I. **Call to order.** Chairperson King called the meeting to order at approximately 6:31 p.m.

II. **Roll Call**

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

**Members Absent.** Nicole Bradshaw.

**Others Present.** Jerome Mapp, Planning, Zoning Director; and April Cabello, Planning Technician.

**Others Absent.** Rob Hopper, City Council Liaison.

**Approval of Minutes.**

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 23, 2019 AND NOVEMBER 13, 2019 WITH CORRECTIONS.

MOTION Commissioner Maughan SECOND: Commissioner Dixon, MOTION PASSED.

III. **Certificate of Appropriateness Interviews.**

- **Action Item:**
  Continued from November 13, 2019 meeting to December 11, 2019 –

  **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.

  Chairman King reviewed the design sheet A-1 from the commissions docket showing four railing options and materials besides the existing railing submitted by the applicant, Gregory Arnold.

  Gregory Arnold, Applicant, 1614 Dearborn Street gave testimony explaining the chamfered trim listed on the design sheet A-1.

  April Cabello, Planning Technician, stated for the record that staff and the Building Plans Examiner met with Mr. Arnold. Per the Building Plans Examiner, all the designs meet code; there is a height requirement because of the handrail.

  Commissioner Maughan stated that his concern remains the same from the last meeting, that is, the massing; there are columns extending along the front walk way up to the house which become part of a massed railing system that are asymmetrical on a craftsman style house. He does not see this harmonizing or compatible with the house’s basic architectural style and has a fundamental issue with the basic design.
Jerome Mapp, Planning Director, numbered the designs listed on the design sheet A-1 as:

#1 Most Formal Railings.
#2 Least Formal with 1x4 pickets and 4x4 wood columns matching existing fencing sections at street frontage.
#3 Less Formal with 1x4 pickets with columns as described with a more formal system above.
#4 Plywood underlain wood lap siding covered columns with siding matching existing pattern used, a house cladding painted, picket sections to be one determined most acceptable.

Commissioner Maughan cannot remember an approved design that is permanent in the district that is like this request and it concerns him because the commission’s primary mission is to preserve the existing feel, design, and material as much as possible as viewed from the street.

Mr. Mapp pointed out that design # 2 does not have pillars.

Commissioner Maughan responded that design # 2 is less objectionable than what is existing but it still creates a picket fence that extends out from the front of the house.

Mr. Mapp stated that one of the issues discussed at the meeting with staff and the applicant is the space going to the lower level has to have a railing, and the railing going up has to have a certain distance because it is over 36”.

Commissioner Maughan responded that the wrought iron railing systems that exist in the district from the mid 1930’s are thin iron systems that do not create a mass structure that extends from the front of the house out towards the sidewalk and would be more in keeping with the styles and nature of the district.

Mr. Mapp asked if metal versus wood is the issue.

Commissioner Maughan responded yes, metal railing systems as they exist in the district are thin, difficult to perceive, they do not change the front view of the building.

Mr. Mapp confirmed that wood creates mass and the metal railing does not.

Commissioner Maughan responded yes, metal railing creates less mass. The commission is dealing with a historic district and the commission’s primary responsibility is to try to maintain the historic nature of the quality of the district, the commission needs to take seriously anything new. The appearance from the curb should not be anomalous, new, or different from the existing architecture. None of the designs submitted pass that test for him.

Commissioner Dixon restated to confirm what Commissioner Maughan said that it is good everything passes code, but code has a different set of goals than the commission has. The Commission must consider the visual architectural history of the structures with an eye to precedent and what people might want to do if they perceive they do not have to conform to the standards. Commissioner Dixon further stated that it makes this situation difficult for the commission because something exists and the commission wants to support the homeowner’s desire to be safe.

Commissioner Dixon shared that in the examples provided (of Craftsman homes as sample models for front steps), that there is some mass in the photos but all of it is below the level of the landing that enters at the front door. In this case, for the desire for the railings, it creates a height that does not exist in the other examples and there are no railings in the historical examples.
Commissioner Dixon spoke of examples at her own home and across the street are sort of safety but also appearance based and stated that for this case she hesitates because of the height. Commissioner Dixon stated that she understands it is because of the code but the mandate for the commission is different and that makes it hard to think through, because the massing is above the level of the landing to the front door, which makes it challenging. There is also the difficulty with symmetry because of how the basement entrance has been treated that poses a challenge that is not easy to resolve.

Mr. Mapp reminded the commission all that existed when the district came into existence is pre-existing and is allowed. The commission needs to look at this in regards to building code that is law and the historical nature.

