



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 8-28-08 TIME 3:15

SERVED BY Cheryl Ingram

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
August 12, 2008

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Case #H-08-103. Within Historic Districts and outside Historic Districts. An Ordinance amending Section 14-8.10(A) SFCC 1987 to permit city banners commemorating the 400 year anniversary of the founding of La Villa Real de la Santa Fe De San Francisco de Asis.

I. OLD BUSINESS

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Cast #H-08-097. 617 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area. Tim Curry/Design Solutions, agent for Mike Coyle, proposes to construct a 1,680 sq. ft. residence to a height of 15'10" where the maximum allowable height is 16'3" and construct a 5' high coyote fence with a pedestrian gate and vehicle gate flanked by stuccoed pilasters. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-08-099. 300 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area. Architectural Alliance, agent for Chris Benson, proposes to remodel a contributing residence with exterior insulation, restucco, repaint and repair windows, replace two non-historic windows on a primary elevation, replace a garage door in-kind and insulate and restucco exterior, and construct a 490 sq. ft. studio to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 15'8", and construct a 4' height stuccoed yardwall and a 6' high coyote fence. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-08-080. 608 Armijo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Schriber, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building by removing 312 sq. ft. and adding 608 sq. ft. to a height of 12'6" where the maximum allowable height is 13'1", constructing an interior yardwall to a height of 4'6" where the maximum allowable height is 6', cut an opening in an historic street-frontage yardwall and construct retaining walls. Exceptions are requested to add more than 50% footprint (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and to create an opening in a primary elevation on the yardwall (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)). (David Rasch)

4. Case #H-08-098. 619 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area. Tim Curry/Design Solutions, agent for Erin Coyle, proposes to construct a 195 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation of a contributing residence at 6" lower than the adjacent parapet, to increase an existing parapet to screen rooftop equipment at a height lower than the adjacent parapet, and to construct a coyote fence with stuccoed pilasters with wooden pedestrian gates to the maximum allowable height. An exception is request to construct more than the 50% footprint (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-08-094. 532 Alto Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Sylvia Leet, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building by replacing the entry door, installing skylights, and constructing yardwalls, gates, and a planter. An exception is requested to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(i)). (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Chapter 14 Rewrite Discussion

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the September 9, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, September 9, 2008.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
September 9, 2008

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes:	None	2
Approval of Findings and Conclusions	None	2
Communications	None	2
Business from the Floor	Discussion - Sign at Convention Center	2-4
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>Case #H 08-103</u> 400 th Anniversary Banners	Recommended approval with conditions	4-5
Old Business	None	5
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-097</u> 617 Webber Street	Approved with conditions	5-9
2. <u>Case #H 08-099</u> 300 Sena Street	Approved with conditions	9-12
3. <u>Case #H 08-080</u> 608 Armijo Street	Approved with conditions	12-14
4. <u>Case #H 08-098</u> 619 Webber Street	Approved with Conditions	14-17
5. <u>Case #H 08-094</u> 532 Alto Street	Approved with Conditions	17-20
Matters from the Board		
1. Chapter 14 Rewrite Discussion	Discussion	20-25
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:37 p.m.	26

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

September 9, 2008

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Jake Barrow
Mr. Robert Frost
Ms. Deborah Shapiro

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Kelley Brennan, City associate Attorney
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. Greg Smith, Planning Division Staff
Mr. Keith Toler, CVB Director
Ms. Jeanne Price, Planning Division Staff
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Rios moved to approve as amended without approval of minutes. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 12, 2008

Not in the packet.

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

None.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Mr. Keith Toler explained that the Convention Center needed to advertize the events and programs coming to the Center in some way. He didn't like hanging temporary banners off the building and asked for the Board's help. He asked to show the Board what would work best for them.

