I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. MINUTES ACCEPTANCE

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Historic Preservation Commission Minutes / January 27, 2020

1. **DRH19-00554 / Robert McAuslan**
   Location: 1708 N. 27th Street
   Discussion and ratification of Findings for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish a contributing structure. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

   **RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
   **MOVER:** Noah Richter, Commissioner
   **SECONDER:** Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria, Vice-Chair
   **AYES:** Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
   **ABSENT:** Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat

IV. NEW BUSINESS

2. **DRH20-00029 / James Bedsole**
   Location: 815 N. 18th Street
   Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

   **RESULT:** WITHDRAWN
3. **DRH20-00034 / Michael Webb**

Location: 1012 N. 15th Street

Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story single-family structure with a one-story detached garage, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. Ted Vanegas

**Ted Vanegas:** The lot is currently vacant. This aerial is an older picture. There were concerns with the original report you received. The applicant has provided revised plans addressing many of those concerns. Those are what I’ll cover at this time. A memo addressing those concerns and revisions was attached to your packets.

The original site plan submitted by the applicant extended all the way to the edge of the street which was very unusual. We were, at that time, requiring them to get a survey completed to justify the extent of that site plan which did impact setbacks and lot coverage. The applicant did come back with a revised site plan that generally matches what exists on the rest of the block. The revised site plan does appear to be accurate and is consistent with the rest of the block. With the revised site plan lot coverage will be at about 37 percent and required setbacks will be met except for the side loading garage which appears to only have 23 feet from the side property line. 22 feet of backup space is required plus a 3-foot landscape buffer so the applicant would need to apply for a variance to reduce that buffer area to about 1-foot.

The height of the structure is proposed at about 30 feet which is reduced from about 34 feet on the original plan. A full front porch will extend the entire length of the façade. It appears there will be a central entrance plus two side entrances. This is a bit unusual in the historic district, however the Commission has approved such entrances in the past on new construction. Most of the houses on the block are one or one and a half stories tall. However, there is a two-story multi-family structure almost directly across the street from this structure. You’ll see here the front façade with the porch, a kind of tri-gabled roof which sort of breaks up the massing from the front and then here is the side elevation, and just the one-story garage. Here are some other renderings or views of the plans. Again, the applicant reduced the peak height from 34 feet to 30 feet.

Here are some photos of other houses on the block. This is, in the upper left, the two-story multi-family structure. This is a site plan that generally shows the lot coverages for that block. The previous plans before they revised had the lot coverage anywhere from 40 to 50 percent...it was a really high lot coverage, so we created this map to show some of the lot coverages around the area. You’ll see they
generally range from about 20-percent to the 30’s. Here, where my cursor is located, is the two-story multi-family which is at about 39-percent lot coverage. The applicant had, with the revised plans, requested the 37-percent. Staff put in a condition of approval that the lot coverage not exceed 35-percent. The applicant has agreed to comply with that and would revise his plans further to reduce that lot coverage to 35-percent.

These are the main issues we had with the original plan and what was corrected. As I mentioned, the site plan was corrected. Lot coverage was reduced to 37-percent, massing of structure for the proposed height again, reduced from 34 feet. 34 feet is close to the maximum allowed for this zone. 35 feet is the actual height maximum, but this is to peak. They had it at 34 to the very peak and now it is 30 feet to the peak.

The garage does not meet the backup space requirements and we’ve discussed that. I believe the applicant indicated to me they will seek a variance to reduce that backup space area.

With that staff does recommend approval of the revised plans with the conditions of approval listed in the revised plans memo.

Commissioner Koski: Do we have anything that would indicate the heights of the other buildings on that block? Just like you had the lot coverage map. Do we have heights of the buildings to the north and south on that side of the street?

Ted Vanegas: Unfortunately, there’s not. I can easily get lot coverages from the neighbors, but I can’t readily get the exact peak heights. I would imagine that with the two-story across the street is probably pretty close and in the upper 20’s to close to 30 at peak. The other houses are generally one and a half story to one-story so I would say the peak height on those are probably 20 to 24 feet. This would be quite a bit higher than those homes. Its only real match on this block would be that two-story across the street.

