I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. MINUTES ACCEPTANCE

1. Historic Preservation Commission Minutes / May 11, 2020

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Noah Richter, Commissioner
SECONDER: Jillian Moroney, Commissioner
AYES: Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
ABSENT: Ericka Rupp, Danielle Weaver

III. CONSENT AGENDA

1. **DRH20-00034 / Michael Webb**
   Location: 1012 N. 15th Street
   Ratification of Findings for denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a two-story single-family structure with a one-story detached garage, and associated site improvements, in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

2. **DRH20-00082 / Jim & Gayle Chalfan**
   Location: 516 W. Franklin Street
   Ratification of Findings for approval of a 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, in an L-OHD/CD (Limited Office with Historic Design Review and Conservation District overlay) zones.
3. **DRH18-00131 / Robin Gates**  
Location: 2115 N. Heights Drive  
Request to extend by 1-year an approved Certificate of Appropriateness to partially demolish the single-story dwelling and construct a two-story addition with daylight basement, in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

5. **DRH20-00200 / Frank Aldana**  
Location: 1620 N. 6th Street  
Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing one-car garage and to construct a two-story garage with accessory dwelling unit, in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

7. **DRH20-00210 / Derek Hurd**  
Location: 1403 E. Warm Springs Avenue  
Certificate of Appropriateness request to move the historic C.C. Cavanah House from its existing location to the subject parcel on Warm Springs Avenue. A detached garage will also be constructed on the site. Also proposed is the house be established as contributing in the Warm Springs Historic District. The property is located in an R-2H (Medium Density Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

9. **DRH20-00224 / National Register Nomination**  
Location: 512 W. Idaho Street  
Request for a Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Office’s Historic Sites Review Board for nomination of the historic Robbins House to the National Register of Historic Places. The property is located in a C-5HD (Central Business District with Historic District overlay) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER: Cindy Montoto, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER: Jillian Moroney, Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES: Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarría</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT: Ericka Rupp, Danielle Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commissioner Richter recused on item DRH20-00210.*
IV. NEW BUSINESS

4. **DRH20-00150 / Ken Litzinger**
   Location: 1521 N. 5th Street
   Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a partial two-story, single-family structure and associated site improvements, in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone. (This item was deferred at the June 29, 2020 hearing.)

   **Ted Vanegas:** This property is currently vacant save for a garage. The contributing house was demolished in March 2020 without approval or permits submitted. A stop work order has been in effect on the property since then.

   The plans you’ll see in this presentation were approved by the Commission back in 2017. However, they were approved for an extensive remodel of the contributing home. Those exact plans have been submitted for new construction. The project is proposed to meet setbacks and will be right at 35-percent lot coverage. As previously mentioned, there is currently an existing garage toward the rear of the property. Sherman Street runs to the north so that would be the street side of the property and then 5th Street running adjacent to the east which would be the frontage of the façade of the property. Here are the west and south elevations of the proposal. Again, this is the concept that was previously approved by the Commission for remodel, but now proposed for new construction. The west elevation is the rear and the south elevation would be the interior side. The 2017 remodel was a proposal for a rear addition, a basement and then an expansion of the roof with the dormers. These are the street elevations. The east again, is the front with the north being the street side elevation. Again, in 2017 the Historic Preservation Commission approved the extensive remodel of the contributing house which included a basement, large sections of the roof reconstructed to accommodate dormers, and a rear addition.

   In March a neighbor called to report that the house was no longer standing. Upon confirming this, the Building Department placed a stop work order on the property. The required approval from the Commission wasn’t sought and the required permits for demolition were not applied for either. On May 8, 2020 the applicant submitted plans for reconstruction of the house using essentially the same plans that were approved for the extensive remodel.
This is the house that was previously there. Staff’s is recommending approval, but I should add that this recommendation of approval, as I indicated in the project report, is not a support or any kind of condoning of what occurred with this contributing property. The loss of a contributing house in the historic district hurts the integrity of the historic district overall. However, staff has to review this application basically on its own merit. With that, the project in staff’s review is appropriate and previously approved by the Commission. Therefore, we are recommending approval of the new construction with the conditions of approval in the project report.