Commissioner Maughan agreed but also stated if you approach it from code compliance and quality building standards in new construction today then you will get a solution that works and is code compliant but does not fit the historic neighborhood. If you start there, then any contractor can build a code compliant railing system but that is not the only code compliant railing system. Commissioner Maughan referenced back to the May 1997 picture of the house showing the metal railing and shared that it is possible to imagine a metal railing on the home. Any welding, railing company could do something like that and it would be a solution that he would be more comfortable approving than one that does not have any precedent in the district. There is no precedent for this particular look in the district, the concern about precedent and how you begin to erode the street view of the neighborhood is an ongoing concern that goes beyond this application. The question is, how does the district continue to do what the district is supposed to do.

Mr. Arnold asked how do you establish a precedent based on an element that has no historical basis.

Commissioner Dixon responded that the commission’s concern is people do not check before they start work and they assume if they see something in the district, that they can do the same thing.

Mr. Arnold stated that he has worked in architecture all his adult life and felt that this design review is subjective and after the decision tonight the commission will never think about this again but he will live with it every day and pay for it. Mr. Arnold stated again that it is subjective, a taste thing and who is to say that with his 40 years of architecture that his taste is less substantiated than the commissions.

Commissioner Maughan and the commission acknowledged his statement but stated that the commission operates to the standards that are established at a national level, it is not subjective in their view. Commissioner Maughan further stated there are a series of standards, a framework, and the Secretary of Interior’s Standards the commission follows, this is difficult, it is important to the community, and important to do it right.

Mr. Arnold responded that the commission is trying to create some sort of objective argument and basing it on a steel hand railing, which does not have any historical character except to the extent that it’s what people did after World War II.

Commissioner Maughan responded it is a historic standard.

Mr. Arnold questioned the commission, for a historic district that is based in the early 1900’s and 1920’s.

Commissioner Maughan responded that the district did not infill until the 1950’s.
Chairman King stated the historic district has a gradient of the architectural styles, closer to the college those homes are older. The infill further towards downtown, came in at different periods, and many of the hand railings did come in during those times.

Mr. Arnold stated that his property is listed as 1920, so how can he be held hostage to the 1960’s architecture.

Commissioner Maughan responded because it is a historic district not an individual historic house assessment point by point. If the home were listed on the national register of historic homes then it would be held to higher standards. The commission’s goal is the entire neighborhood not each individual house considered individually.

Chairman King shared that the commission goes through education classes and seminars; they receive education and input from the City, the McCallister book, and Secretary of Interior Standards and with the education received, the objective facts are that this is a modification to the structure. Chairman King stated that he does expect to see the thinner railings and this is a change and does not seem to fit.

Chairman King acknowledged that Mr. Arnold’s concerns are very well noted and the commission does not take this lightly.

Commissioner Dixon shared that her issue is the height of all the designs remains the same and the project as built does not match presented examples in terms of the relationship to the porch level; she feels most comfortable with design #2 that has the 4x4 wood columns to accommodate the residents’ needs for safety.

Chairman King agreed with Commissioner Dixon that he is more comfortable with design #2.

Commissioner Maughan stated that he could not vote to approve any of the designs and referenced back to the photo of the house from 1997, which shows a metal railing. The entry to the basement had not been put in yet and the big arborvitaes are not there and you can see that there was a metal railing that extends down to the sidewalk, it extends up to the house, it’s designed for the main entry way. Commissioner Maughan stated he could support a design in that style and those materials, but cannot support any of the designs that have been presented because none of the designs is in keeping with the historic appearance of a craftsman house in the district.

Mr. Arnold responded that he could come in with a hundred photographs of non-compliant elements throughout the historic district. There is a chain-link fence around the corner from him.

Commissioner Dixon responded that specific fence is grandfathered in because it was there before the historic district, that all the chain-link fences in the district were grandfathered in at the time the district was created, and so if they ever decide to replace the fence, a chain-link fence will not go in.

Commission Maughan stated that the dilemma for the commission, is if they approve this application then a year from now, potentially they will have an applicant that saw this railing and thinks it is clearly allowable.

Chairman King asked Mr. Arnold if wrought iron or metal railing would be a consideration if he started from scratch.

Mr. Arnold responded that he will not pay for wrought iron and he does not like it.
Chairman King explained to Mr. Arnold that he could appeal the commission’s decision to City Council if he wants to contest their decision.

Commissioner Lyons shared a picture of a craftsman porch railing that he pulled up on his laptop and wondered if cap railing, instead of the railing on the inside of the casing, if it would be appropriate.

Commissioner Maughan responded it would require a complete replacement of the front steps but it does fit a craftsman style and he would be more open to this design if it were brought in by the applicant but would not advocate this as a solution.

Mr. Arnold asked the commission what makes it more suitable.

Commissioner Maughan stated for the record the picture shared by Commissioner Lyons from his laptop is a traditional standard craftsman stoop which has four columns attached by wooden rails and a wooden set of stair treads. This design is common to Craftsman style houses and is closer in style than the application before them.