Mr. Adrian Sanchez said he knew there were many options. We manufacture various types of signs. We manufacture a digital sign with pastel background. It would be recessed into the structure and using historic colors. We would like a definitive answer to what moving signs are. In our industry it was the structure that moves. Digital were not considered moving signs. He zoomed in to show pigment backgrounds. We could get close to the stucco. Only the test with no video or flashing lights and a standard 15 second fade from one to the next.

Mr. Toler explained this would be at Marcy and Grant on both sides of the intersection. They could also disguise the lens by making a wooden shutter to go over it when the sign was not in use.

Mr. Featheringill thought it was a nice looking drawing.

Mr. Sanchez said if they could match the stucco you couldn't see the sign.

Chair Woods said when she was walking down the street she overheard their conversation and it sounded okay until they said it was like having a television there. Her concern was that it was like having a television.

Ms. Walker asked if they could you do letters manually.

Mr. Sanchez replied that multiple events would require having 16-18 lines to give the descriptions and it would have to be 16 feet tall.

Chair Woods thought it was wrong to say they would match the stucco.

Mr. Sanchez said they could match that to a digital color.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the Board could be shown what they looked like in other locations.

Mr. Sanchez said he had nothing comparable to show the Board.

Mr. Featheringill suggested they might come back with a working model.

Ms. Rios asked if they had done anything in Albuquerque.

Mr. Sanchez said they did the Kimo Theater and were now upgrading it, but said they had no restrictions there. He said they could visit his web site at fenixglobaltech.com/sfc.

Ms. Rios asked how big the opening would be.

Mr. Sanchez said it would be 2.5' tall by 4' wide.

Ms. Walker asked if Sweeney often had more than one event at a time.

Mr. Toler explained that they were now competing at a different level with convention centers all over the country. They wanted it on the outside so locals would know what was going on. Sweeney was 10,000 sq ft and they now had 40,000.

Mr. Rasch read the ordinance citation. 14-8.10H that prohibited signs that flash, blink revolve or vary in intensity or motion and electric signs were limited by size.

Chair Woods reminded them that any recess into the stucco would have to be at least three feet from the corners. The idea would be to make it non-obtrusive. She asked how high above the ground it would be.

Mr. Sanchez said they proposed 12' above ground.

Chair Woods thought maybe framed in wood instead of recessed would be better. It was taking a really difficult element and hard to make it look traditional.

Mr. Featheringill felt it was way too wide. He suggested looking at placing it where it could be a sign in

a frame.

Ms. Rios suggested some place where it was less obtrusive.

Mr. Toler pointed out that the proposed location was the main door to the facility.

Chair Woods asked about under the portals. She asked if the Board had given enough feedback.

Ms. Rios said once people knew the location, they would keep going to that location.

Mr. Featheringill thought over the top of the portal might be the place he would look for a sign.

Mr. Toler said that on Grant under portal it was all windows.

Chair Woods asked what could be done to mitigate the digital display. The City went through lots of hoops to get it to look this way.

Ms. Walker asked them to consider a manual sign instead of this. A moving sign was not appropriate.

Mr. Toler asked if she meant something like the Lensic.

Ms. Walker agreed but not that big.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Case #H 08-103.** Within Historic Districts and outside Historic Districts. An Ordinance amending Section 14-8.10(A) SFCC 1987 to permit city banners commemorating the 400 year anniversary of the founding of La Villa Real de la Santa Fe De San Francisco de Asis.

Mr. Rasch clarified that banners were illegal in the historic district. If the Board recommended approval he said they should put some restrictions on it.

Ms. Price said she was assisting in forwarding it through the process and the HDRB was the first one. She clarified that it was an overall change to the sign ordinance. This was an unusual and unique occurrence with the 400th anniversary. The Councilors have seen many other communities that have done banners. This would be just for the 400th anniversary.

Ms. Walker felt the Board needed to see all the parameters: location, duration, size, materials.

Ms. Price hoped the 400th Committee would have that soon. The code amendment wouldn't be adopted until December 10th. It would be a code change for the whole City. It was limited to the 400th anniversary. They wanted to make sure because they didn't want it to apply to everything else.