**Commissioner Koski:** If there is a stop work order on this right now by the Building Department what are the ramifications of them moving ahead on something where it was illegally torn down in the first place without permission?

**Ted Vanegas:** The stop work order is in effect until the Historic Commission approves the plans for new construction so essentially they are not allowed to do…since we found out about this in March the stop work order was put in place and they weren’t allowed to perform any work on the property except for some clean up. If the Commission approves the project tonight then the stop work order would then, the next day, tomorrow, be lifted. After the 10-day appeal period is over the applicants would then be allowed to construct the project. Without Commission approval the stop work order would remain in place until they achieve either approval from the Commission or approval from City Council.

**Applicant Testimony**

**Ken Litzinger** (Applicant): As mentioned we did get the approval to do this project in 2017. I wasn’t part of that original approval, but we combed around town and stuff just trying to get this building reconstructed. The way we were trying to do it, it became kind of a hazard for our employees trying to…most of this building went away anyway. There were a few remaining walls that needed to be let out which we did preserve originally even though we took the building down. We were preserving the walls to stand the walls back up and we had seen other projects in the area particularly on 15th Street where they did the same thing. We submitted a letter explaining what we did over there and the dangerous conditions and stuff to preserve a little bit of this building. Our full intent was to preserve as much as we could. The floor and everything was built on…the building itself had been added onto multiple times. I don’t
know when these other additions were added to this building, but essentially what we had over there was a floor system that had been scabbed on so many times...it was all these different heights and stuff and we wanted to put the new floor on it and I don’t know how you put a new floor on without kind of disassembling it. I did not know that disassembling it...while taking it down basically would be considered a complete demo when we were going to put some of it back up. When they did the stop work order on it, they told us we could clean up the job and essentially the house was no longer contributing so don’t even worry about preserving what walls we intended to preserve on this building.

As you can see by the plans it is considerably different than the original house that was on the project. As a matter of fact, you wouldn’t know much of that house had it still been left there with just a couple of walls that were going to remain. Again, we saved those walls and we were going to use that lumber to try and put back a section of that house. If we did something wrong, I wasn’t aware of it. Outside of that I don’t know what else to tell you. We did the best we could. Our intent was to save the walls. It needed a new floor. I don’t know how you put a new floor on it without taking it apart. I’ve built a lot of houses and I just don’t know how to do it. Outside of that I don’t know what else to say. I can answer your questions, but that’s about all I know.

**Commissioner Richter:** There’s a world of questions here. Without going down a road that we shouldn’t be going down I think your biggest quote right here Mr. Litzinger, was “I didn’t know how to do it”.  

**Ken Litzinger:** Okay, yeah.  

**Commissioner Richter:** If you didn’t know how to do it then you shouldn’t have been there in the first place.  

**Ken Litzinger:** That’s of course your opinion.  

**Commissioner Richter:** That is not my opinion Mr. Litzinger. That is fact.  

**Ken Litzinger:** Really?  

**Commissioner Richter:** There was a way to preserve this home without tearing down the walls and without tearing out the floor structure. If the proper precautions were taken initially during the
demolition of this home, then you could have saved the walls without tearing them down. You could have saved the floor structure without tearing them down. Yes, it takes longer, yes there are steps to take in the beginning to make sure it is done safely, but if those steps were taken in the beginning we would not be in this predicament and you would not have said, “I didn’t know how to do it”. I’m extremely disappointed that we’re in this situation right now.

**Commissioner Koski:** I am outraged. I’m outraged that we’re in this position and you mentioned you were going to try to save parts of the walls. I was there on the morning...on the site when it was reported that it had been torn down. You can’t save walls when you’re tearing it down with a backhoe. That was like a war zone and everything was just destroyed. I disagree with your statement saying that you tried to preserve some items because you didn’t.

**Chairman Montoto:** Are there any questions for the applicant regarding the plans that we have in front of us?

**Commission Moroney:** I see the plans that we already approved as kind of a verbal contract of what we’re going to do and how they were going to proceed and where Mr. Litzinger has proceeded in violation of this contract. It is hard to approve something when they’re saying yes, we agree to do everything that we say we’re going to do when they’ve already violated that. I guess I’m asking the applicant, what can you say to guarantee us you’re going to go ahead and follow this verbal contract that we’re representing to you right now?

**Ken Litzinger:** We’re going to build the house exactly as planned. Building the house back is not a problem. I’m a little offended by everybody telling me...I saw what they did on 15th Street. They left four feet of walls in two corners, okay. Same thing, they had to replace the floor so this is not unusual what was taking place over there and if the other guy would like to show me how to remove a floor underneath a house, I’d like him to come out to the job site. The thing is I’ve built a lot of houses in my life. I was trying to do exactly what I was seeing go on in town year after year after year on these historical houses. We did preserve the walls and again, I take offense to somebody saying that the walls were not there. We pulled them off to the side...we did the two walls that were going to remain. We did remove the siding. The siding was lead paint siding. It was going to removed anyway. It was on the plans to remove
and replace it. I don’t know how much of this thing was supposed to be preserved when the plans clearly showed that two corners were about all that was preserved. I can assure you that we would go back in with the plans that were approved back in 17.

**Commissioner Valderrama:** I just wanted to say how disappointing this has been for our Commission and our Historic North End. Unfortunately, these types of things happen throughout the whole United States and it is something that is very detrimental to our historic properties and our historic neighborhoods. As far as cutting up a house like a piece of cake and putting the walls and the sides and... assuming we can put it back together like a Lincoln Log is inappropriate to think of and while yes, there may be other properties that has something similar to this perhaps for some of those not necessarily thinking of the ones on 15th Street, but they could also have had some sort of disappointments to the Commission to their historic integrity. So, while one must also be conscientious of can I do this project or not? I want to say this more on record, we all need to be conscientious of where we can and can’t accomplish something and ask questions. We’re a Commission and we could have probably helped with questions Mr. Litzinger and maybe provided you...I don’t know if our Commission could do that, but I think asking questions is better than tearing down a historic property.

**Neighborhood Association Testimony**

**Sherri Battazzo (North End Neighborhood Association):** I am the historic preservation liaison for the North End Neighborhood Association (NENA). The association takes exception and shares in Commissioner Koski and Commissioner Valderamma’s outrage as to what happened. We take exception to the presentation of the plans presented here tonight for the proposed new construction at 1521 N. 5th Street on the basis that a contributing structure was removed without the consent of this Commission and the City. It is apparent that the applicant does not fully realize that historic districts are not arbitrary. They are created, set forth, and governed by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) guidelines that allow cities like ours to designate areas where preservation is a priority such as the North End. Actions like the one that lead to the presentation of these plans this evening impact everyone and like Mr. Vanegas said, the integrity of the district. There are so many people that make great effort to comply with that which preserves this history, and this jeopardizes the ability to maintain the effect of
the district itself. It is incumbent upon all of us to honor these requirements of a historic district or risk greater impact on the entire area. It is an egregious action that sets a poor precedent including the example set forth by the applicant such as 15th Street. We condemn the practice of illegal demolition and fully support any disciplinary action taken by the City and we do not support the plans to move forward with the new construction. With that I yield my time.

Public Testimony

Steve Vaught: I’m the homeowner of the property now. I want to let everyone know that our intention was to preserve the integrity of the property. Obviously, we did not know of the actions of severing the walls from the subfloor is considered a demolition. When looking at the City’s code and reading the information I don’t see the true definition where it is defined as such so that is nebulous to me, but problems not for problem, problem for solution and realizations. I just want you to know that I purchased this property, I plan on moving into it, I’m stuck in a predicament, and I would like to move forward. It will be a beautiful home when it is done. It will look the exact same as it did before in a replica (inaudible) similar to before demolition. In essence I would just like the Commission’s approval to move forward with this project and get something built on the property because now, as it sets, it is just a public liability and we need to move forward and get something done. The original plans and stuff that were approved...we can rebuild that home exactly as it was approved in the past and it will be a beautiful home and will fit in the neighborhood cohesive with everybody. I know that many members are outraged with what’s done and I don’t condone those actions. We accept responsibility and liability now that we know after the fact that it was done. We’re just wanting to move forward. We’ve had numerous people come by and praise what we’re doing and appreciate the things that we’ve done. Obviously, people, when they appreciate something they don’t come out and typically publicly testify because they get caught up with all the negative. I just want you to know I’ll answer any questions, but I would like to move forward and get this home built and move into it.

