



## Planning & Development Services

Boise City Hall, 2nd Floor  
150 N. Capitol Boulevard  
P. O. Box 500  
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Phone: 208/384-3830  
Fax: 208/384-3753  
TDD/TTY: 800/377-3529  
Website: [www.cityofboise.org/pds](http://www.cityofboise.org/pds)

# Historic Preservation Commission

## Hearing Minutes of May 7, 2007

**Commission Members Present** Jennifer Stevens, Chairman, David Thomas, Scott Chandler, Cathy Sewell, Betsy McFadden, Christopher Pooser, Barbara Dawson

**Members Present** Sarah Schafer, Julie Archambeault, Amanda Horton, Nicki Heckenlively

---

### WORKSESSION

Julie Archambeault: Donna Hartman's application was the only application received for the survey proposal (copies of application distributed to Commissioners). Donna's bid came in at \$5,000. \$1,000 less than the amount budgeted.

Commissioner Sewell: I have a business relationship with Donna and would ask to be recused.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO RECUSE COMMISSIONER SEWELL FROM PARTICIPATING.

COMMISSIONER MCFADDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES WITH COMMISSIONER SEWELL RECUSED.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE SURVEY PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATION.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES WITH COMMISSIONER SEWELL RECUSED.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **DRH07-00148 / Jay Parks / 1717 Brumback**

Requests Historic Preservation approval to remodel the structure located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone. *(This item was deferred at the April 23, 2007 Hearing.)*

Julie Archambeault: This is an updated drawing. Some of the concerns the Commission had regarding this application were that this eave line did not match eave line. They do not match the side eaves. There was a concern that this roofline did not match the picture. This is a much shallower pitch. That's actually purposeful. The roof will be removed and replaced with a 12/12 pitch roof. There is also a concern that this eave is much higher than the current eave and there are no windows currently. That has not changed. Changes include the window in front has become 1/1 instead of a picture window and instead of multi-paned windows here.

Chairman Stevens: We have two front elevation drawings that are different from the first one. Could you clarify what it is we're looking at and what the proposal is. Is it for that one you were just talking about or is it for the one currently up on the screen.

Ms. Archambeault: I believe the proposal is for this one. I'm not sure...we don't have any side elevation for this. It looks to me like this is wider and taller than the original. This element here. This may be coming out a little farther. It's hard to tell. I don't have any side elevations. The proposal would have to be for this because this is the only one we have side elevations for and I discussed that with the applicant.

Chairman Stevens: We should ignore that other...

Ms. Archambeault: I would ask the applicant. I ignored it. I didn't address it because I wasn't able to address it.

Chairman Stevens: We don't have any other elevations for it?

Ms. Archambeault: Indicated that was correct.

Commissioner Dawson: I was not at the last hearing (she did not receive a copy of the transcript of the previous hearing).

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO ALLOW COMMISSIONER DAWSON TO RECUSE HERSELF FROM THIS APPLICATION.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES WITH COMMISSIONER DAWSON RECUSED.

Commissioner Chandler re-visited the site prior to the hearing. Commissioners Sewell, Stevens, Thomas and McFadden did not re-visit the site.

Jay Parks (Applicant / 1220 N. 18<sup>th</sup> Street): I brought even more elevations. A quick explanation. Can we look at the picture of the existing house? So this is the existing house. The goal is to one, make it attractive and two, add a bedroom and bathroom to the upper level. It is a split level house and in order to add a second story you have to raise the roof.

In talking with Julie one of the concerns with the design submitted was the clipped gable and the flat roof. My house is next door and it has a flat roof and I was worried about this house being too similar. Keeping it short and attractive requires a flat roof for this split level design. The clipped gable was to keep that right hand eave low. It was so low it doesn't allow any windows on that second floor. Code requires windows be a certain amount of both. The door is in the middle of the house and I can't move that because it's not 15' from the sidewalk. I have been talking to Planning and Zoning for a couple of years about what I can do with this particular structure and keep all the setbacks proper.

In talking with Julie it sounded like the clip gable was a big concern and I can get rid of the clipped gable by raising that right eave another couple of feet. If I can pass out drawings I have some. This would be the actual proposal I'd like to go with today.

Chairman Stevens: We can do that, but I need to tell you that because none of the Commissioners nor Staff has actually had a opportunity to look at this...if that's the proposal you want to go with depending on how everybody feels about it we may have to defer again so there's an opportunity for Staff to comment and for the Commission to look at the drawings.

Mr. Parks: The big goal is to get something attractive there. In order to redo it I need to get another bedroom above grade. That's the only place it can go.

Chairman Stevens: We've got two elevations. A front and a west elevation. We'll mark those Exhibits 1 and 2.

Mr. Parks: Did you get enough for each one (referring to copy of drawings)?

Commissioner Sewell: Yes.

Mr. Parks: This is the one I proposed after working with Planning and Zoning (referring to new drawings). I went and reworked the entire design after going back with this. This one couldn't be approved because it added a little bit of roof about the front porch and you really can't do anything in that setback. The explanation for this is that this is the design I wanted to go with, but it didn't meet setback plus the second floor that was added was within the setback, which I was told at one time they'd go with, but not now. This is the one I really wanted to go with and it's modeled after a plan that I came across about a year ago. Julie, if you could click on the "Cool Plan". The key to this design is

the gable part is bigger than the flat roof part...hipped part and the front door is not in the center of the house.

Now looking at this one again, in order to keep it short I've gotten rid of the clipped gable and gone with the eave height of 19 ft., which just allows you to get an egress window in the second floor. I've extended the gable portion over so the front door area is in side of it or at least it appears to be that way. I wouldn't be adding any living space above that front door for that first 6 ft. When you look at the west elevation you will see the addition upstairs is setback to meet the setbacks. I went to the 8/12 pitch to keep it a little bit shorter and with a wider gable that pitch works alright. The 12/12 is the most attractive. The 12/6 is to keep low pitch, short, and go together with the gable part. I could make that eave probably a little bit shorter. I end up with a 1 ft. roof from the door which is as existing. The roof above the rest of the right half of the house is actually above the living quarters as you can see in the west elevation which is unchanged. That's the same roofline that's there now.

Those were the considerations. I also submitted a roof plan. The roof has certainly been thoroughly thought through. It is a very complex roof design. This is correct for what I'm submitting here. The clipped gable would have course have the bottom two diagonal lines meeting at the clipped gable. The floor plan remains the same. I have added windows to the west elevation. The increased eave height allows me to get upstairs windows so there's one in the bath and one in the bedroom. The bottom floor plan is wide open so I can put windows anywhere down there and be fine.

Chairman Stevens: I'm going take these to Staff so she can put them up and also so she can look at them and comment if she wants to.

Mr. Parks: I realize handing in drawings might not be sufficient to get this passed today, but I'm look for some parameters that the Commission will want to see in making an attractive unit that facilitates adding about 500 sq. ft. upstairs.

Commissioner Chandler: In comparing the two north elevations, the one that came in our packet and then the one you just handed to us there's a dimension of height of 25 ft. on both. I realize that in copying things can become distorted, etc... but it appears as though the newer one you handed out is taller than the one that's in the packet.

Mr. Parks: It might be 2 or 3 inches taller. I'm not sure. I can make the flat roof 6 ft. wide and shorten it a few inches. My garage, which is behind this structure, is 25 ft. tall. I want to keep this house shorter than my garage.

Commissioner Chandler: Even if they don't necessarily match up in the drawings the intent is to keep it under 25 ft.?

Mr. Parks: Exactly. That's why the 25 ft. reference is there. The roof has been completely redesigned from a 12/12 small gable to an 8/12 larger gable. Keeping the

6/12 hipped part and getting rid of the clip gable. There are a lot around this structure, but I'm not all that fond of it either. I'd rather get windows upstairs.

Commissioner Thomas: We don't have an adjusted floor plan to reflect the elevations that you just handed out.

Mr. Parks: They don't change at all. I'd need to add windows.

Commissioner Thomas: You stated that you couldn't build in the setback and I note that on the existing structure that upper floor actually sticks out over the garage.

Mr. Parks: It does.