Chair Woods asked if she was looking for a conditional approval that could come back with all the information. She didn't know how they could make it a blank check.

Ms. Price agreed it could be conditional. She was hoping for a draft resolution soon.

Mr. Rasch urged the Board to make the conditions clear.

Mr. Featheringill asked if making it conditional on the details coming back for approval, would give the approval of the signs themselves.

Chair Woods said they could get into details later.

Ms. Price said they would put in the resolution as much as they could and then the Board could decide what else was needed.

Mr. Rasch noted that some communities were very proud of these anniversaries and some of them have left the banners up for a decade so tourists would see them.

Ms. Walker moved to recommend approval of the ordinance to the governing body with the condition that the following items be submitted first to the HDRB: color, fabric, how attached, duration and locations. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. OLD BUSINESS

None.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 08-097.** 617 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Tim Curry/Design Solutions, agent for Mike Coyle, proposes to construct a 1,680 sq. ft. residence to a height of 15' 10" where the maximum allowable height was 16' 3" and construct a 5' high coyote fence with a pedestrian gate and vehicle gate flanked by stuccoed pilasters. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

617 Webber Street is a 3,722 square foot vacant lot that is located behind contributing and non-contributing buildings. Although the structure will be visible from the public way, it will be without street frontage in the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct a 1,680 square foot residential building with full basement in

the Territorial Revival style. The building will feature brick coping and a metal cap on the parapets, pediments and wood surround on windows and doors, and a portal with square posts and a standing-seam metal shed roof. There will be window wells on the south and north elevations as well as three steps down to grade on all elevations.

The building will be 15' 10" high where the maximum allowable height is 16' 3" as determined by a radial calculation.

Finish details include: cementitious stucco in "Buckskin;" white-painted wooden elements and cladding in "Seashell;" rolled steel roof in "Rust;" and parapet cap in "Red Flash" brick and anodized "Bronze" cap.

Also proposed is the construction of a 5' high coyote fence with a few stuccoed pilasters and wooden pedestrian and vehicle gates along the south lotline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Tim Curry, 574 W. San Francisco Street, who described this parcel as a very small lot and designed an infill project in the Territorial style with large openings on the south side for solar gain. He said he tried to make it compatible and adjusted the set backs after talking with a backyard neighbor. He could have treated Webber Street as front of lot but met with staff and decided the south side of Duvall would be used as the front of the lot and lessen the impact for neighbors.

Ms. Walker asked what the new setback would be.

Mr. Curry said it would be ten feet from the neighbor to the north. The house was a little bit at an angle. 10' 6". The owner met with the neighbor and relayed the concern and they placed a lower ceiling on that part of the property in order to keep the parapets low on that side.

Ms. Rios asked how it related in height to the neighbor to the north.

Mr. Curry didn't know. That portion of the house was not 15' 10" but was down to 12' 4" there.

Mr. Rasch said the building to the north was 17' high.

Ms. Rios asked what portion of the wall on the south elevation where window wells were would be publicly visible.

Mr. Curry said the wall would screen it. The wall in question was 48" and was a retaining wall. You wouldn't see it at all but could see the coyote fence. There was a basement under the house that would not be seen.

Ms. Rios commented there were not many coyote fences around there and asked if he had contemplated a wall instead.

Mr. Curry said he could talk with the owner about it.

Ms. Rios asked how close they were to the parapets.

Mr. Curry said they had a five foot double hung with 2' window above. They were 18" below the bottom of the beams.

Ms. Rios asked how high they were above the grade.

Mr. Rasch said they were 10.25'

Ms. Rios thought the windows looked awfully big and asked what would be visible from Webber.

Mr. Curry explained that it was set back over a hundred feet back from Webber. There was a parking lot on Duvall there.

Ms. Rios said the houses in that area were smaller scale with smaller windows so this would introduce something different.