Frank Aldana: I live just up the street from this property. It has been sitting there for at least 25 years, racoon infested, broken windows, random homeless people living there, and it has just been an eyesore. It has been bringing down the neighborhood and is an
opportunities for people to move in there and do drugs or whatnot. I was a builder and I built a couple of homes here in the North End where we excavated the home and lifted the homes kind of like what Mr. Steve Vaught is doing here where we lifted the house up, put them on piers and then excavated. The year I did it was 2016 so we had a really big snow load and I was physically under the house putting together the foundation, the house was creaking and we actually ended up going back to the building department and the City of Boise brought out an engineer and verified that the house was about to come tumbling down on us as we were beneath it building the foundation. What I wanted to say is with this house in particular on 5th Street here a lot of these homes...I work primarily in the North End as a remodeler and a lot of these older homes when you open up the walls and it is very uncommon to have a structural wall built. A lot of these sections you'll have 12 feet where two of those studs are actually touching bottom to top plates so structurally this house is garbage. It really is. I walk my dog by it on the daily and when the walls were moved, I actually looked at it and the foundation...the structural walls that were called to be kept were garbage. They really are, they are a complete liability. The 2x4’s are rotting out so as a builder it makes it really complex. I don’t condone what the builder did as far as not getting the permits. That was a big drop of the ball and he really missed the target on that and that was a big screw up, but I think as a homeowner they should be permitted to move forward with their project because this house is a complete eyesore. Basically, anything new in the neighborhood that is rebuilt with the same structural and architectural integrity is only a gain in my book. It’s really silly to basically have these walls to be kept up when they are not structurally solid. Basically, it is going to cost the builder another 30-40 percent more to keep these existing walls that aren’t structurally sound.

Applicant Rebuttal

Ken Litzinger: I apologize for not going and getting the proper permits. I didn’t think I needed any other permits. I felt the permit covered what we were doing. If I needed to go and get a demo permit for this house, I apologize for that. I agree with the guy that structurally it wasn’t sound. We did save those walls and we have those walls laying on the ground. They are just stud walls that were going to have to be completely modified anyway for the new window locations and everything. The house had no headers in it or anything structural holding the thing up. It was becoming a hazard.
The workers and I don’t know what somebody’s like if the thing collapses on people it collapses on people. I agree and I’m not out there trying to tear down houses that are contributing just out of spite. This house was in poor shape and there were a few walls that were going to remain, and I saw what they did on 15th Street. I watched that job because I knew this job was coming up and I thought well, this must be how we need to do it. I will admit it is the first time I’ve done a full house refurbished like this in the North End. I’ve done a lot of smaller stuff and this was a little bit different. I felt like watching what they did on 15th Street would educate me enough to know what I needed to do on this project. Again, we tried to save the walls, out intent was to save the walls and I really don’t know what else to say besides that except I’m sorry if I didn’t get the proper permits. I didn’t know I needed the permits. I guess that’s all I have to say.

Chairman Montoto: With that I will close the public portion of the hearing and we’ll consider a motion or discussion on the matter.

Public Portion Closed

Commissioner Koski: Without understanding or knowing exactly what kind of consequences are the result of taking down a contributing house, we are the Historic Preservation Commission and we’re here to preserve and help preserve things that can’t be replaced.

COMMISSIONER KOSKI MOVED TO TABLE DRH20-00150.

Chairman Montoto: Is there a second or would there be further discussion.

Commissioner Richter: There is a considerable amount of issues to discuss here as far as what happens to this property moving forward to ensure that what is ultimately built on this property doesn’t necessarily celebrate what was there but builds a new future for what is to come. I have strong opinions that the house that is being presented today is merely a replica of what used to be there, and you cannot replicate history like that.

COMMISSIONER RICHTER SECONDED THE MOTION TO TABLE.

Commissioner Ricther: I seconded because I think there is a lot of stuff that needs to be figured out before any sort of decision is
made on what happens here. What happens on this piece of property in the future will ultimately define the future to move forward for that parcel.

**Commissioner Valderrama:** I agree that we need to know more about what is going to happen at this property. Primarily because we can’t necessarily recreate a historic home. We can’t make it look the same. That’s not part of the guidelines. I agree with Commissioners Richter and Koski that we need to possibly table this for further discussion.

**Chairman Montoto:** I concur. I have a very hard time with this. I was not present for this application initially. I was recovering from having my son so I’m not incredibly familiar with the situation other than what we’re seeing today and I’m incredibly disappointed. Had Mr. Litzinger known the process of working in a historic district he would have known that demo permits for a contributing structure are a Commission Hearing event. I would like to see a redesign and more detailed plans of this property as opposed to what has been presented for the initial 2017 plans. We don’t want a copy and paste of something with new materials. We want something that will be congruous with the neighborhood. I suppose we can go ahead and vote on this motion now or if Commissioner Koski would like to potentially amend your initial motion to add specifics to what you would like to see for the applicant so that we are very clear in what we are wanting?

**Commissioner Koski:** No conditions can be applied to a motion to table. I will keep my motion as stated.

**Ted Vanegas:** For a point of clarification if this is going to be deferred or tabled to a specific date then the Commission would let us know the specific date it is tabled to. Also, some specifics on what the Commission is wanting to see when the applicant does come back...what is the applicant supposed to do or bring back to the Commission when that date is met?

**Commissioner Koski:** To put any kind of conditions or any of those requests with the motion to table then that would change that to a motion of reconsideration. I will stick to my initial motion to table seconded by Commissioner Richter.

**Ted Vanegas:** Another point of clarification. Is the application tabled to indefinite or when does the Commission expect this
application to come back? We need to give some sort of reasonable expectation. We can’t just table this without some sort of date for it to come back or under what circumstances.

Chairman Montoto: Right, we need to have some guidelines on that.

Commissioner Koski: If I could speak to that. That would be a question for Legal as far as when it gets addressed next. They would have to answer that, but I believe it is the next meeting, but I don’t know that for a fact. That would be something Legal could answer for us.

Adam Dingeldein (City Legal Counsel): Not audible but noted in chat it would default to the next hearing.

Chairman Montoto: It sounds like item DRH20-00150 will be tabled to the next hearing. Do we have a date for that yet Ted?


Commissioner Moroney: What does that mean? We’re seeing it again, we’re seeing a new design, we’re talking about it amongst ourselves. I just haven’t had this happen before and I’m wondering what it means.

Chairman Montoto: Commissioner Koski, would you like to speak to your motion since there were no specifics...could you just clarify?

Commissioner Koski: Commissioner Richter said it best when there are so many unanswered questions and concerns. There are some things we need to know more about as a Commission before we can make a vote on this. Understanding what kind of consequences there are if any and how we, as a Commission, need to address for the future activity like this where a preserved property which was approved to be preserved is now gone and can never come back. It would be just discussion amongst ourselves and with Planning and Zoning to understand better how to address this with a property vote.

Chairman Montoto: Commissioner Moroney, does that answer your question?
**Commissioner Moroney:** To clarify, what is the property owner supposed to be doing between now and the next meeting and what are we doing between now and the next meeting?

**Commissioner Richter:** I think a lot of our responsibility between now and the next meeting is to speak with Planning and Zoning, speak with the City of Boise, speak with the people in our cohort that can inform us on what the proper actions are and what the proper possible consequences are of actions that are taken by the citizens and contractors when a contributing home is demolished. Instead of looking at an application that comes across our table two weeks before we hear the application where there is an exorbitant amount of information that we need to try and consume and understand when we don’t necessarily understand what the ramifications are when something like this happens because it very rarely happens. Me, as a Commissioner, I’ve seen this twice. This being the second time. I’ve been here for going on almost nine years. We need to understand clearly from Planning and Zoning, from City Council, from the City of Boise what happens when something like this happens? What happens to the contractor, what happens to the client, what happens to the applicant? What kind of actions are taken to ensure that these types of things, these types of missteps don’t happen again? It is our responsibility between now and the next meeting. We have to gather that information from the people within our cohort...from the people within the City to make sure that we can make a ruling saying, okay, now that we have this information and we know that we can make ruling knowing that these missteps will not happen again, now we can move forward and we can confidently say, “Okay, we’re now at a point where we can move forward”. Right now, if we say yes to this application it is basically like washing this thing off the board...like it never happened. We need to know why it happened, how it happened and how it won’t happen again. That, I believe, is our responsibility as a Commission to find out these answers within the next month.

**Chairman Montoto:** I have a follow-up question to that as well. What would you like to see from the applicant and homeowner over the next month?

**Commissioner Richter:** At this point, I don’t think I need to see anything from the applicant or the homeowner. I think this is our responsibility as a Commission to find out information that we need
to find out. Right now, I don’t need to see anything from the applicant.

**Chairman Montoto:** We just need to have specifics in place for them...knowing what they are coming back to so thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>TABLED [3 TO 2]</th>
<th>Next: 7/27/2020 6:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Devin Koski, Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Noah Richter, Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Devin Koski, Noah Richter, Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS:</td>
<td>Cindy Montoto, Jillian Moroney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Ericka Rupp, Danielle Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **DRH20-00202 / Raphael Streiff**

Location: 916 E. Warm Springs Ave

Certificate of Appropriateness request to demolish an existing garage and guest house and to construct a two-story garage with accessory dwelling unit, in an R-2H (Medium Density Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

**Ted Vanegas:** Presented project report. Recommendation to approve with conditions contained in project report.

**Applicant Testimony**

**Raphael Streiff (Applicant):** Stated he is homeowner. Read staff report and agrees with it and the conditions of approval. Believes the garage addition will be a significant improvement to the property and consistent with historic character of the neighborhood. Feels strongly that preserving the integrity of the Historic District is important and by doing the project this way they keep that in mind. Reason for addition is two-fold. Old garage is an illegal garage built prior to purchase of house and not suitable for modern cars which is a drawback living on Warm Springs.

**Beth Lassen (Applicant’s Representative):** Agrees with staff report and what homeowner stated. Clarified that the garage and stair will be moved two feet to get it out of side easement. Addressed letter of opposition from neighbor noting the precedent set by the Commission previously rejecting a two-story proposal on that alley at 921 Bannock Street. Stated that garage was approved in 2017 and the homeowner of that property decided not to build garage so there should be a two-story garage on alley adding by saying none have been approved is incorrect.
Public Testimony

Nick Miller: Submitted narrative and shared concerns about no current two-story structures on alley, impact of this project and the precedent the Commission sets by allowing a two-story structure where there are none. Feels this would not be the last.

Looked at the law and regulations and found a clause in Paragraph 6.1.11, that anything should maintain a blend with heights of buildings on adjacent sites. Feels there is a legal argument with allowing a two-story where there are none and concerned with precedent set in a wider stretch of the whole East End.

Neighborhood Association Testimony

Ted Vanegas: Stated East End Neighborhood Association (EENA) contacted him with questions, but no formal testimony or opposition was submitted.

 Applicant Rebuttal

Raphael Streiff: Thanked Mr. Miller for comments. Feels they both share a desire to keep neighborhood character intact. Stated if there were a way to keep both an ADU and a functional garage they would do that. Added the way their property sits, with geometry of the situation requires there be one structure with legal car entry orientation. Noted he would hate to not be able to keep a dwelling unit that could provide a place to live for somebody who could be a benefit to the neighborhood. Feels it is a point of pride that our City is pivoting towards maintaining housing, density, infill and looking towards building out the opportunities for people to live and work in the same neighborhood and feels strongly about this as he is 5th generation Boisean.

Public Portion Closed

Chairman Montoto: In support due to City's needs and applicant's willingness to move exterior stairway.

Commissioner Richter: Feels there possibly needs to be more discussion about whether or not this is congruous or incongruous with surrounding structures.

Chairman Montoto: Explained thought process being the guidelines state that the garage or ADU cannot be taller than main house and this is a guideline that will be implemented with any structures on
Bannock adding Warm Springs has grand houses and often much larger than the rest of East End. Bannock will not have massive ADU’s. Will be in scale with those guidelines. Personally, does not see setting a precedent be much of an issue.

**Commissioner Moroney:** Agrees with Chairman Montoto noting Commissioner Richter and Mr. Miller brought up good points. Feels this is what the City wants to see noting this ADU makes sense with existing house. In support of the application.

**Commissioner Valderrama:** Stated her first question was why demolish when there is already an ADU type dwelling at this location but given evidence she believes removing vehicles from street makes sense for walkability. In favor of the project.

**Commissioner Koski:** Asked staff to pull up alley photos of adjacent properties referencing Page 206.

**Ted Vanegas:** Presented alley photos from the presentation, added there may be more in the project report.

**Commissioner Koski:** Asked staff to show pages 207, 208, 209, 210 and 211 of project report.

**Ted Vanegas:** Described photos as shots of the alley, then photos of adjacent properties. Asked if there were specific photos.

**Commissioner Koski:** Suggested Commission consider photos once again as photos show they are all one-story garages. Added a point of discussion from Commissioner Richter was exactly that with all one-story garages with relatively low roof lines.

**Chairman Montoto:** Reminded Commissioners they are looking at a home on Warm Springs with alley shared on Bannock Street. Noted homes on Bannock are not of the same scale as Warm Springs so two-story garages won’t be seen on Bannock side of shared alley.

**Commissioner Richter:** Appreciates Chairman Montoto’s comments. Taking everything into consideration; Mr. Miller’s comments, guidelines, and discussion believes this project is designed well and could move forward successfully and will fit the subject property.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Noah Richter, Commissioner
SECONDER: Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria, Vice-Chair
AYES: Montoto, Koski, Moroney, Richter, Valderrama-Echavarria
ABSENT: Ericka Rupp, Danielle Weaver

8. **DRH20-00219 / Michael Webb**
   Location: 1012 N. 15th Street
   Certificate of Appropriateness request to construct a partial two-story single-family structure and detached garage, with associated site improvements, in an R-1CH (Single-family Residential with Historic overlay) zone.

   **Ted Vanegas:** Presented project report noting changes to the original application include reduction in massing and lot coverage. Recommended approval with conditions contained in the project report.

   **Applicant Testimony**

   **Michael Webb:** Presented new rendering of house stating they brought peak height of house down approximately five feet and pushed dormers back 12-13 feet adding there is a better perception from the street. Shared that all neighbors gave thumbs up and appreciate their changes. Noted they are taking 2% out of garage for lot coverage reduction. Shared drawing of floor plan and offset gables.

   **Neighborhood Association Testimony**

   **Sherri Battazzo (North End Neighborhood Association):** NENA appreciates the applicant’s changes and supports project with applicant holding to lot coverage of 35%.

   **Applicant Rebuttal**

   **Michael Webb:** Looking forward to working on project and moving to the neighborhood.

   **Public Portion Closed**

   **Commissioner Koski:** Appreciates the applicant’s efforts and changes and will be happy to see applicant on the streets of Boise. Shared he still has concerns with massing as adjacent houses are small and skinny adding widths should be considered for new buildings. Noted on Page 306 of project report the photos show six
houses on block and as seen they are skinny and all the additions to those are in the rear of property. Asked staff to go to Page 318 where it shows street view.

**Ted Vanegas:** Noted this is with the old house.

**Commissioner Koski:** Noted on that you can see the lack of width on the other homes adding the rendering on Page 325 which Mr. Webb referenced shows the width of house completely maxed out. Feels it is much better but is afraid this home will over mass other homes. Likes design, but feels Commission needs to consider width.

**Commissioner Richter:** Hears Commissioners Koski's concerns, but feel it fits within the side setbacks, the Historic Guidelines and Boise Building code. Feels the applicant has done a tremendous amount of work to make sure the project can move forward. Reiterated this fits the property and guidelines and will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. Will support the application.

**Commissioner Moroney:** Wasn't at last hearing and didn't see original rendition. Appreciates the design and will support the project.

**RESULT:** APPROVED [4 TO 1]

**MOVER:** Noah Richter, Commissioner

**SECONDER:** Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria, Vice-Chair

**AYES:** Cindy Montoto, Jillian Moroney, Noah Richter, Carolina Valderrama-Echavarria

**NAYS:** Devin Koski

**ABSENT:** Ericka Rupp, Danielle Weaver

**V. ADJOURNMENT**