Commissioner Richter: Can you go back to the pictures of the houses that are on the block?

Ted Vanegas: This is the two-story up on the left and these are most of the other houses.

Commissioner Richter: Do you have a picture of the two houses that are adjacent to this proposal?
Ted Vanegas: Yes. This blue house which is hard to see in the bottom right is adjacent to the north and the red and yellow house I believe is adjacent to the south if I recall.

Commissioner Koski: Can you go one more slide? I want to look at the street view or the view of the houses...pictures of the houses next to it. I want to make sure we indicate which ones are across the street and which ones are on the same side of the street.

Ted Vanegas: There is a rendering in your packets. I can bring that up. Do you want me to bring those up or not? I decided they were a bit misleading, so I didn’t want to present them.

Commissioner Richter: Yes, the renderings are a bit misleading.

Ted Vanegas: Do you want me to bring those up or not? I decided they were a bit misleading, so I didn’t want to present them.

Commissioner Richter: Yes, I don’t know if it is worth bringing them up if it isn’t something we need to talk about.

Commissioner Koski: I would like to look at the picture of the other houses that are next to it. That I believe is across the street. Go to the next slide.

Ted Vanegas: This one is to the north.

Commissioner Koski: That one is north. The green one in the upper right, or yellow with the red stairs is further to the north.

Ted Vanegas: That’s on the corner I believe.

Commissioner Koski: Yes. Is there one more slide? There’s got to be one more slide. The house right next to it is not pictured there. I think the house next to it is that dark red one. Maybe the applicant could speak to that when he is up, but I believe it is the blue one and...

Ted Vanegas: I thought it was this red and yellow one, but it might be the red one here.

Commissioner Valderama: That red one there is on the other opposite end.

Commissioner Koski: That dark maroon one is on the south border of that property.
Ted Vanegas: Okay. Again, that is a one-story Craftsman style house. This one on the north side here is kind of a Cottage Queen Anne style house that was recently renovated.

Commissioner Richter: Yes. If it helps, if you go to page 39 of 92 inside the packet that was sent out to us it shows a pretty good front view...it’s like Google Earth. I don’t know if you have those capabilities.

Chairman Montoto: There’s also a pretty good shot on Page 113 of the packet.

Ted Vanegas: I can bring that up. That is the vacant lot as it is now. This is the house to the right. As you’re looking from the back this is the blue house to the north and then that small red Craftsman is to the south it looks like. The yellow house is what was there previously.

Commission Weaver: Do you happen to know the height of the original house that was there? The yellow one.

Chairman Montoto: Was it 30 feet Ted?

Ted Vanegas: That house wasn’t likely 30 feet. It doesn’t appear to be 30 feet. It was probably 22 to 24 feet at the peak or maybe a little taller. Here is one of the renderings we talked about. This is the previous house. It was that red Craftsman on the south there and then the blue one.

Commissioner Koski: That’s a good picture Ted. Thank you.

Applicant Testimony

Michael Webb (Applicant): First of all, thank you everyone for taking the time to hear us on this. My family and I are super excited about the opportunity to build this great house in your neighborhood and become a contributing member.

The houses to the left and the right as Ted said, height wise, the front of the houses are both one-story where they build to a second story on both the north and south facing. Those houses...the peaks are approximately 24 to 25 feet on both sides of the house to try and help out with that question.

Also, when we discussed the massing initially, as Ted pointed out, we did request 42 or 47-percent. That was before I was aware of the 35-
percent lot coverage. Since then we have backed down to find a way so that we can come within the requirements so we can build our house at that point and time.

Another thing I wanted to point out, is Ted mentioned the house directly across the street being a two-story house and that’s the only one on the block. Directly behind the house across the alleyway is another two-story house and then the house directly behind it to the south is additionally a two-story house. Let me figure out how to share my screen. I’m not sure if I can to show those pictures.