Mr. Curry said the owner wanted to put solar panels on roof but felt it would interfere with neighbor so the larger windows were for passive solar gain.

Mr. Rasch said the window on north elevation would be 12.5'.

Chair Woods didn't know of any that big. It was in a neighborhood of very small windows.

Mr. Curry thought they could drop the window 18" and have only an 18" transom. It was not visible on the north elevation.

Chair Woods said they were still concerned with scale.

Chair Woods announced to the public the procedure for appealing decisions of the Board.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Curry said they would drop it from 10' to 8.5' in height. They would change the windows from 6' to 5' and use a 1.5' transom instead of 2'.

Chair Woods said the grade was confusing.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the coyote fence sat at natural grade. Mr. Curry agreed.

Chair Woods asked how far in front the coyote fence was.

Mr. Curry said it was 7.5'.

Chair Woods asked about the window well on the north side.

Mr. Curry said it was just a metal grate.

Ms. Rios asked how long the wall was.

Mr. Curry said it ran across the entire south façade and was owned by two family members. It was 175' altogether and on this property was about 85'. There was vegetation on the Webber side. It was interrupted by vegetation closer to Webber.

Ms. Walker asked if the tops would be irregular. Mr. Curry agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if he could talk with his client about lowering it a little bit so staff could approve it.

Chair Woods reminded the Board that he wouldn't get his permit unless the Board approved something tonight.

Mr. Curry said it had to be at least 36" in height. He proposed that they do a masonry wall from Webber to this property and then have coyote on this property. It would distinguish between them too. They would prefer to keep the fence at 5'. He showed where that wall would be located.

Ms. Rios asked if the vehicle gate was for this property. Mr. Curry agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if the vehicle gate was three feet from the house.

Mr. Curry showed it with the pointer and showed where parking would be.

Ms. Walker asked if he could have some fenestration on the gate such as spacing the latillas further apart.

Mr. Curry said the owner was interested in privacy at the gate area. There was a question on the driveway material. The City required parking at that location but they might be parking on the other side.

Chair Woods said they needed to cite the ordinance

Ms. Rios moved for approval of Case #H 08-097 per staff recommendations and conditions:

- 1. That the big windows on the north and the south be reduced in height by 18",**
- 2. That the coyote fence be at 4' high and the vehicular gate have some openness to it/**Ms. Walker

3. That the wall on the property of 619 Webber be continued to meet the Wall and Fence Guidelines and at a height of 4 feet. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 08-099.** 300 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Chris Benson, proposes to remodel a contributing residence with exterior insulation, restucco, repaint and repair windows, replace two non-historic windows on a primary elevation, replace a garage door in-kind and insulate and restucco exterior and construct a 490 sq. ft. studio to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height was 15' 8" and construct a 4' height stuccoed yardwall and a 6' high coyote fence. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

300 Sena Street is an adobe, single-family residence that was constructed in the Mission Revival style between 1930 and 1936. The front porch was infilled, presumably, at a non-historic date. A free-standing garage in the rear was presumably constructed at the same time as the residence. Both buildings are listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The north and east elevations of the residence and the north and west elevations of the garage may be considered as primary.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following ten items.

1. The arched and textured glass windows on the north elevation of the residence will be removed from the non-historic porch infill on the north elevation and replaced with 8-light windows that will match existing historic windows.

2. The pedestrian door on the west elevation will be removed and replaced with a door of the same dimensions.

3. A window well will be constructed at the rear of the west elevation and a larger window will be installed.

4. The residence and garage will be insulated with 2" spray foam insulation and restuccoed with an original sand finish in the original "Adobe" cement stucco color.

5. All historic windows will be repaired, retained, and repainted in "Deep Crimson" color which will not match the teal blue of the existing trim.

6. The board and batten wooden carriage doors on the garage will be removed and replaced with similar doors. The existing doors may be historic and there is little evidence of rot on the bottom edges.

7. A 490 square foot studio will be constructed on the west side of the residence and garage in the

vacant area. The studio will be approximately 14' 3" high where the maximum allowable height is 15' 8" as determined by a linear – street truncation calculation.

The rectangular studio will feature redwood oil-stained carriage doors with an inset pedestrian door on the north, street-facing elevation with windows that are similar to the residence and a large skylight.

8. The wrought-iron pedestrian gate in the yardwall by the residence will be removed and replaced in kind.

9. A 4' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed at the west end of the north lotline to continue the existing stuccoed yardwall.

10. A 6' high coyote fence will be constructed along the south lotline from the garage west to the alley and along the west lotline at the alley. The latillas appear to be cut even on the tops.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the skylight may not be publicly-visible. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch what the staff recommendation was on the garage doors.

Mr. Rasch said he didn't know the date of their construction.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said the applicant requested one change to the fenestration on the front of the studio with the two fixed windows. He thought it needed new colors. He handed out the changes to the studio floor plan (Exhibit A). He wanted to raise the windows.

Chair Woods noted there were two of one side and one different.

Mr. Enfield explained that it was because of the need for adequate ventilation

Present and sworn was the owner, Mr. Christopher Benson who explained that they wanted ventilation of the entire floor and was hoping to get a line of air across the studio. They could all be identical in width. But he would want the same window area.

Chair Woods suggested he could move the narrower window to the middle and open the big window and get better ventilation.

Mr. Enfield agreed to move the small one to the center.

Ms. Rios asked how the exterior insulation would change the reveal.

Mr. Enfield said it would increase the reveal by 1 1/2 ".

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if it that would affect the historic status.

Mr. Rasch said he would like less than 2 1/2" for reveal but it would not change the status.

Mr. Enfield said it was presently an uninsulated house.

Mr. Enfield showed the color chart.

Ms. Walker asked if the garage doors would look the same as the ones that would be removed.

Mr. Enfield agreed and said they would match exactly and would use what they could from the existing doors.

Ms. Walker asked if he could vary the tops on the fence. Mr. Enfield agreed to vary them.

Mr. Rasch noted there was added information in the handout about a yard wall.

Mr. Enfield explained it was to create a small courtyard and a small gate to match the garage door style.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the garage was contributing.

Mr. Rasch said it was and the north and west façades were primary.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the wall could be connected to the side a foot back. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the fence.

Mr. Enfield said it would be six feet on the west and south.

Ms. Walker asked if the studio had same color stucco and trim colors. Mr. Enfield agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods summarized: additional window on the studio, new colors, and new gate matching garage doors, the wall as adjusted, coyote with irregular tops, and that skylight being not visible.

Mr. Enfield said they would have three windows all the same size.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-099 per staff recommendations and conditions:

- 1. That skylights not be visible,**
- 2. That the coyote fence have uneven tops,**

3. That the wall in front be at four feet high and the part that was in front of the contributing garage connect a foot back from the corner,
4. That the new colors were approved,
5. That the three windows be of similar size on the studio,
6. That the garage door be Sage Green and the studio door have a natural stain,
7. That the pedestrian gate match the garage door style.

Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 08-080.** 608 Arnijo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Schriber, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building by removing 312 sq. ft. and adding 608 sq. ft. to a height of 12' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 13' 1", constructing an interior yardwall to a height of 4' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 6', cut an opening in an historic street-frontage yardwall and construct retaining walls. Exceptions were requested to add more than 50% footprint (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and to create an opening in a primary elevation on the yardwall (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(ii)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

608 Arnijo Street is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1920 and 1930 in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. According to the recent owner, an addition on the southwest, rear elevation occurred in the 1960s. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The north, street-facing elevation may be considered as primary.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following three items.

1. The 1960's 312 square foot addition on the southwest corner will be removed and replaced with a 608 square foot addition. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required responses are attached. The addition will be 12' high where the maximum allowable height is 13' 1" as determined by a linear – street truncation calculation.

The addition will feature taller massing than the historic building, an inset pergola, a stuccoed chimney, clerestory windows facing south, and three 15-light French doors facing the street.

2. A section of the historic stone retaining wall will be removed to create parking at the street. New retaining walls and 4' 6" high free-standing yardwalls will be constructed on the north side of the residence. The wall construction materials were not submitted. A pedestrian gate and steps will lead to the front door. An exception is requested to cut an opening in the primary elevation of the historic stone wall where one doesn't exist (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(ii)) and the required responses are attached.

3. Stucco and trim finishes will match the existing finishes of "Kokanee" cement stucco and

turquoise-colored paint.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception requests to construct more than 50% of the historic footprint (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and to create an opening in an historic yardwall where one does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exceptions. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Woods asked if the historic status would be affected if the addition were built.

Mr. Rasch said the southeast location was sensitive and didn't affect the primary elevation. It was slightly taller but probably would not affect the status.

Ms. Rios asked if the clerestory on the south was not visible.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Schriber, 608 Armijo Street. He said there were a few mistakes in the staff report. The addition was 800 square feet after the removal of the 300 feet of the 1960s addition. There was no 4' 6" retaining wall. It would be less than 3'. The doors visible on the north elevation were about 50 feet back from the street. The street was much lower by 8'. So you could not see it while walking.

Ms. Rios asked him to give the total square footage and what would be there.

Mr. Schriber said it was just over 900 square feet and included the 300 square foot 60's addition. They would add 813 square feet to make the total 1,421 square feet.

Ms. Walker asked if there were other dimensions that were incorrect.

Mr. Schriber said part of the addition was 12' and the rest was same height as existing. The taller room was a break between the old and new building.

Ms. Rios asked if he would use cementitious stucco.

Mr. Schriber agreed. The one west wall was an unusual color. He shared a sample of it. He said the original windows were this polished aqua color. They could go back to that. He didn't know the color of stucco.

Mr. Rasch thought it looked like Kokanee.

Mr. Schriber said they would try to match it.

Ms. Rios asked if they would have anything on the roof.

Mr. Schriber said they would have a skylight at the rear.

Chair Woods asked if the clerestory windows were undivided.

Mr. Schriber said they were divided into 30" sections and not publicly visible. He explained that he owned the houses next doors and they had zero lot lines. He also submitted a letter that his neighbors agreed to this request.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-080 per staff recommendations approving the responses to the exception criteria as presented on pages 7 and 8 for exceeding the 50% rule and agreeing that the wall was not historic so no exception was required.

Ms. Rios seconded and added conditions that the stucco be cementitious, the windows be aqua and the stucco match existing color and no visible rooftop equipment be permitted. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H 08-098.** 619 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Tim Curry/Design Solutions, agent for Erin Coyle, proposes to construct a 195 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation of a contributing residence at 6" lower than the adjacent parapet, to increase an existing parapet to screen rooftop equipment at a height lower than the adjacent parapet and to construct a coyote fence with stuccoed pilasters with wooden pedestrian gates to the maximum allowable height. An exception was requested to construct more than the 50% footprint (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

619 Webber Street is a single-family residence that was constructed with Pen-tile in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style between 1912 and 1928. A sunroom addition on the rear, east elevation was constructed at a later date, possibly in the 1970s. A free-standing, two-story, rear residence was constructed at an unknown, presumably non-historic, date. The primary residence is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Historic District and the west and south elevations may be considered as primary. The secondary residence is listed as non-contributing to the district.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following six items.

1. A 195 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear, east elevation of the contributing residence and connected to the non-contributing residence. The addition will cause the secondary residence to be part of the added square footage of the massing and therefore, an exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)92)(d)) and the required responses are not attached but must be provided by the hearing time.

2. The sunroom windows will be removed and replaced with windows that match the existing historic windows and divided-light doors that enter onto a new deck.

3. An historic 5-over-1 window on the non-primary, north elevation will be removed and replaced with a 3-over-1 window in a smaller dimension.

4. A section of the existing yardwall will be removed from the parking area and a 5' high coyote fence with stuccoed pilasters and an antique bi-leaf pedestrian gate will be constructed further back. The date of construction for the wall to be removed is unknown.

5. A coyote fence with stuccoed pilasters will be constructed around the front yard. The maximum allowable height for this fence is 3' 8" but the Board may grant an additional 20% for a height of 4' 5". A small section of the existing low rock retaining wall will be removed for steps that will lead to an antique bi-leaf pedestrian gate that will be installed between stuccoed pilasters.

6. The existing ductwork on the roof of the non-contributing structure will be hidden by constructing a parapet extension. The parapet will be lower than adjacent parapets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception requested to add more than 50% footprint to a contributing structure (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the request. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Ms. Rios clarified that the motion she made for the adjacent property was the side wall, not the front.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Woods asked if the connection would affect the status. Mr. Rasch said it would not.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Tim Curry, who said they didn't take this request lightly on the exception. It could be considered functionally obsolete and the second bath was required. This was the only way they could add on and it was almost totally non-visible. One could argue that the buildings were visually connected now so the physical connection was of no consequence.

Mr. Rasch said they were not aware of the maximum height for the fence but the Board could grant up to 4' 5".

Mr. Curry said on the west elevation, it would be fine to change it to masonry. It was set back about 30' on the southwest area to keep as coyote.

Chair Woods asked if he would be okay with the maximum allowed height.

Mr. Curry said they would appreciate the 4' 5" height.

Ms. Rios asked how high the little stone wall in front was.

Mr. Curry thought it was 20" and added that it was not on this property. The property line was about five feet behind the stone wall.

Ms. Rios commented that this neighborhood had very low walls and they didn't use coyote fencing.

Chair Woods said the Board was trying to work with him and felt he should not change the character by adding coyote.

Mr. Curry said he felt it was a reasonable compromise. He said they had not been aware of the maximum allowable height. He said the owner would put in plants, and said they had pets but not big dogs.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Curry to tell the Board about the gates.

Mr. Curry said they had a problem with the gates. He said they had some antique gates they were going to purchase, but said they would put in gates that would be of the same or nearly same height until then. He said it would be maybe feet tall.

Chair Woods said the calculation would be from grade.

Mr. Curry said he proposed they would set it back. He pointed out the common entrance to the guest house, and said if they pulled back the fence, they could create landscaping.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that the location off the street could be six feet high.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker asked if they were suggesting coyote or masonry for the fencing on either side of the gate going back to the guest unit.

Mr. Curry said they would prefer coyote. He showed an existing wall that was heavily landscaped. He said it would be disruptive to have to put a masonry wall there.

Ms. Walker asked if the coyote fence would have uneven tops.

Mr. Curry agreed it would.

Ms. Rios said they were introducing coyote to the neighborhood. She said the portion they were talking about was small. She said she thought a wall would be better.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case # H 08-098 per staff recommendations, and approving the applicants answers to the exception criteria on page 19-21, with the following conditions:

- 1. That the wall not exceed 3' 8" anywhere,**
- 2. That the design for the gates be brought to staff,**
- 3. That stucco be cementitious,**
- 4. That the windows match the existing ones,**
- 5. That there be no rooftop appurtenances visible to the public, and**
- 6. That the north elevation and side walls could be coyote.**

Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Featheringill said the wall in the back wall was higher. He asked if there was a lower wall in front of it.

Mr. Curry said they would use a higher gate in back.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H 08-094.** 532 Alto Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Sylvia Leet, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building by replacing the entry door, installing skylights, and constructing yardwalls, gates, and a planter. An exception was requested to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(I)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

532 Alto Street is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed before 1912 in a vernacular manner. An addition on the rear created an accessory dwelling at an unknown date. A free-standing shed is located at the rear southeast corner of the lot. The residence is listed as contributing and the shed is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The north and west elevations of the residence may be considered as primary.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following six items.