Mr. Mapp labeled the picture, Craftsman Porch Railing, as exhibit 1000.

Commissioner Maughan made a motion to deny the application and plans submitted, asking the applicant to consider an iron (metal) railing system that mirrors the appearance of the railing systems that are iron (metal) in district.

Chairman King stated there was no second so the Motion died.

Chairman King made the motion to approve the design #2 labeled least formal with 1 x 4 pickets and 4 x 4 wood columns matching existing fencing section at street frontage with the removal of the existing masonry columns.

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

**MOTION:** Chairman King **SECOND:** Commissioner Dixon **MOTION PASSED WITH A SPLIT VOTE. Those voting yes Chairman King, Commissioner Lyons, and Commissioner Dixon. Those voting no Commissioner Maughan.**

Mr. Arnold asked the commission instead of doing the less formal individual pickets with 2 x 4 attachment at the top and the bottom, can he do something like in design #1 either with 2 x 2 pickets or with 1 x 4 pickets that are trapped in between.

Mr. Mapp stated that there is a process and if they want to hear the applicant’s comments, they will need to open the hearing back up for clarification.

Commissioner Maughan shared that there was an approval for a design and now the applicant is asking for further modification for the design. If they want to reopen discussion for a modification for the motion that was already passed, then it needs to be done on the record.

Chairman King stated for the record the commission had approved design #2 on the plans but will reopen the discussion and noted the time 7:34pm stating that Mr. Arnold would like to provide a few more suggestions.

Mr. Arnold stated that the commission approved design #2 based upon the 4 x 4 wood columns and he would like to do either 2 x 2 pickets or 1 x 4 pickets that are trapped like in design #1 between two railings, it is more formal and he likes it better.
Chairman King asked if it was the 1 x 4 cap and trim as opposed to the open pickets that match the fence.

Mr. Arnold confirmed.

Chairman King stated the request is like taking design #2 with the 4 x 4 wood columns and insert them in place of the masonry columns with the more formal intermediary pickets in between with the cap and trim on the top and bottom as presented in design #1.

Commissioner Dixon asked if the commission considers that modification, could the commission request the applicant to submit a drawing as a condition.

Commissioner Maughan requested that the sketch be taken to Planning and Zoning staff and authorize the Chairman to give approval.

Commissioner Lyons clarified what was being said was that there are three sections, the top, bottom and middle sections would be the picket.

Mr. Arnold responded yes.

Commissioner Dixon responded to Commissioner Lyons and stated that is a wonderful question. Design #1 where the pickets are in between, the middle section is not depicted as being trapped and wondered if that would remain as it is.

Mr. Arnold responded no, everything would match.

Commissioner Dixon asked if Mr. Arnold was proposed 2 x 2 wood pickets or 1 x 4 wood pickets because both are depicted in design #1.

Mr. Arnold responded 2 x 2 picket with more space in between, be more open.

Mr. Arnold stated that he would have to do something that matches on the other side at the head of the stairwell retaining wall, and asked if he was to replicate the design on the stairwell retaining wall.

Chairman King stated that changes the motion and the commission held a discussion on general guidelines.

Commission Dixon stated that Commissioner Lyons found in the original packet a drawing that is not numbered, but there is no railing attached on that drawing going into the basement.

Commissioner Maughan stated that they have a motion on the floor to amend the motion the commission passed that was to allow the 2 x 2 slats that are cadged between the 4 x 4 posts of the original design #2 is what is on the floor is to approve that modification of design #2.

Chairman King stated for the record the motion before the commission is to approve design #2 merged with design #1, with a cap and trim on the 2 x 2 pickets with the 4 x 4 wood columns, pending a sketch for the Chairman to review and has the authority to make the final decision.

Motion to Approve Case Number CA-19-11 with the following condition: Design #2 merged with design #1 with a cap and trim on the 2 x 2 pickets with the 4 x 4 wood columns, pending a sketch to be submitted for the Chairman to review and has the authority to make the final decision.
MOTION: Chairman King SECOND: Commissioner Dixon MOTION PASSED WITH A SPLIT VOTE. Those voting yes Chairman King, Commissioner Lyons, and Commissioner Dixon. Those voting no Commissioner Maughan.

Motion to Approve Case Number CA-19-11 with the following additional condition: Sketch to be submitted merging design #2 with design #1 with a cap and trim on the 2 x 2 pickets with the 4 x 4 wood columns showing the front step railing to the house and the opposite side of the stairwell going to the basement for the Chairman to review and make the final decision.

MOTION: Commissioner Dixon SECOND: Chairman King MOTION PASSED WITH A SPLIT VOTE. Those voting yes Chairman King, Commissioner Lyons, and Commissioner Dixon. Those voting no Commissioner Maughan.

IV. Audience Participation. None.

V. Actions Since Last Meeting.

- Discussion Item:
  Chairman King reviewed case number CA-19-13 Tracy Zamzow, 1621 Fillmore Street, Caldwell, ID. Commission Level approval to build a 6ft cedar fence with craftsman architectural features along the street side, side and rear of the property adhering to fencing code, and to the site plan submitted with the application.

VI. Old Business.

- Action Item: Steunenberg Facebook page and C of I Student Internship:

  Chairman King thanked Commissioner Maughan for his work getting this program started and asked to inform them if he needs the commission to be more actively involved with the process.

  Commissioner Maughan reported that he needs to talk to Jerome Mapp, Planning Director and Chelsea Wilson, Mayor’s office on how this will work; they potentially will get a couple of interns when the spring term begins in February. That will give the commission a couple of months to figure out what they can do, what they want to do, when they get it on paper and registered with the experiential learning center on campus. Commissioner Maughan envisions having someone that can help with the Facebook page, Newsletter, outreach, and media. Have an intern that would work with Chuck Randolph to get some supplementary oral histories on the various surveys of homes in the various neighborhoods, having a student to record and transcribe, and build a kind of library framework for access to contents. Chuck Randolph is an enormous resource.

  Commissioner Dixon stated having a page on the website that would be a virtual tour, accompanied by photographs, if some of the information could be captured in 3-4-minute chunks about a certain house, story maps and history on transportation routes through Caldwell and the impact of the freeway. Commissioner Dixon suggested at a January Historic Preservation meeting, the commission could go over and make a draft list of tasks for the internship, but the most urgent is talking with Chuck Randolph.
Chairman King stated that once Commissioner Maughan meets with the City and figure out the rules and requirements for getting a student internship through the college then the commission needs to meet and establish an approach.

April C. stated she would add to the January agenda, as an action item, draft list of jobs/tasks for the intern.

Jerome M. asked the commission to email their ideas to him and he will put them on a list for the meeting.

- **Action Item: News Letter:**
  Chairman King shared that he emailed a picture of the commission to April C. to put on the newsletter, and suggested using a narrative of a home from the walking tour pamphlet as a featured house of the neighborhood. He stated that he would email the commission the address of the home he would like to feature for approval.

- **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 stated that the goals are the internship and educating the community.

### VII. New Business.

- **Discussion Item: Potential Local Historic Districts.**

  Jerome M. shared that he would be meeting with the City of Boise Historic Preservation Officer to discuss insight on local historic neighborhoods, when to bring the community into the process. In addition, there are books of surveys in April C.’s office and the commission needs to decide what the next potential local neighborhood or property is.

  Commissioner Maughan shared the next natural extension is Idaho Street, it has been surveyed and a number of the houses have gone over that 50 year age, marker of historical significance. The Arlington Street survey has a number of David Dorsey clinker brick houses and very little change in the neighborhood. The original Historic District has challenges as it is distressed in a lot of ways but it is the original town site where the original college site was, with the Reverend Boone Church, and the Isaacs House. It is not a district that they have paid a lot of attention to because there are many rentals in the district. The question is, is it time for preservation now that they are seeing north of the railroad tract development in the Chicago and Elgin area, a lot of Caldwell Housing improvement going on in that area and maybe that district could become a part of it.

  Commissioner Dixon asked what is the goal in establishing additional districts, we are not Annapolis, we are not 1600s, 1700s, it’s not that kind of history and the commission needs to determine what district or property deserves this level of protection and not make people feel that they are being overly supervised. She stated that we are on the cusp of a lot of development and the commission would like to be mindful of the historical bones that we do retain and try to support keeping them.

  Chairman King shared that he would like to have any articles or case studies on how Historic Preservation contributes to Community and Economic Development.

- **Discussion Item: Mission Statement.**
Jerome M. shared when he looked at the City of Caldwell’s Comprehensive Plan he did not find anything that gave a sense of purpose of why we do what we do and he wrote and shared a Mission Statement for the Historic Preservation Commission. Jerome M. wrote the following mission statement.

Historic Preservation Commission
Identify, promote, and preserve our historic structures of architectural significance and historic legacy through education, training, and cultural activities and events for the betterment of the citizens of Caldwell.

Commissioner Dixon responded and suggested to move the phrase “for the betterment of the citizens of Caldwell” before the word through because that allows the conjunctions to play themselves out, also thought replacing betterment with benefit.

VIII. Commission & Staff Reports.

- April C. reported that the 2020 Annual Update Report Presentation to City Council is scheduled for Oct 19, 2020.

- Jerome M. reported that he would be having a training class in January and felt it would be good for the commission to attend.

IX. Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by April Cabello,
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