at exactly, on the conceptual drawings those type of details aren't shown and there are similar details or lack of details along the north side of the home also. I'm wondering if the complete plans or the other plans show any of those details to remain because the way it is shown conceptually it shows an alteration on the front of house which is not supposed to be touched.

Ted Vanegas: Correct. These are the kind of details that we should probably be conditioning and not be touched, but the plans show a similar facade and they should be in the packet...the drawings. The Commission could certainly add a condition of approval if you're going down that road that none of those architectural details are removed or altered.

Applicant Rebuttal

Sarah Inouye: As far as the details we just don't have them in drawings. It's not our intention to remove anything. I wanted to add that we have discussed this project a lot with our neighbors directly. They're the only neighbors directly next to us. We do have a letter of support from them that's included in your packet.

Public Portion Closed

Commission Deliberations

Commissioner Koski: Lot coverage is something to definitely be discussed. Especially that the structure is part of that porch. It's not just a porch itself. We've got an existing roof structure going over that. What I'm concerned about is detailing of what is going on. If you look on the Ada or north street view of the existing and then the drawings. In the drawings it appears that there is going to be some significant changes on the north façade. While that is the side of the house that faces the street and it is a contributing structure, there are architectural details of gable details that exist and there are significant changes in fenestration and window size which means you're going to be altering the wall quite a bit. So, I don't know if it could be put as a condition of approval, but I'd be really interested in seeing the details of what that is going to be and if it would fit and the guidelines of altering facades. It is similar to my question that I brought up to staff earlier on the front of the house and gables. The same kind of thing. If you look at the window and

gables details on the north elevation it doesn't match what's existing. While they are adding a significant addition, they are also proposing significant changes to that façade. I'm concerned about that.

Commissioner Richter: The secondary front porch is a concern of mine for sure. Especially with the approach. I think it would be okay if you just turn the approach to the side, but don't make it such a prominent approach to the front of the house. You're actually approaching it to the left of the stairs running down left off the deck. I'm okay with the deck and I'm okay with everything like that, but with that prominent of a stair competing with the front entry of the existing house I think that's a bit of a concern.

While I understand staff's concern with the stepped back gable, you would have an awfully hard challenge redesigning that roof to get rid of that thing. It would be a challenge to get that roof to work out and get your addition taken care of. I see why you did that, and I understand your intent there and to get that roof system to work. You're basically dealing with two competing ridgelines of the same height. How do you get water to move from one to the other and also with steps and foundations and stuff like that to get rid of that gable would leave a funky little valley right there. It would look worse if it wasn't there quite honestly.

Another concern of mine is the lot coverage. I think that is one of the biggest concerns I have. I think you have done a great job and you've gone down a road of probably a lot of long hours and long evenings and early mornings, and a lot of discussions to getting this thing designed right, but I think if you were to reduce your rear patio by 4-percent that would be a good move on your part. That is something I'd probably want to stick with as far as lot coverage goes.

To Commissioner Koski's comment about the north facing façade. The dormers are a little bit much, but the fenestrations and the reconfigured window openings...I don't know if I have too much concern with that.

Commissioner Koski: I think the window portions of it look good, I'm just concerned about the details of removing architectural elements on a contributing structure.

Commissioner Richter: Sure.

Commissioner Koski: I would agree with you on the window part of it. You're dealing with a contributing structure and we want to protect these structures and all the little details. Trim details, gable details, the little windows that are up there, the little vents and all those kinds of things contribute to it so whenever a drawing isn't showing that and while it may just seem like it is a basic drawing, it's not there and we want to make sure it stays.

Commissioner Valderrama: I agree with you Commissioner Koski. Also, the columns on the porch don't seem to match up with what is there originally. If you look at the chimney and I hate to nitpick here, but the chimney is kind of on the front and if you look at the original photo the chimney is somewhat on the back on the rear of the roofline. You've got to consider these plans like law. If you've got some legal thing you have to go to the tee of it. If you look at these plans with the little window missing on the second main living room window...we have to go based on approving what's on the plan and if it is not in the plan those little tiny details get missed and lost. Sometimes people think we're just going to go based on what is on the plan. I hate to be super micromanaging, but the chimney is in the front and not in the back, the little window is missing...it's like where's Waldo, but all those little details we have to be attentive to. For me, the little details like what Commissioner Koski is talking about...those are very important. That is a point I wanted to make.

Commissioner Moroney: I agree with those little details. I don't know if the plan doesn't reflect it because it's not a detailed plan or if in their plan they could be removed, but I think those things are important. Like the chimney placement, the tiny window and the horizontal white stripe. Those things really add to the character of the house and that is what we're trying to preserve so making sure those are important...it's complicated to say yes, we approve this plan not knowing if they are included in here.

Chairman Montoto: I would, very quickly, like to go back to that patio addition on the front. I like what Commissioner Richter presented about rotating those steps to be on the left side. It was something that really struck me on this plan because it does appear to be a competing second entrance which is why I asked what it was going to be used for. Since it isn't really going to serve as a second entryway, I would feel a lot better about having those steps moved to the left side so it doesn't compete and also can more privately serve your family versus someone maybe like...a little kid trick-or-treating getting confused and walking up those steps. I don't want to reiterate too much of what else has been said, but

I'm very much feeling the same as my fellow commissioners. I'm ready to entertain a motion. If we feel like we need to have more discussion, we can do that as well.

Ted Vanegas: As far as moving the stairs on the side I think we'd need to be careful with the setback on that side elevation. Right now, it is at the 5-foot mark on that side elevation and a stair can go into a setback somewhat, but you're already right at the setback line so I'm not 100-percent sure if it would work. If the intent of what you're saying is to have the stair come off that south side of the porch it could be problematic with setbacks.

Chairman Montoto: With that I will entertain a motion. This is tough. Ted, could you pull up conditions please? Legal, can I suggest motions?

Adam Dingeldein (Legal Counsel): Sure.

Chairman Montoto: We can move to deny this project, we can move to approve this project with the existing conditions in front of us, we can add additional conditions like including a condition to include and protect the architectural details and that those are not touched. I know this is tricky, but we do have another item we need to hear.

Commissioner Moroney: With regards to these conditions, I agree with Commissioner Richter that maybe taking off the condition that the roof shall be redesigned to not include an upper front facing gable just because of the problems with drainage that might propose.

COMMISSIONER RICHTER MOVED TO APPROVE DRH19-00487 WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN THE PROJECT REPORT WITH THE DELETION OF CONDITION 1.E. AND THE ADDITION OF A CONDITION, "NO ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS ON THE EXISTING HOME SHALL BE DISTURBED OR REMOVED".

Commissioner Moroney: What are we doing with the secondary porch? Are we good with it?

COMMISSIONER RICHTER AMENDED HIS MOTION TO APPROVE DRH19-00487 WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN THE PROJECT REPORT WITH THE DELETION OF CONDITION 1.E. AND THE ADDITION OF TWO ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS, "NO ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS ON THE EXISTING HOME SHALL BE DISTURBED OR REMOVED" AND "THE SECONDARY STEPS TO THE LEFT OF THE FRONT OF THE HOME SHALL BE REDESIGNED TO NOT COMPETE WITH THE MAIN FRONT ENTRY".

COMMISSIONER MORONEY SECONDED.

RESULT:	APPROVED [4 TO 1]
MOVER:	Noah Richter
SECONDER:	Jillian Moroney
AYES:	Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria, Cindy Montoto, Jillian Moroney, Noah Richter
NAYS:	Devin Koski
ABSENT:	Ericka Rupp, Xavier Suarez, Danielle Weaver, Anthony Shallat

3. **DRH19-00495 / Kerry Calverley**

Location: 1416 E. Bannock Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request move a historic house onto a contributing property. The existing contributing house on the property will be converted to an accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-2H (Medium Density Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

Ted Vanegas (City of Boise): Presented project report with a recommendation to approve.

Kerry Calverley (Applicant): This is my husband Steve; my partner and we're involved in working through this together. This is a very unique project that we are involved with. We have moved six homes off the St. Luke's Health System lot. We have one home that is a duplex that moved directly onto its forever lot up on the Boise Bench. We are currently working on sitting it down on its foundation in the next two to three weeks so moving ahead on that one.

Our other homes we moved over onto the temporary location. Our original plan was to take five homes and move them onto an acre parcel off of Warm Springs and Walnut on Lewis Lane. We were working with some lot owners there that had an acre parcel that were very interested in working with us to create a Subdivision called Preservation Park. We were talking with them for over a year about this possibility and just as we came down to it, we didn't come to a meeting of the minds of what that lot property...what

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Nov 25, 2019 6:00 PM (Minutes Acceptance)

they wanted to sell it for and what we felt was fair to pay for the lot. Given the unique nature of our project we really could not overpay for the land that we were working on developing. We had to go to Plan B. We had moved our houses onto the temporary lot due to the fact that we were not able to move them directly onto the lot without a building permit, so we went to Plan B and tried to stay within the southeast side. Finding land that would work and be ideal for these houses has been the utmost challenging.

We have two of the houses now that we have moved across the street, literally, to a wonderful lot next to the Warm Springs Golf Course.

We have this Craftsman now that we had to figure out what we wanted to do with it and what we could do. In talking with Bret and Lily Bantz who are the current owners of this lot...we got talking to them about a possible other lot in the neighborhood and that particular lot didn't work out. They came to share with us that they have a lot and they own this lot and we're very excited about this. We huddled up and talked more about this. In just looking at the street of 1416 E. Bannock, there are a lot of Craftsman homes on this street. This house would look really well with the street. One thing I'll say about this particular house is at the current moment it is not at its ideal state. It is a little run down looking. The siding and the coloring on it are not, in my eye, very pretty. We feel that it definitely needs a better paint job with some warmer and nicer colors on it.

Our plan is we'd like to have it fit well with the existing structure even though they are two different architectural styles, but they're not really entirely different given the look of the house and the shaping of the house. If you see where the front door is currently, and of course that door is not very pretty, that front extension used to be a front porch and has been covered in. When you inside of that you can see on the rafters above it has some amazingly beautiful wood. Is it oak on the entrance of that? When you look up?

Steve Calverley: I don't believe it is oak. I believe it is fir.

Kerry Calverley: Fir, but it is a beautiful finish. It's clear. Our intention is to make that first section back into an open porch. Of the homes that we've moved, this particular house...it may not be the prettiest from the outside, but from the inside it is the most beautiful. It has the original lighting in most places, it doesn't have very pretty carpeting right now. It's like a teal green carpet, but

when you pull back the carpeting it has the original floors in amazing shape. The carpeting has probably been there for 40 years and it has been the best protectant for that floor. Now we can go and refinish that floor. It has some beautiful wainscoting in the original oak. We were so excited when we saw the interior of this house and the potential that it has. We want to bring that beauty back to this house.

Moving a house is very challenging, but the good news is this is a single-level home. For the argument of it not being a two-story it doesn't take as much ...the prospect of it taking gardening space. I know that is a big concern of people in a historic neighborhood. How much is it going to affect my light on my garden? Being a single-level structure, it should fit in within that parameter. The challenge of moving a house into the neighborhood itself...we have worked with the City of Boise and with the Forestry Department. We will not be affecting much on the trees in the right-of-way coming through. Just from an architectural standpoint we really believe it will fit in there very well.

The other thing is you see on the side of this house it does not show a fireplace. They had to remove the fireplace due to weight that it had on the move. We will be replacing it. Steve has been talking with a fireplace specialist and we would like to try and stay within the Arts and Craft style as we're putting that into consideration. We have chosen it yet, but we have a couple in mind.

Speaking about ADU potential. I know we have an existing home and obviously I know from a neighborhood standpoint I know neighbors are probably a little concerned they are going to miss their open space of that front lot, but it does look a little bit out of place in the neighborhood with the house sitting so far back. Friends that I know that live in the East End...there are other ADU units that are very similar in size so it seems that it would fit very nicely for an ADU unit. My husband and I are thinking...our intent is to live in the house. We want to move into this house. We want to downsize. We love this area. Our kids went to Roosevelt Elementary and I've enjoyed a lot of really good memories of strolling down the streets and being in the East End. More importantly having an ADU unit would be ideal for us. Possibly taking care of an aging parent. Not sure which one. We also have a child, she is a graduate of high school, but because she has Epilepsy there may be a day that she needs to live a little closer to home so the ADU downstream might be good.

Steve Calverley: I'm more the architectural geek. The things I like are the gables. That's really Craftsman if you look at that. It's just the wrong paint colors so you can't see it. We think if you bring in a lighter paint color and a darker base on that body, you'll bring the gables back in. That is really the architectural detail if you see the different facias in that house. By bringing back the front porch it is really the way it should have looked. It has been commercialized. We think it could be a really cute house on Bannock.

Chairman Montoto: This was initially a project that was recommended for the consent agenda, but the Commission wanted to take the opportunity to thank you for your efforts in saving this and all of the other St. Luke's projects. This is really, really special and I know I'm personally really excited to be a part of this hearing process for this project. I know when we were discussing it in our work session the question of the 1416 address came up and whether that will remain with the cottage or if this new home will take on that address and that the cottage will have its own separate address or become like a 1416 B. Can you speak to that?

Steve Calverley: What is the precedence?

Chairman Montoto: I don't know.

Steve Calverley: I guess we're open to whatever would be the precedent and whatever would be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood.

Chairman Montoto: Great...wonderful. My next question was do you have any plans of this home potentially regaining contributing status to become an East End contributing property? Have you looked into that at all?

Kerry Calverley: No, honestly, we have not looked into that, but we're very open to that. How I understand it, it is no longer a contributing property since it has moved off its original lot. Whatever that process might be...I don't know what that process is, but again we would be open to pursuing that if it is possible.

Chairman Montoto: Wonderful.

Commissioner Koski: I want to applaud you for doing this. I think it's great, I think it's fantastic. You have two contributing structures. When you put them on one lot, you'll have one contributing structure so it would be great if you could check into that and pursue that because you obviously want to preserve it and we'd like to be part of helping you preserve it too.

Commissioner Richter: I would also like to commend your efforts on saving this home. Any more people seem like they want to get rid of them more than save them. People may question us about the lot coverage thing, but with a special circumstance like this where you are saving a historically contributing home and rehabbing it and bringing it back to its...from what I understand the process you are going to go through to bring it back to as close to original state the lot coverage doesn't take any concern with me on this one for sure. I want to get that on public record because it is a very special project. I think if you investigate it with Ted or whoever you may want to talk to about getting it to be re-contributing or get a façade easement on it...I think you have an awesome opportunity here and thank you for doing this. I really appreciate it.

Public Testimony

Bret Bantz (1421 E. Bannock): I live just east and up the street and this is my property currently, so I have some interest. In talking to the neighbors...we went around talking to them because an orange sign goes up and people get interested. It is a lot that, from a financial point of view for myself, we have to do something with it. When Steve referred to himself as an architecture geek he really is! This opportunity to put a house in that meets...in terms of width it is a little long for the property and thus the amount of coverage, but it really fits. More so than, I would say, the house to either side. The house to the east is about 10 years old and the house to the west has been extensively remodeled with a second floor added. In an odd way moving this in would be the most historically correct house out of those three. From the street it meets setback requirements and it is narrow enough to where it will sit on it and I would just love to see this happen, which I think is just adding to what the Commission already thinks.

No Applicant Rebuttal

Public Portion Closed

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Noah Richter
SECONDER:	Jillian Moroney
AYES:	Valderrama-Echavaria, Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter
ABSENT:	Ericka Rupp, Xavier Suarez, Danielle Weaver, Anthony Shallat

V. ADJOURNMENT



City of Boise
Public Hearing
Historic Preservation Item

**Planning and Development
Services**
150 N Capitol Blvd
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 972-8531

4.1

TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Ted Vanegas, Planning and Development Services
DATE: November 25, 2019
SUBJECT: | Certificate of Appropriateness - Residential | DRH19-00502 / Robert Musheno

SUMMARY:

DRH19-00502 / Robert Musheno / Location: 1011 W. Resseguie Street / Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story garage with a second level accessory dwelling unit. The project will increase lot coverage above 35%. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION:



City of Boise
Public Hearing
Historic Preservation Item

**Planning and Development
Services**
150 N Capitol Blvd
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 972-8531

TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Ted Vanegas, Planning and Development Services
DATE: November 25, 2019
SUBJECT: | Certificate of Appropriateness - Residential | DRH19-00529 / Jay Curtright

SUMMARY:

DRH19-00529 / Jay Curtright / Location: 1110 N. 20th Street Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing one-story non-contributing single-family structure and to construct a one-story single-family structure. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION:



City of Boise
Public Hearing
Historic Preservation Item

**Planning and Development
Services**
150 N Capitol Blvd
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 972-8531

TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Ted Vanegas, Planning and Development Services
DATE: November 25, 2019
SUBJECT: | Certificate of Appropriateness - Residential | DRH19-00535 / Cooper Kalisek

SUMMARY:

DRH19-00535 / Cooper Kalisek / Location: 1723 W. Eastman Street Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a roof over the main entry of a contributing structure. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

BACKGROUND:

RECOMMENDATION: