CALDWELL HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting of November 13, 2019 @ 6:33 P.M.
Caldwell Public Library – Idaho Room
1010 Dearborn, Caldwell, Idaho

I. Call to order. Chairperson King called the meeting to order at approximately 6:33 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present. Jacob King, Randy Lyons, Nicole Bradshaw, Megan Dixon and Steve Maughan.

Members Absent. None.

Others Present. April Cabello, Planning Technician.

Others Absent. Jerome Mapp, Planning, Zoning Director; and Rob Hopper, City Council Liaison.

Approval of Minutes. Continued to next the meeting.

III. Certificate of Appropriateness Interviews.

- **Action Item:** CA-19-13 Applicant: Tracy Zamzow, 1621 Fillmore Street, Caldwell, ID. Request for approval to build a 6ft cedar fence with craftsman architectural features, adhering to fencing code.

  Tracy Zamzow, Applicant, 1621 Fillmore Street gave testimony explaining that she would like approval to install a 6ft cedar fencing with craftsman architectural features. Ms. Zamzow reviewed the site plan and placement of the fencing explaining that they wanted to preserve the front of the house, it is a beautiful house but also needed some privacy.

  The commission expressed their appreciation for the thoroughness and completeness of the application, extremely well done.

  Commissioner Dixon made the motion to approve the application.

  **Motion to Approve Case Number CA-19-13:**

  **MOTION:** Commissioner Dixon **SECOND:** Commissioner Maughan **MOTION PASSED WITH A UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

- **Action Item:** CA-19-11 Applicant: Gregory Arnold, 1614 Dearborn Street, Caldwell, ID. Request for approval to construct guard railing / stair railing systems at existing front entry steps and basement stair entry.

  April Cabello, City of Caldwell, Planning and Zoning gave the staff report explaining that the Planning and Zoning Department was notified of front stair railing construction at 1614 Dearborn without a Certificate of Appropriateness. On October 9, 2019 the property owner was contacted and was requested that all work stop immediately and to submit for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Cabello further explained that the property owner Mr. Arnold responded immediately and stated that he did not think he needed a Certificate of...
Appropriateness because when he did the picket fencing a Certificate of Appropriateness was not required. Mr. Arnold submitted his application for work already started. Ms. Cabello stated that staff consulted with the State Historic Preservation office requesting guidance for staff and the commission. Staff determined that the replacement railings are not appropriate for the character of the house based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation and recommends modifying the railings. Ms. Cabello further stated that the State Historic Preservation Office does not have any authority for determination on this case; they only responded to staff’s request for guidance and recommendation.

Gregory Arnold, Applicant, 1614 Dearborn Street, gave testimony explaining that he would like approval to keep the partially completed guard railing / stair railing system for the front entry steps and basement stair entry. Mr Arnold handed out two exhibits, exhibit 1 – memo and exhibit 2 - craftsman handout. Mr. Arnold stated that he had reviewed the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the Steunenberg Historic District Guidelines and pointed out that the metal railing that was removed was not original to the house. The railings were most likely installed in the 60’s/70’s and were not a historical element. Mr. Arnold further stated that he did not realize it needed to be replaced with in-kind or similar railing because the metal railings he removed did not exist in the 60’s. Mr. Arnold referred to a picture taken in 1997 and that there was a square column made of brick on the porch and was there in a picture from 2008; the column would have been historical and he is not sure when the column was removed. Mr. Arnold shared that he thinks there was no entry into the basement at the front of the house; it would have had a typical craftsman kind of entry and shared examples of typical craftsman style entryways within the district.

Commissioner Maughan confirmed the reason for tonight’s meeting and that the application was to approve or deny the work that was already started on the home. Commissioner Maughan shared that it would be ideal to get closer to the original look of the home or maintain the look of the house when it was brought into the district.

Mr. Arnold explained the partial work on the railings and that phase two would be to duplicate the current design down the stairwell into the basement, which has no guardrail. Currently you can fall down into the basement stairwell from the side. Mr. Arnold further explained that his lot slopes down to the sidewalk about 2 feet and his plan is to put something there to level out his lot, columns spaced 8 feet with picket sections in-between to make it all match. He acknowledged that he would apply for that portion of work at another time.

Commissioner Maughan shared that the commission is to determine whether the work being done fits the original craftsman set of designs.

Chairman King shared that the stucco and masonry noted on the application does not meet the craftsman appeal referring to the examples provided by the State Historic Preservation Office and wondered if Mr. Arnold had any interest in any of the suggested styles.

Mr. Arnold responded, no, he does not because the examples given by the State Historic Preservation Office are not code compliant.

Ms. Cabello stated that the building code portion of the discussion would need to go through the Building Department for what the requirements would be. There are ways to take historic design, making it code compliant.

Chairman King stated that assuming the handrail meets code, they can discuss the materials and design. Chairman King referred to the McCalister book submitted by the applicant showing several designs.
Mr. Arnold responded that there are no examples for craftsman style homes with wood hand railings, it would be very unusual. The craftsman style home would have a couple of columns with a swooping wing and no hand railing system associated with it.

Commissioner Maughan stated that there are a number of prevalent railing styles in the neighborhood and the question is does the system that the applicant is proposing harmonize with the district and to what degree is harmonization historically necessary. Commissioner Maughan stated that he has not seen any other houses in the district with this classic craftsman styling with the brackets and open soffits having this kind of entry way massing and masonry style.

Chairman King shared that looking at the specific frontage features of the house, the prominent features are the front windows and the exposed braces. The new railing system blocks that second set of windows and it seems the current new masonry detracts and takes away from the character of the house.

Mr. Arnold responded referring back to the picture from 1997 showing the column that was blocking the same window and any railing he puts in would be 36” in height to meet code.

Commissioner Maughan responded that just because it has to be code compliant does not mean it cannot fit the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Lyons asked the applicant the height of the columns.

Mr. Arnold responded 40” tall and has to be that tall in order to get a hand railing to come down at that angle. Mr. Arnold referred back to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation under entrances and porches.

Commissioner Maughan stated that he is concerned that the design going in is not in character with the massing and style of the home.

Mr. Arnold responded that he does not agree. There is no change to the existing structure of the building and if the builder came to the house he would say, that is my house with a new railing system.

Commissioner Maughan and the commission stated that this is not easy and cannot say OK just because the applicant is earnest, loves the property and has a vision on how the property will be improved, it comes down to the view from the street. Commissioner Maughan stated he has concerns over the massing of the railing elements going up to the front of the house and might achieve the same kind of safety and code appropriate solution with a different design.

Commissioner Lyons discussed the picture submitted by the applicant of the house across the street from the subject property and the low flowing stair sides; discussing the option to place metal railings in the middle to keep the consistency and style of the house with the addition of a modernized rail.

Mr. Arnold responded that all the bungalows in the district are legal-nonconforming meaning they were legal at the time of construction but do not conform to the current land use code and the type of railing suggested would not be approved, legally.

Commissioner Maughan responded that the question is if what is being presented to the commission is acceptable in terms of appropriateness with regard to the historic neighborhood and historic uses of porches and railings that exist within the district.
Commissioner Dixon stated that she is not persuaded visually that the proposed design fits the style of the house. Commissioner Dixon referred to the examples submitted by the applicant and that they are more retiring at the entry. Commissioner Dixon further expressed that the mass of the proposed design does not harmonize visually with the house or the neighborhood.

Mr. Arnold asked if it would be acceptable if the columns were not 6” by 16”, instead 6” by 8” with the same picket system in-between.

Commissioner Dixon stated that the columns have a very blocky shape and they step down only once. Commissioner Dixon shared that it is a lack of a line, which you see in the house across the street and it is matched by the more minimal profile of other elements at entrances.

Mr. Arnold asked the commission if they would rather him to infill with a stucco wall.

Chairman King responded that if it was a stucco house that would be okay.

Commissioner Maughan stated that would be going the wrong direction because it would make more of a massing issue. The commission has to look at other homes like this with one with the same gables, the same glassed in porch with the same appearance in the neighborhood, how they managed their entryways and to try and harmonize towards that average of what those look like in the neighborhood. There is always the option of like for like which would not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman King asked the commission to suggest other materials besides the stucco finish, if the applicant was to thin down the columns.

Commissioner Maughan responded that he would need to see a design.

Ms. Cabello suggested that if the commission wants a new design, to continue the case to the next scheduled meeting on December 11, 2019 requesting the applicant to meet with staff and the Building Department to review a new design, making sure it would meet Building Code.

Commissioner Lyons asked if it was appropriate to request the applicant to submit several different designs.

Mr. Arnold responded several different designs would not be required because the design would have to out of wood or steel without any mass.

Commissioner Maughan made the motion to continue the case and request a design or a few designs that modify the entryway in accordance of the factors discussed tonight.

Commissioner Bradshaw made a motion to amend the motion to have the design more in line with the craftsman style, the house and the neighborhood.

**Motion to Continue Case Number CA-19-11:**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Maughan **SECOND:** Commissioner Dixon **MOTION PASSED WITH A UNANIMOUS VOTE.**

Commissioner Dixon wanted to acknowledge for the record a complicated feature, symmetry. When looking through the photo examples (exhibit 2) submitted at the meeting and if the entry to the basement was added later, that poses an issue for maintaining
symmetry because there is not enough space between the stairway going up and the stairway going down to make things match what may be a usual craftsman way.

IV. Audience Participation. None.

V. Actions Since Last Meeting. None.

- Chairman King reviewed case number CA-19-12 Michael O Victory / Victory Revocable Trust, 1419 Cleveland Blvd. Staff Level C of A issued for removal of a noncontributing, not eligible garage and covered patio replacing with a concrete/asphalt parking area with alley access. Removal of the curb cut and driveway off Cleveland Blvd., replacing both areas with landscaping grass.

VI. Old Business.

- **Action Item:** Steunenberg Facebook page:
  Commissioner Maughan reported that he wrote up two possible internships for C of I students, Webpage Social Media Development Internship to work on the FB page, work with the City of Caldwell PR group the other Oral History with Chuck Randolph and supplement the information on some of the iconic houses in the district. Steve M. expressed the need to figure out who at the city is the contact and whether the internship fits with HR and Social Media policy, who the Interns will work with at the City. April C. stated that she would talk to Jerome Mapp the Planning Director.

- **Action Item:** News Letter:
  April C. reported that she has a current mailing list for the district and would send out a mass reminder mailing.

- **Action Item:** Adding a new commission member:
  Chairman King asked the commission if they had contacted anyone about becoming a member on the commission. The commission discussed whom to contact.

- **Action Item:** Historic Preservation Commission goals for upcoming years:
  Chairman King shared that connecting to the College is a big goal along with the FB page, newsletter and adding a commission member.

VII. New Business. None.

VIII. Commission & Staff Reports. None.

IX. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by April Cabello,
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