Josh Wilson: I can promote you so you can do that.

Michael Webb: Okay.

Josh Wilson: You’ll be dropped for just a second.

Michael Webb: Okay I’m back. There is the share screen. You can see the green house on the screen. That is the house directly behind our house and one to the south. Then if I go one to the right, that blue house is the one that is directly behind the house across the alleyway from our proposed site.

Chairman Montoto: Do you happen to have the heights on those houses?

Michael Webb: I do not have the heights on those houses. I do know that they are slightly taller than the houses to the north and to the south of ours. An estimate, again without having a measuring tape or walking next to them...probably in the 25 to 30-foot range.

Chairman Montoto: That’s helpful. Thank you.

Public Testimony

Sherri Battazzo (North End Neighborhood Association / NENA): I am the Historic Preservation Commission liaison for NENA. NENA wishes to be a party of record for any items regarding massing issues and specifically regarding this project from a one and a half story to a two-story for massing.

Commissioner Richter: What specifically about massing...you said you wanted to be on the record for one and a half to two-story. Are you in favor or against...what exactly about massing are you going to be representing from NENA?
Sherri Battazzo: This is my first time doing this on behalf of NENA for Mark Baltes. In discussing this project today, he had concerns about the massing on 15th with the surrounding properties not all being two-story. He felt the lot coverage exceeded 35-percent and he would like the lot coverage held at 35-percent. He felt the two-story felt over massed for the surrounding properties.

Krista Grisel (1116 N. 15th Street): My concern is similar. It is a little bit inconsistent with the neighborhood in the size of the street presence. I wanted to speak in particular to the offset in the alley for the variance on the garage. We have also applied once or twice for a variance on a garage upgrade and have been denied. I want to make sure that inconsistency is called out. If we have to hold to it, we would like others to hold to it as well and also be kept to the size of the lot coverage. We’ve been held to it as well in the past and we want to make sure it is consistent.

Tom Szulga: I own 1004 and 1006 N. 15th Street, two houses down from this property. My question is, because I couldn’t tell from the photos or the drawings, what is the exterior of the home made of? Is it siding, shingles, stucco, brick…it just seemed like it was a flat surface? If you have an answer or more detail about that?

Ted Vanegas: I believe it was proposed to be horizontal siding on the side of the house. Fiber cement.

Chairman Montoto: Mr. Zulga does that answer your question?

Tom Szulga: Yes. I’m for this and someone wanting to upgrade the street and the block in a much-needed part of 15th Street. It’s fantastic and more power to them.

Lloyd Porter (Applicant Team): I was just going to comment on the siding. It was lap siding, cementous fiber, and wood trim. To comment on the variant on the drive we need 25 to be compliant and we’re at 23 right now, but if you look at the layout for the house with the garage, we’ve arched the driveway to leave a big tree and eliminate some of the hardscape of the driveway. That’s what we were hoping to propose in the variant, is that we’re not going to take out that tree and not have so much concrete in the backyard at the drive. Does that make sense?

Chairman Montoto: I think so.

Lloyd Porter: If you look at your Page 73 and Page 74 in the packet it shows the radius on the driveway to keep from taking out that tree.
Chairman Montoto: Has everyone had a chance to reference the packet? I’m still trying to find the page.

Lloyd Porter: There are a lot of pages in there.

Chairman Montoto: You said Page 73? Is that correct?

Lloyd Porter: Yes, Pages 73 and 74.

Chairman Montoto: Thank you so much. I appreciate your comment.

Applicant Rebuttal

Michael Webb: Lloyd helped me out with the exterior portion and also discussing the tree. One of the big things we’re trying to build with this house is preserve as much of the green space as possible. That is what we love about the neighborhood. The large trees and the green space so we want to keep as much of that as possible while we do this.

Also, another member of my team did share with me that the house directly behind us measuring to the peak is 29 feet. So, 29 feet for the house directly behind us. That is all I have.