Commissioner Thomas: I'm looking for some confirmation that when you build this it's actually going to be moving inward...it's going to be setback over the garage?

Mr. Parks: If you look at the west elevation the part behind the side is over the garage.

Commissioner Thomas: It will no longer be hanging back over the garage?

Mr. Parks: I do want to pull it in a foot so it is flush.

Commissioner Thomas: The setback is essentially at the face of the garage?

Mr. Parks: No. I could build it where it is now or move it back a foot because it would improve the look.

Commissioner Thomas: It's still in the setback.

Mr. Parks: It is in the setback. I could leave it overhanging and have it further in the setback as existing.

Chairman Stevens: There are a number of window choices for the front elevations. What you handed us today looks like 1/1 double hung or single hung.

Mr. Parks: I do need to use a casement window in both of those bedrooms to meet egress. You can't get the 1/1 double hung. 1/1 double hung has to be 3 ft. x 5 ft. 4/9 to meet egress. Those are big double hung windows that we really don't have room for. I have a double hung look here, but it is a casement. I got rid of the picture window up front. I heard there were folks that didn't like the picture windows.

Chairman Stevens: Julie what was your recollection on that?

Ms. Archambeault: I don't believe there was much conversation. There was a clarification that the bay window was being removed and replaced with a picture window.

Stevens: That was my recollection too. You are planning to use wood clad?

Mr. Parks: Yes, it does.

Commissioner Thomas: I wanted to comment briefly on the revised design that you submitted today. It is a drastic improvement over what we received in our packets. I talked a lot in the last hearing about the rooflines. I wanted to inquire while you were still up here whether or not there was anyway we could try to adjust it so that the 8/12 and 6/12 roofs were actually the same pitch. Personally, I wouldn't mind if it gained a little height if we were able to get the roof pitches to match.

Mr. Parks: The gable looks the best with a 12/12 and the "Cool Plans" design and all the split levels I saw that were like this...that's part of the look. You've got this steep gable and then a low hip that intersects it. If we could make it a little bit taller I would prefer a 12/12 pitch over the gable instead of the 8/12. It works either way. If you go to the 6/12 the hipped part would intersect the gable too low to pull the look off. It should hit it about midway up for this look. If we make it a 12/12 it will hit more in the middle and I will work to make this eave as low as I can. Keep 8 ft. ceilings and windows on the second floor.

Commissioner Thomas: If the upper were increased to an 8/12...it wouldn't dramatically increase the height of the building.

Mr. Parks: I agree. One of the designs was an 8/12. I like that look too. It does get a little bit taller, but there are plenty of full double two-story houses around this one. I still think you need a change in pitch going from the gable to the hip part to make it look right. Otherwise when look up this gable part you are going to see one continuous roof plane up that side. If we could make the gable 12/12 and that part 8/12 that looks the best for this Victoria style...it's not really. I'd like to do something in the gable like the "Cool Plans". I didn't put all the detail in here, but I would like to dress it up some more.

Commissioner Thomas: What are you using as the reference when you indicate it's common to have that change of pitch. The picture that's in the application of that house...I don't think that is a correct characterization of what's going on there. What you really see going on there is that the pitch of the farther back roof since that roofline is receding you are looking at it at a completely different angle than you are the gable. In elevation versus perspective I think we would probably find that it was in fact the same pitch. I'd appreciate other comments on that as well. I am referencing the Field Guide to American Houses on Queen Annes and I'm not finding examples of that situation.

Mr. Parks: That's a tough call. I'm not certain. I've looked at that picture a lot and I actually called to check it out. I've seen others like this. It is hard to tell when it's probably going from a 12/12 to an 8/12 in most cases. I think the gable is 12/12 and maybe the hipped part is 12/12 as well.

Chairman Stevens: What is the eave height of your house to the west?

Mr. Parks: The one I'm building now?

Chairman Stevens: Yes. The one on the corner...the Four Square. I know they're tall, but I'm trying to get a sense of perspective for...if we leave this at 19 ft. what you're proposing in front of us.

Mr. Parks: About 20 ½ ft.

Chairman Stevens: There even taller than that. And the height of the house?

Mr. Parks: That house is 25 ½ or 26 ft. It's got very high eaves, but it's got a much flatter roof pitch.

Commissioner Sewell: The widening of the gable on the front end, was that to get that main roof eave to hit it at a little bit lower point on the roof? I thought you indicated you're not going to have any livable space in that area.

Mr. Parks: The part directly above the front door couldn't have any livable space because that's not pre-existing in the setback. I made it wider so it would encompass the front door. It looks funny if you try and split it down the middle of the front door. I would move the front door to the right and split the size of the two halves, but that is not an option.

Ms. Archambeault: That section will need to obtain a variance because it will be in the setback.

Chairman Stevens: Even if it doesn't have living space?

Ms. Archambeault: Correct.

Mr. Parks: Could it be considered changing the roof?

Ms. Archambeault: Its wall plane.

Commissioner Thomas: There is not a lot of information on the front door. What I see there looks like its got five panes of glass in it.

Mr. Parks: The way I would interpret that is that would be a five-panel door...in the simple rectangle drawing. I would want to put some glass in it, but I haven't. That's not a final design.

Commissioner Sewell: What was the reasoning for widening that gable if there's no livable space?

Mr. Parks: Two options. One is to leave the gable the size of the garage, which makes it too narrow. It doesn't look as good that way. That's the drawing I submitted with the 12/12 and the 6/12 meeting it. The building gets more attractive if you can make that gable wider. I went with making clear about the door which would need a variance. It's not just roof. It's a wall plane even though there's no living space there. It sounds like that won't work anyway. Again, trying to make it look as attractive as possible. It looks like the one I submitted might be...I could certainly make that one work just as well going 12/12 and raising the other eave. I could do a 12/12 with a small gable and then an 8/12 on the top part and not get away from the quick gable. Keep the eave at 19 ft. or maybe a little bit less. Sounds like that is the only option that is available if I can't even build a dummy wall up there to make it look attractive.

Commissioner Thomas: I was going to offer you a look of a couple of photographs with similar rooflines where you can actually tell that even though the lines of the roof are at different angles that the pitch is consistent all the way across. There's a number of examples in here that I believe this particular example being on Page 268 of the American Field Guide to American Houses.

Mr. Parks: I'm fine with that. I was worried it wouldn't look right.

Commissioner Thomas: I was going to add that it sounds like you have backed off your design a lot with the threat of a having to get a variance. I would encourage you to attempt that at least because you're right that it does look better and as a Commission we've seen a number of variances approved where people actually wanted to build within the setback on top of an existing structure. You're not expanding the structure. There is an example on Harrison Boulevard where they had a similar situation because they had a bump out on their house that set in the setback and they want to put the second story on it and it was approved.

Mr. Parks: Okay.

Commissioner Thomas: It's not the end of the world. It's a little bit more paperwork, but it happens.

Mr. Parks: The original design looks the best...when I actually add living space and keep the front plain. The two gable look like the reference plan. That would be the best, but that would require a variance and I was told variances take three months to schedule.

Chairman Stevens: They take a long time.

Mr. Parks: Can I get approval to go ahead and take it down to the studs?

Chairman Stevens: What we're going to do is close public testimony, talk and see how everybody's feeling about how we want to move forward and then depending on how that goes we can go ahead and call you back up if we need to. Either defer or ask for a final design. We'll see how the Commissioners want to proceed.

NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chairman Stevens: I would like to hear your opinion Julie.

Ms. Archambeault: It's much improved. Having the eave lines match is a roof form that's found much more frequently in the District so that improves the design. I'm concerned about the variance that will be needed to widen the front bay, but that roofline is much improved.

Chairman Stevens: Mr. Parks you do have the opportunity to have any final remarks since I let Julie talk. Do you have anything you want to add?

Mr. Parks: If you look at the west elevation I have provided, I would probably add a belly band and do something different up top then from the bottom. The most awkward thing is meeting the setback. The angled roof right there...if you think a variance to actual add the living space within the setback would make it more attractive I would like to hear feedback on that.

Commissioner McFadden: Are you proposing brick around the garage door?

Mr. Parks: Yes.

Commissioner McFadden: I wasn't sure if that was brick or shingle.

Chairman Stevens: That is existing isn't it?

Mr. Parks: No. It's not. We would be adding brick all around the garage area there so the full first floor, the left half, would be brick veneer.

Chairman Stevens: I meant existing from the current plan.

Mr. Parks: Yes. That was not a change.

Commissioner McFadden: That would be on the alley side as well?

Mr. Parks: Yes.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

Commissioner Sewell: The elevations submitted by Mr. Parks today are an improvement. A continuous eave is more congruous with what you find in the neighborhood. The information you see in the house plans from *coolhouseplans.com* is a solution that shows that the applicant is trying to stay within the existing form of the house. Keeping the width of the garage and continuing up fits better with the house. It sounds like it is a variance issue anyway. Keeping the gable as it is and increasing the

pitch to 12/12 and the main house to 12/8 is better than what was presented at the initial hearing.

Commissioner Thomas: My comment is in regard to the roof line and the width of the gable. They are framed with the applicant's request for a wider gable. If the gable only wanted to be as wide as the garage, that is an acceptable solution. An overall pleasing design could still be gained with that perspective.

Commissioner Mc Fadden: I agree with Commissioner Sewell on the roofline. If the gable was the same width as the garage that could be...I also agree with Commissioner Thomas about the change in pitch. One solution, to keep it all simple is to keep it all an 8/12 pitch and bring that gable up to the width of the garage. Trying to put a Victorian look on this isn't the right thing to do with a 12/12 pitch. It seems like it gets it too tall and it's so narrow anyway.

Commissioner Chandler: My only concern is the west elevation with no upper story windows and that has been changed. All other elevations have been improved. I have no real concerns regarding the roof pitch.

Chairman Stevens: My concern was the big mass of wall space on the west elevation and I agree that has been alleviated. If we're adding a second story it's fine to go to 25 ft. or even 25 ft. 6 inches if you need to maintain a little more variation on that west wall. The roof pitch doesn't make a whole lot of difference to me. It's the more I look at this the less awkward it would be to keep the gable directly in line with the garage and keep it a steeper pitch. Even, again, if the house has to go up to 25 ft. 6 inches. I will reiterate from our last hearing that I don't think anybody's concern is saving the historic nature of this house. It's just getting the right design that fits in with the surrounding structures. I concur with what the other Commissioners have said and especially with Commissioner Chandler with regard to that west wall. To address your last comment, which was to bring the house flush with the front, I personally would not want to see that happen. It's much more common to have a little bit of break in the wall plane. Having it all flush with the front end of that setback would not be something I would want to see personally. I will say that because there is so much that is unclear at this point I don't feel comfortable saying, "Here...go ahead" because there is a lot of talk about what this design really is. If we're talking about changing it back to a gable that's directly over the garage...changing the roof pitches...we're not sure what the windows look like. I would feel more comfortable deferring one more time and getting a final design based on the comments that we've had today.

Commissioner Thomas: I would concur.

Commissioner Chandler: I would concur. You indicated a comment regarding a belly band around that on the west side. That would particularly help that doing something to further break up that wall. It would be nice to have a further refined drawing as to where it's going to go in the long run.

Commissioner Sewell: If the applicant is comfortable with the things we've discussed today keeping that gable the same width of the garage and extending the roof pitch I would be comfortable with approving the application and have the applicant come back to staff with the changes.

Chairman Stevens: My personal opinion is there are still a lot of unknowns.

Commissioner Thomas: Given the significant amount of improvement that we've seen today and the fact that is wasn't part of the application originally noticed, I think it is appropriate to defer.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO DEFER TO THE MAY 21, 2007 HEARING.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

PUBLIC PORTION RE-OPENED

Chairman Stevens: Do you have enough information from the Commission and does the date work for the applicant?

Mr. Parks: I believe the date will work. If I keep the gable part the width of the garage, with a 12/12 roof line, I can make the gable tall enough to intersect with the 6/12 pitch but I would still have different pitches for the hipped part and the gable part. Is that going to be a big deal? Do I have to have the same pitch to get it approved?

Commissioner McFadden: The bigger deal is the eave line.

Mr. Parks: The clipped gable.

Commissioner McFadden: Anything you can do to make it look simpler is better.

Commissioner Chandler: I have no problem with the change in pitch.

Commissioner Thomas: I do find the change in pitch problematic. It starts to become an element that is so complicated that it's unprecedented in the District. At least historically speaking. That's something I'd like to see addressed. What the pitch is doesn't matter to me so much as I would like to see constant planes.

Mr. Parks: I can show some pictures of fully hipped roofs with gables coming in at a different pitch that might help. The garage and the house have 7 ft. 6" ceilings in them. It would be great if those were 8 ft. That would push the eave height above existing. I kept it 15 ft. 4 inches on the left side to keep it exactly as existing. If I can go up another foot on that eave height it actually helps bring it together at the same pitch. If that's a parameter that I have work with then I'll experiment with different approaches.

Commissioner Thomas: I can't find an example of what I would like to share with you at this moment. It is a dormer situation but the window is actually centered on the eave so the dormer starts and then the window or the wall that the windows on is flush with the exterior wall of the building. The window actually bisects the eave. That allows you to keep the eave height a lower but still raise the ceiling. That may be an appropriate solution. I know there are examples around the District.

Chairman Stevens: In regard to the photos it is always better to have more. If you can find examples of the things that are appropriate that would be helpful. Commissioner McFadden, I would like to clarify that I understand what you are saying. When you say you want to keep the eave height the same for simplicity...

Commissioner McFadden: What I'm saying is not to have the clipped eave on the front like that one shows, but have the eave height continue around the front like this one shows (referring to drawing).

Mr. Parks: Yeah. This is a clipped gable here. That's just a straight hipped roof. I like the straight hipped roof better too.

Commissioner McFadden: The simplicity is nice more so than the clipped. I see what Commissioner Thomas is saying about the pitch, but the more I think about the more it doesn't really bother me because it's up there and I don't think you'd notice that much.

Mr. Parks: No one has commented about the height on that left side. Do we want to keep that at 18 ft. or would ½ ft. make a difference. It helps bring the roof together.

Commissioner Sewell: I don't think that's an issue. That may be a zoning problem and you may want to address that with Staff. Getting rid of the clipped eave is more congruous with the District. The District does often have a mixture of roof pitches.

Commissioner Pooser: I agree with the comments about the eave height and don't have a problem with the different pitches.

Commissioner Thomas: On Page 248 of the Field Guide to American Houses.

Chairman Stevens: The City has a copy of that for your use on the second floor.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED.

ROLL CALL VOTE 8:0. MOTION CARRIES.

**DRH07-00176 / Christ's New Covenant Church**

Location: 1717 Eastman

Requests Historic Preservation approval to change the use from a parsonage to a single-family residence on property located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

Julie Archambeault: Presented staff report with recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Thomas: So we are clear, not only is the house not on the Historic Register, but this is not an application to change this from contributing to non-contributing.

Ms. Archambeault: That is correct.

Commissioner Stevens: This is not an application to remove it from the District?

Ms. Archambeault: That's correct.

Pete Chesney (Board Member of Church / 938 N. Callahan Avenue): This is pretty straight forward. It has been used as a parsonage for about 57 years and the pastor is no longer living there. There is no desire or no point for a future pastor to reside at this location. It was remodeled two years ago. This is just a step for us to go through to sell this off.

Chairman Stevens: No questions from the public.

**PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED**

**COMMISSIONER THOMAS MOVED TO APPROVE DRH07-00176 PER STAFF'S REPORT AND REASON STATEMENT.**

**COMMISSIONER SEWELL SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE 7:0. MOTION CARRIES.**

**DRH07-00178 / Robin Rowe and Linda Blanksma**

Location: 711 and 715 E. State Street

Request Historic Preservation approval to change the status of the property located in an R-2H (Combined Residential with Historic Overlay) zone.

Julie Archambeault: Presented staff report with a recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Sewell: From the 2002 Survey it doesn't look like it has changed since then. The surveyor obviously thought the stair was alright.

Ms. Archambeault: This was a difficult application. It hasn't changed since the survey was done. It has original materials and the height is the same. Something like the huge set of concrete stairs does impact the design.

Chairman Stevens: It seems like the house is intact. There would have had to be stairs originally getting to that door.

Commissioner Chandler: It appears the structure was built in 1937 and the front entrance was remodeled two years earlier. One could make the assumption that the original design was not adequate. With the existing stairs being over 50 years old...does that impact your opinion?

Ms. Archambeault: I believe those front stairs are much more recent.

Commissioner Dawson: Looking at the east side photograph there appears to be another entrance there. Where does that entrance go to? Was that the original entrance to the basement?

Ms. Archambeault: I believe so.

Commissioner Thomas: Do we have any reason to believe that the original stairs to this structure were any dimension at all. I am not sure what I am comparing this to. I am having trouble with the structure being removed from contributing status without know what the original staircase width was.

Ms. Archambeault: Historically speaking it would be very rare for a staircase to be this wide especially given the era of this house, but there is no record.

## **SITE VISITS**

Commissioners McFadden, Stevens, Chandler, Sewell and Dawson visited the site prior to the hearing. Commissioner Thomas did not visit the site, but is familiar with it.

Robin Rowe (Applicant / 719 E. State Street): No objections to the Commissioners viewing the site. The steps seem out of balance with the house. With the way they are set up the downstairs entrance gathers water because of the way the roofline is set up. We would like to apply for an application to correct the front entry someday.

Commissioner McFadden: Is there another stairwell entry to the basement on the west side?

Mr. Rowe: Yes that appears to be the original entrance.

## **PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED**

Chairman Stevens: I understand staff's concern about the staircase, but with respect I don't agree with it. It feels to me that this is an accessory staircase and it could be removed and maintains its status. Everything else seems to be in tact. I went back to our pamphlet and read about setting and that it had been diminished. Having modern structures around it doesn't have anything do with the setting of a particular property. It says here, "Setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how not just where the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space." It is still surrounded by single-family homes.

It's still in the same type of neighborhood it was originally built in. With that I don't feel comfortable changing the status of this home. I won't be supporting this application.

Commissioner Sewell: In looking through the guidelines the period of significance was between 1890 and extended to 1940. Noting that this house was built outside of the period of significance. It was also built as a duplex which is different. The stair appears to be original. I don't have issues with removing. Architecturally and historically it does represent the East End.

COMMISSIONER SEWELL MOVED TO APPROVE CHANGE OF STATUS FOR DRH07-00178.

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Chandler: I find this unusual. I do disagree with Staff and believe the 1949 building permit was to enlarge the front entrance. This might be part of the historical significance of the house. The house is outside of the period of significance. While it has not changed appreciatively overall the District can be best served by the latitude that would be given if this was a non-contributing structure.

Commissioner Thomas: I don't think this is the most stellar example of a contributing structure. Nevertheless it was determined to be contributing and it is important to maintain as many as possible. Here are a number of points.

1. The staircase was enlarged two years after initial construction. This is likely attributable to the original staircase being inadequate.
2. The house is largely intact.
3. There has been no significant change to the structure since it was originally deemed contributing.
4. The stairs could be removed.
5. The goals that the applicant stated himself could be accomplished through a number of other applications beside the change in status.

If the applicant had brought us an application to change the stairs, we would all be open to approving that. I won't be supporting this application.

Commissioner McFadden: This is a tough one. I am leaning towards approving the motion. I understand what Commissioner Thomas's points are and agree that just because it isn't attractive doesn't mean we should make it non-contributing.

Commissioner Dawson: I am going to support the motion. One of the things that has been mentioned is the aesthetics of the street and this house sits much more forward and these stairs emphasize that intrusion.

Commissioner Stevens: It concerns me greatly that we could change the status of a home so easily. A perfectly intact home except for a set of stairs on the front of the home. We know what happens to those homes. It concerns me that we could take a house that is fully intact and change the status so easily.

ROLL CALL VOTE 4:2 WITH COMMISSIONER STEVENS AND THOMAS AGAINST. MOTION CARRIES.

**MINUTES - April 9, 2007**

COMMISSIONER CHANDLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 9, 2007.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES.