I. CALL TO ORDER

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

ABSENT: Shallat, Montoto

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

1. Historic Preservation Commission Minutes | August 26, 2019

RESULT: ACCEPTED [5 TO 0]
MOVER: Noah Richter
SECONDER: Jillian Moroney
AYES: Richter, Weaver, Valderrama-Echavarria, Rupp, Moroney
ABSTAIN: Devin Koski, Xavier Suarez
ABSENT: Anthony Shallat, Cindy Montoto

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. DRH19-00372 | Sara Moroney
Location: 1920 N. Harrison Blvd.
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing detached one-story garage and accessory dwelling unit and to construct a detached two-story garage with accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

2. DRH19-00380 | Scott Yribar
Location: 1215 N. 6th Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing detached accessory structure and to construct a two-story garage with accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.
4. **DRH19-00382 | Julianne Bronner**  
   Location: 1721 N. 15th Street  
   Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing detached accessory structure and to construct a one-story garage with attached accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [5 TO 0]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Noah Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Danielle Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Richter, Weaver, Valderrama-Echavarria, Rupp, Moroney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Devin Koski, Xavier Suarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Anthony Shallat, Cindy Montoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULT: APPROVED [5 TO 0]**

**MOVER:** Noah Richter  
**SECONDER:** Danielle Weaver  
**AYES:** Richter, Weaver, Valderrama-Echavarria, Rupp, Moroney  
**ABSTAIN:** Devin Koski, Xavier Suarez  
**ABSENT:** Anthony Shallat, Cindy Montoto

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

3. **DRH19-00381 | Erin Loudy**  
   Location: 2401 N. 20th Street  
   Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish existing detached accessory structures and to construct a 1½-story garage with accessory dwelling unit. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

**Ted Vanegas (City of Boise):** Presented project report. Recommended approval with conditions contained in project report.

**Carey Simons (Owner / 2401 N. 20th Street):** Inquired if any neighbors have voiced opinions to the City.

**Ted Vanegas:** Stated there have been no comments from neighborhood.

**Tim Beaudoin (TBL Construction / 2511 W. Heron Street):** Testified he is aware of the limits and concerns with height in relation to the house. Stated the structure is a small 750 square foot footprint so they were left with trying to fight with doing an ADU and making it smaller than the house. Talked with staff about what may be appropriate and came up with a little less than three feet. Structure will be stucco with Pella windows, high-end and will match house. The bonus room is 400 square feet of the 1,300.

**Commissioner Richter:** Asked if there is any way to get this down lower.
Tim Beaudoin: Confirmed yes, stating the head height and dormers might get bigger.

Commissioner Richter: Stated peak heights should not exceed the existing home and feels garages and ADU's should be subordinate to the houses adding the guidelines state, “It is generally appropriate to maintain a proportional mass, size and height to ensure that the accessory dwelling unit is not taller than the primary building”. Feels if they could lower this to the same peak height of the house, he would be in favor of approving this, but with it being taller than the house he would not.

Tim Beaudoin: Responded he has notified all the neighbors and there has been no objection to their proposal. Stated there is a massive garage to the south that looms over that house by 15-20 feet. Understands rules and tried to follow them. Plans were drawn in what they felt were acceptable and followed previous heights that have been approved.

Commissioner Richter: Feels the design, architecture and materials are great and fits well with the house but is concerned with the height.

NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Commissioner Koski: Asked to clarify with staff that the square footage of the existing home was 1,328 square feet and the proposed building is 1,398 square feet.

Ted Vanegas: Confirmed total square footage of the existing house is 1,328 and the proposed ADU is about 1,300 square feet.

Student Commissioner Suarez: Asked staff if most of the garages being built in the historic districts are as big as the house or smaller.

Ted Vanegas: Replied most of the time as far as height goes, in square feet, the garage is smaller adding it is not common that a taller garage is requested noting it has been occurring a bit more lately with more ADU’s coming through.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMISSIONER KOSKI MOVED TO DENY DRH19-00381.
COMMISSIONER RICHTER SECONDED.

COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS

Commissioner Koski: There are significant items that need to be looked at in massing and height. Guidelines are clear in Section 6 and Commissioner Richter noted one on maintaining the appropriate mass and size. Height is a portion of that, but square footage is significant. When you’re looking at a new building that is going to have more square feet with a significant portion of the existing building in the basement that goes toward the massing element. While the square footages may look and appear same, the massing is significantly different.

Commissioner Moroney: I have similar concerns when doing the math. It looks like the new one is a bit bigger square footage wise and none of it is in the basement underground. When thinking about the massing and what is the more dominant structure on the property it is hard to image that the house will be when the proposed garage has a larger footprint and is taller.

Commissioner Weaver: I appreciate the applicant’s note about the house we had looked at before that was potentially four feet taller. The consideration I have on this house is that it is a corner lot and even from the front, although it does stick out past the existing house by I don’t know how many feet, but to the north a little bit so you can see it from 20th Street which I was considering the front, but from the side you will see the houses side by side and it looks like the actual footprint of the garage is about 200 square feet bigger than the footprint of the house if I’m looking at that right and I’m not 100-percent sure that I am, but you will see the difference in the height of that house as opposed to a garage that might be a little bit taller but set back and the only way you see it is from the front. So visually you can’t tell the difference, but from the side you’ll definitely be able to tell that. It makes me worry that this will make the garage more dominate on that lot than the house is.

Ted Vanegas: I want to put a point of clarification on where you may be going with this to try to let the applicant know exactly what you’re looking for. For one, how low the garage needs to go and if it needs to lose footprint or square footage overall? And, what you’d like to see so they know how to redesign or if you want to set parameters around the size of the structure. Do you want it to come back to you or do you want staff to operate to review revised
plans within the parameters that you lay out as far as height and massing goes?

**Commissioner Richter:** Per Ted’s suggestions and direction on this honestly if the garage was the same height as the house and didn’t exceed the height of the house and the footprint didn’t exceed the footprint of the existing house the lot is big enough to handle it. To Commissioner Weaver’s point you are going to get it from a side view too, so they are going to look very similar to each other. As far as the overall footprint goes, I’d look for some more discussion on that with my fellow Commissioners, but as far as the height goes, we all know where I stand.

**Commissioner Weaver:** Staff you’d have to correct me, but if I read the plan correctly the existing house main floor square footage is 768 square feet, in my mind the footprint and the garage plus the studio first floor single-level is 982 square feet so it seems the garage plus studio footprint is actually larger than the house footprint. Maybe I’m missing something on here? I’m looking at the SP01 plan.

**Student Commissioner Suarez:** I came to the same conclusion with the math.

**Ted Vanegas:** Maybe the applicant can clarify that as well. It looks like that is what is on the application.

**Tim Beaudoin:** Speaks from the audience (Inaudible).

**Vice-Chairman Rupp:** We have a current motion for a denial and a second, but I hear based on our conversation we are thinking we support the project, but the context for what has been proposed wanting to make some modifications. Clearly, we have modifications being discussed as a team around the context of the height. I also feel like we’ve gone into the massing and the overall square footage if I have that articulated so far about our team mates and what we’re thinking. So, to Ted’s point and staff how we’re wanting to help guide the homeowner in knowing what to go back with. For me I haven’t been able to do the math as much as you all have so I’m going to trust you and with two of you getting the same math is how I’ll trust that. Some initial thoughts of mine with regards to knowing that the height of the house I would agree we have approved some of those in the past but trying to make sure we’re staying as true as possible to the guidelines. The height is
something that could be modified. Whatever we propose and agree upon, I would be okay with having staff work within those frameworks and make approvals based on feedback and guidance and allowing staff to do that modification without having to bring it forward to the full panel in the future.

Commissioner Richter: I agree with that. I don’t think it would need to come back to the Commission if the applicant agreed to make the modifications that we come up with tonight.

Vice-Chairman Rupp: Can the applicant come up? I feel as though you’d like to share something.

Ted Vanegas: I want to make sure I’m clear on what your parameters are. So, it has to be no higher at peak than the existing house and the footprint should be no larger than the footprint of the existing house.

Vice-Chairman Rupp: To Ted’s point, you want to know exactly what we’re guiding you to do and we will make sure we do that by the end of the night. I think we’re still deciding it. I’ll let the applicant tell his point and then I’ll come back to his comment.

PUBLIC PORTION RE-OPENED

Tim Beaudoin: I fully understand the height issue. The square foot issue is something that maybe we could discuss. The house is 760 some square feet. If I added onto that house by 200 square feet, then that discussion goes away. I’m not saying...I have to talk to my clients, but if we did an addition on the house and made it 1,000 square feet then we’re under that piece. I’m just saying....

Vice-Chairman Rupp: You’re saying six one of half dozen other...

Tim Beaudoin: Yes. We could add onto that house because the lot coverage is so low at 25-percent. I could propose to them if they want to keep that size of a structure but reduce the height, we could add 500 square feet onto it and make it a 1,200 square foot house and still keep the same square footage.

Commissioner Richter: That would fit within the guidelines.
Tim Beaudoin: It would fit within the guidelines. I’m not saying they are going to bite off on it, but that’s all I was saying. The square footage could be argued…not argued, but I’m just asking for consideration on that piece. If we lowered the roof and made the dormers a little bit bigger, we’d probably be okay with that piece.

Commissioner Richter: Would you be okay with making it a 768 square foot garage?

Tim Beaudoin: Well that’s a (inaudible). It is a 750 square foot house, so you are kind of continuing with that thing so...

Vice-Chairman Rupp: Could the garage function with 700 and whatever feet…you could park your car and do whatever you needed to do?

Tim Beaudoin: The average garage...

Commissioner Richter: 22 by 30.

Tim Beaudoin: A minimum of 22 by 22, but they have a RV they’re trying to park in that one bay.

Commissioner Richter: 22 by 30.

Vice-Chairman Rupp: So that’s why the garage...

Tim Beaudoin: Yes, it’s a little bit bigger. 550 is the average garage and then we have some on the main level for the ADU piece.

Commissioner Koski: I can amend the motion and I think it is probably what we can do when we finally get down to it. I would to suggest that not only do we lower the height and the square footage, but I also think because this is on the street side on a corner lot when you’re talking about massing that street elevation of the building if it is the same width or wider than the house do we need to consider that as part of the massing? We could lower the square footage, but if from the street side it looks like the same size or bigger than the house I just wonder if we need to consider that? I wonder what the other commissioners think.

Commissioner Richter: I don’t think the width of it is going to matter. You’re talking about the Brenneman side of the street? You’re looking at the site plan?
Commissioner Koski: Correct.

Commissioner Richter: If you left the garage in the same place and got rid of that lower portion of the ADU it would be very subordinate to the house because you’re stepping it off the side of the property line and you’re pushing it back into that corner. And, if the peaks are the same height, I’m not sure if the width would make a difference. Do any of the other commissioners have an opinion about that?

Commissioner Weaver: I’m not concerned about the width. You can see the house in the picture. It is hard to visualize what a second structure on the lot will look like, but I’m very concerned if this is built as it is, it is going to look bigger than the house and it will start looking like the main structure on the property. The width isn’t as much of a concern, but I would like the size to not be so large and definitely shorter. The width could stay the same if there is a way to make that work. I’m fine with that.

Vice-Chairman Rupp: We have the ability to amend the initial motion. As we think about how we want to clarify that knowing that we want to make sure that staff has clear directive of what we would like. We could all help you with that amend or if you want to start with it?

Commissioner Koski: I think we’re talking about a building that is less high than the house and smaller in square footage. Right?

Vice-Chairman Rupp: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KOSKI MOVED TO AMEND HIS MOTION TO APPROVE DRH19-00381 UNDER THE CONDITION THAT THE BUILDING HEIGHT AND SQUARE FOOTAGE IS REDUCED TO LESS THAN THE HOUSE.

Commissioner Richter: I think we need to take the word less out of the amendment or add less or equal to because less...we’re already shackling him a little bit, but less even shackles him more.

Commissioner Moroney: And rather than square footage I would say the footprint because the basement makes it more square footage than that already.

Commissioner Richter: An equal size footprint.
COMMISSIONER KOSKI MOVED TO AMEND HIS MOTION TO APPROVE DRH19-00381 UNDER THE CONDITIONS THAT THE HEIGHT OF THE NEW STRUCTURE IS EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN THE EXISTING HOME AND THE FOOTPRINT IS EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN THE EXISTING HOME.

COMMISSIONER RICHTER SECONDED.

RESULT: APPROVED [6 TO 0]
MOVER: Devin Koski
SECONDER: Noah Richter
AYES: Richter, Weaver, Valderrama-Echavarria, Rupp, Koski, Moroney
ABSTAIN: Xavier Suarez
ABSENT: Anthony Shallat, Cindy Montoto

V. ADJOURNMENT