Public Portion Closed

COMMISSIONER KOSKI MOVED TO DENY DRH20-00034 BASED ON MASSING, HEIGHT AND WIDTH RATIO FROM THE HISTORIC GUIDELINES 5.2-5.

COMMISSIONER RICHTER SECONDED.

Commissioner Koski: While there are some taller structures across the alley behind and one across the street, the façade that is of the biggest that needs to be addressed is the façade on that side of 15th Street. So, the five buildings and five lots on the east side of the street on that block two of which are single-stories and two of which are story and a half. By looking at those photos like we did earlier you’ll note that the front façade of these houses are quite small and while the story and half properties have a taller roof in the back of the home, the front is quite small. This proposal at a full two-stories is a significant mass compared to the other four on that side of the street and as well as the four across the street except for the one that is two-stories. That is the reason for my motion.
Commissioner Richter: I would like to mirror what Commissioner Koski has stated so far. The massing is definitely out of place for that side of the street. I think there are a lot of things that are off though and coming up against this one. Lot coverage obviously being one of them. Also, the backup space for the garage. That needs to be taken into consideration pretty heavily. I understand that they are trying to save a tree, but I don’t think they are going to get that 25 feet of backup space. So, without having something redesigned for us to take a look at that addresses not only the massing, the lot coverage and also the required backup space for the garage I would have a hard time approving this application.

Chairman Montoto: The motion before us is to deny the application. Is there any additional discussion?

Commissioner Rupp: I would like to offer that based on staff’s recommendation that the lot size wouldn’t be appropriate and that they seem to agree to go down to a lot size of 35. I was also worried about lot coverage, but with the approval from the applicant based on the recommendations from staff I felt a little more comfortable with it, but I’m just weighing and offering that.

Commissioner Richter: Even with the condition of approval and that the applicant is willing to take it down to 35-percent lot coverage, my biggest issue with this one is the massing of it and the way it presents itself on not only the side of the street it is on, but also on the entire block there.

Chairman Montoto: I concur. I agree that the massing and the impact it would have on the block face altogether is concerning to me. With that, let’s go ahead and have the clerk call the roll on this.

RESULT: DENIED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Devin Koski, Commissioner
SECONDER: Noah Richter, Commissioner
AYES: Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
ABSENT: Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat

4. DRH20-00036 / Michael Belt
Location: 1015 W. Resseguiue Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish a non-contributing single-family structure and detached garage and to construct a one and one-half story single-family structure and detached garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-2HD(Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.
### 5. **DRH20-00059 / Brian & Pippa Balogh**
Location: 2100 N. 17th Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story single-family structure with attached garage, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

| RESULT: | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: | Noah Richter, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Devin Koski, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria |
| ABSENT: | Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat |

### 6. **DRH20-00065 / Joseph Foregger**
Location: 1716 N. 20th Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story single-family structure and detached garage, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

| RESULT: | APPROVED [6 TO 1] |
| MOVER: | Noah Richter, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Devin Koski, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Montoto, Rupp, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria |
| NAYS: | Devin Koski |
| ABSENT: | Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat |

### 7. **DRH20-00078 / Kate Hoffhine**
Location: 601 W. Sherman Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish a non-contributing one-story single-family structure with attached garage and to construct a one-story single-family structure with attached garage, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Devin Koski, Commissioner
SECONDER: Ericka Rupp, Commissioner
AYES: Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
ABSENT: Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat

8. DRH20-00082 / Jim & Gayle Chalfant
Location: 516 W. Franklin Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish a non-contributing two-story office building, and to construct a two-story single-family structure with attached garage, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an L-OHD/CD (Limited Office with Historic Design Review and Conservation District overlay) zones.

Ted Vanegas: The project is located in the Hays Street Historic District and in an area that is located in zoned Light Office. Many of the traditional or historic structures in this area have been converted to office and multi-family uses over time. The existing building on site was constructed in about 1972 as an Art Deco style and is non-contributing in the district.

A single-family structure is located to the east as you can see here. The lot is quite large at about 100 feet in width and 120 in depth. As you can see from the proposed site plan the footprint will be extensive, but at 26-percent lot coverage will remain below the 35 required in the guidelines. Additionally, the house will exceed the side setbacks leaving additional space between properties. The front setback appears to be about 30 feet. This sets the house further back from the street than is typically desired in the guidelines and in the code. A 15 to 20-foot setback would be more appropriate and would improve the street presence of the house.

The garage will be located adjacent to the alley and will be attached to the house via a breezeway. As you can see the house is designed to be quite modern with flat roof planes and horizontal and vertical design elements. While the house is large there is quite a bit of modulation incorporated into the design which effectively breaks up the massing presenting a less massive appearing structure. Overall, the size and massing of the structure on this large lot is not altogether inappropriate.

Additionally, there are large structures with more massing found in the immediate neighborhood and throughout the district. However, staff finds the design of the project to be problematic for the historic district. Although the guidelines state, “Modern elements may be introduced in new construction”, this design may be too much of an
outlier and not compliant with the spirit of the guidelines. The Commission has in the past allowed more modern elements in new construction. However, there is typically an underlying compatibility with the historic district. For instance, constructing a new building that is congruous with the district, but incorporates or blends more modern elements with traditional elements which has been found to be acceptable. In this case, staff has found it more difficult to reconcile the project with the guidelines. However, it is understood that the neighborhood is office in nature and use and provides an eclectic array of designs constructed after the period of significance for the historic district.

Here are some other elevations of the building, a rendering and photos of the existing building. As you can see it is designed to be in the Art Deco tradition, but it was constructed in the 70’s. Here is the eclectic neighborhood. This is the property to the east which is multi-family. These are the properties to the west which are more traditionally designed styled single-family homes, but probably used as office or multi-family. In the bottom left picture, which is across Franklin Street, you’ll see a modern designed office building. The picture on the lower right is located off the alley. That was approved a couple of years ago. This structure was approved, but it is not readily visible from the street. It is a modern design but located off and across the alley from the subject property. Here are some more photos.

Some of the concerns with this project:

- “Use massing and forms similar to neighboring buildings.” It is kind of hit and miss with this one because there are neighboring buildings that are quite large and modern in style, but right next to it and across the alley and in the surrounding blocks that massing is more of the historic and traditional styles. You certainly can find an eclectic array of structures of massing and styles.

- “Use of design elements such roof forms, lines, openings, and other characteristics commonly found in the Historic District”.

- “Have a building form which is unique in the district but relates to the neighboring buildings and to the neighborhood”. An argument could be made that maybe it relates to the office building across the street or to the multi-family to the east. The historic district exists due to the historic traditional structures constructed in the period of significance.
- “It is inappropriate to use massing and building forms which are completely foreign to the historic district.”

- “Uniform setbacks and building spacing should be maintained in new construction.”

Those are some of the points of the guidelines we looked at. Like I said, there is a point to be made that there is enough going on in this eclectic neighborhood that it might fit, but on this one we went a little conservative with our determination and determined that the intent of the guidelines are maybe not met with this very modern style.

Staff has received three comments in support of the application and one opposed due to incompatible design. Staff recommends denial of DRH20-00082 due to the issues expressed in the Commission packet. I did make a note that if the design of the new construction is denied the applicant would like to request approval to demolish the existing office building and come back later with designs acceptable to the Commission.

**Chairman Montoto:** I have a few questions. I’m looking through the packet and I’m curious, do you happen to know if any of the surrounding Art Deco office buildings, that are not the property in question, if they are contributing?

**Ted Vanegas:** The Art Deco buildings that are immediately surrounding would have been constructed outside the period of significance. For instance, the one in the lower section here...in the 60’s maybe. The one in the upper right is obviously modern construction. I didn’t look at all of them so I’m not 100-percent sure. In going around and looking at them and being familiar with the neighborhood I don’t think any of them would be considered contributing.

**Chairman Montoto:** I’m looking at, for reference, Page 330 of the packet and it looks like there’s a couple of properties adjacent to the west. Yes, the ones in the upper righthand corner. Clearly, those are most likely not office spaces. Those appear to be residential and perhaps even multi-family, but I was curious to see because this is a very eclectic block. I guess that is my only question.

**Applicant Testimony**

**Beth Lassen** (Applicant’s Representative): To answer the question on the adjacent properties to the left. The one directly to west is used as
a residence. The one next to that I believe is the Conservation League of Idaho or something, but it is a business. I just want to throw that out there. I know I’m pressing the limits here on a contemporary style but give me a minute because I’m going to try and convenience you that a contemporary design can be congruous with this particular neighborhood. First off, as Ted stated, this is a very diverse neighborhood. Yes, there are some historic homes, but there are just as many government office buildings, parking lots and modern business complexes. Secondly this lot is zoned for office space. We actually have to get a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) just to put a house on it. Again, it is not your typical north end / east end residential historic neighborhood.

The guidelines as the staff report stated, “It is preferable to design a congruous contemporary structure rather than duplicate or mimic the design of historic buildings”. We were going that route. Also, the staff report states, “A building form maybe created which is unique in the district but relates to the neighborhood in massing” and that is exactly what we tried to do. It’s offices, businesses, and parking lots.

This is a house, but it’s broken up and it’s got all sorts of elevations and things going on so that was the approach we took. One of the letters and there have been quite a few of them in support, but one of them is from local architects Sherry McKibben and Doug Cooper and I know this was in your packet, but I’m going to state a little quote from their nice letter that says, “The project architecture is contemporary and representative of this time in history and is a good example of such. The massing and materials contribute to variety and visual interest of a walkable neighborhood”. That is what I have to say, and I can answer any questions. I’m not sure if the lot owners can hear and if they want to speak.

**Chairman Montoto:** I do see them here.

**Jim Chalfant (Applicant):** Beth did a good job describing the neighborhood. This neighborhood is eclectic, and it is right on the seam between downtown and what most people might think of as the North End. Literally, one side of street may be a business building or government building and on the other may be a residence. This home is really blending what’s in the neighborhood. As a side note, the house to the west is a residence, but it is currently being proposed as a hair salon. That is how transitionary this neighborhood is. That was our whole idea was to...some people refer to it as a contemporary design and I believe it is. In my view it is kind of an urban contemporary which is very fitting for the neighborhood. That’s all I have to say.
Chairman Montoto: To clarify, the current building square footage is just under 8,000 square feet? Is that right?

Beth Lassen: Ted might have that. I don’t have that in front of me, but it’s large.

Chairman Montoto: The proposed new house is around 3,000?

Beth Lassen: The main floor footprint is 2,500 and upper floor is 1,200 so 3,700.

Chairman Montoto: It’s only about 26-percent lot coverage so that’s a big lot.

Beth Lassen: Exactly. It’s a very large lot. It says the lot is 12,000 square feet.

Chairman Montoto: Ted did mention in his report that staff would like to see a preferred front setback of about 15 to 20 feet. Can you comment on that?

Beth Lassen: Yes, and I might have Jim chime in on this too. We’ve got these planters in front to do the stair stepping. They really don’t want a really big back yard. It’s fairly close to the house on the west as far as the front setback. It might be back a few feet. We would certainly address that. I don’t know if you can tell, but the existing building is 40 feet back from the front property line or the most forward point I guess is 30 feet back. There might be a little wiggle room in there to bring it forward slightly.

Commissioner Koski: I don’t see any dormers or metal roofing on this one.

Beth Lassen: I know. What are we going to do...

Commissioner Koski: I did have a question about the setback from the front. I think I’m in agreement with you mostly because of its mass. It would seem to make sense to be where it’s at. I would like to ask a question and maybe you could address an attached garage. Can you talk towards that design please?

Beth Lassen: It is not your typical North End bungalow with a detached garage. As you can see, we have minimized the connective piece and we’re treating it as an almost glass breezeway through there. That building directly to the east is a long parking
garage for the apartment building further east. That is just a long wall so we’re creating a visual buffer from that so when you’re outside in the back patio you’re not looking at the back side of this long very unattractive garage, in my opinion.

Public Testimony

Sherri Battazzo (North End Neighborhood Association / NENA): I don’t know that this falls under NENA so we will stay off the record on this one.

Chairman Montoto: Is there anyone representing any other neighborhood association here to speak? I’m trying to think of the boundary. I don’t know if this would be Downtown Business Association (DBA).

Ted Vanegas: This is in the North End Neighborhood Association.

Chairman Montoto: Sherri, would you like to state anything on the record?

Sherri Battazzo: I’m going to go with no on this one.

Chairman Montoto: I don’t have anyone on the sign-up sheet other than Beth to testify. Is there member of the public wishing to testify regarding this application? If so, please virtually raise your hand. I’m not seeing anything. Beth, would you or Mr. Chalfant like to have a few minutes for rebuttal?

Applicant Rebuttal

Beth Lassen: I guess the lack of neighborhood opposition speaks highly of this being...the neighbors are excited to get rid of the existing building and put a residence here. The fact that the neighbors are in support of this speaks highly of it.

Chairman Montoto: If there is nothing further from you Beth or Mr. Chalfant we will go ahead and close the public portion and render a decision.

Public Portion Closed

Chairman Montoto: I do have a few comments before we entertain a motion. When I first looked at the packet, the design struck me as something...I suppose I was shocked. Then as I was looking through the rest of the packet and seeing the different photos included of
inspiration from different historic properties within the North End, I felt much more as ease and I suppose more comfortable with it. Also, going back and looking at the actual block face of the property in question I felt more comfortable with the idea of this residential property going in there. My only real issue is the setback but being that it is 10 feet forward from the existing property I’m not super concerned about it. I’m curious to hear what my fellow commissioners think.

**Commissioner Richter:** I had kind of the same feeling as you when we first looked at this application. I knew right away looking at this application this was a pretty bold statement and an appropriate statement for the location of this home. I’m very familiar with the location of this home and I’m very familiar with the building it should be replacing. Due to the eclecticism of neighborhood and the surrounding structures I think the design of this home would fit really well although it doesn’t check the boxes of traditional historic homes within this district.

**Chairman Montoto:** I agree. Would you like to make a motion, or does anyone have anything further to discuss?

**RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
**MOVER:** Noah Richter, Commissioner
**SECONDER:** Devin Koski, Commissioner
**AYES:** Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
**ABSENT:** Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat

9. **DRH20-00119 / M.A. Goldy**

Location: 2425 W. Ellis Street
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish a detached garage and to construct a two-story detached garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

**RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
**MOVER:** Noah Richter, Commissioner
**SECONDER:** Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria, Vice-Chair
**AYES:** Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
**ABSENT:** Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat
10. **DRH20-00130 / Amanda Swails**  
Location: 1611 10th Street  
Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a second story addition to the existing garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [6 TO 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Noah Richter, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Ericka Rupp, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Montoto, Rupp, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS:</td>
<td>Devin Koski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **DRH20-00135 / Murlyne Eblen**  
Location: 408 W. O’Farrell Street  
Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a second story addition and basement to the existing single-family structure and to construct a two-story detached garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [6 TO 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Noah Richter, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Devin Koski, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS:</td>
<td>Danielle Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **DRH20-00137 / Derek Hurd**  
Location: 1019 W. Thatcher Street  
Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct an addition to the existing single-family structure and to construct a two-story attached garage with accessory dwelling unit, and associated site improvements. The project site is located in an R-2HD (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Noah Richter, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Danielle Weaver, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Montoto, Rupp, Koski, Suarez, Weaver, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jillian Moroney, Anthony Shallat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **ADJOURNMENT**