1. The bi-leaf 6' wide by 6' 8" high entry door on the primary north elevation was removed and the opening dimensions were changed without a permit or Board approval before installing a different single-leaf 4' wide by 6' 4" high entry door. A stop work order was issued. An exception is requested to alter an opening dimension in a primary elevation, Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) and the exception response are attached. A 12' concrete stoop will be installed below the door. Exterior light fixtures will be installed on either side of the door and photographs of the lights are submitted.

2. Two 2' by 2' skylights will be installed.

3. An existing 5' high wooden slat vehicle gate will be removed and replaced with a 6' 6" high by 13' wide arched wooden slat vehicle gate at the rear end of the driveway. A 5' high wooden slat pedestrian gate will be installed adjacent to the vehicle gate and the residence.

4. A stuccoed CMU block yardwall will be constructed behind the residence to define the yard and parking areas. It will be approximately 3-4' high and continue the arched line of vegetation. A bi-fold wooden pedestrian gate will be installed at the walkway.

5. The entry door on the shed will be removed and replaced with another door of the same size.

6. A stuccoed CMU block planter at 2' 6" high will be constructed in front of the rear lotline wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception request to alter a primary elevation opening unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the request. Staff further recommends that the skylights may not be visible from a public way. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dennis Gonzales, of 527 Alto Street, who said the yard wall would start at two feet and go up to four feet, and up to a door like the one he showed to the Board.

Chair Woods said they needed a drawing of the door to approve it.

Mr. Gonzales asked if they could have staff approve it.

Ms. Rios asked if Mr. Gonzales had explained the wall.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He said it separated the parking from the yard.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Gonzales if he knew why Sylvia had changed the door.

Mr. Gonzales said he did not know. He said they had been in the process of doing it, and the inspector had stopped them. He said she had not known she needed a permit.

Ms. Rios asked about the detail on the light fixture.

Mr. Rasch said it was on page 21.

Mr. Gonzales said Sylvia had wanted to change the gate from one with wooden slats to the new design on a handout he gave the Board.

Mr. Featheringill asked if there was a height limit on the wall with a pedestrian gate.

Mr. Rasch said it was six feet for the interior.

Ms. Walker asked about the gate drawing.

Mr. Gonzales said the gate would be wrought iron

Mr. Jerry Richardson, of 703 don Felix, was sworn in. He said he was there to speak in opposition to changing out the door. He said he had lived in the building 29 years, and said he liked that it was historic. He said they had redone the building four years prior. He said it had been an old zaguan, so it had been characteristic of very old neighborhoods. He said it had been upsetting to see the very old fenestration disappear. He said the door was out of character for the neighborhood, and was highly visible where Alto narrowed down to one lane. He said it should be put back the way it was, and said the façade had cohesiveness to it. He said he did not object to the other things in the proposal, but said there were no other arched gateways, which also seemed out of character.

Ms. Rios asked what had happened to the door that was removed.

Mr. Gonzales said it was not historic. He said it had been made out of planks, and said the weather had caused cracks that could be seen through. He said it was non-functional, and non-compliant. He said the building Mr. Richardson had spoken about was three buildings down, but said the building next to it had a pitched roof and was contemporary. He said the old building belonged to Charlotte White. He said he had grown up there, and said they made pottery in it.

Chair Woods asked how the changes would affect the status.

Mr. Rasch said he did recommend denial of the exception.

Chair Woods explained the staff recommendation, and said the recommendation was to put it back the way it had been, with a replacement door that looked like it with the original opening. She said that was one of the most important features of the building.

Ms. Walker said they could not approve something that would downgrade the building.

Chair Woods said they had several things they were asking for, and said the only exception was the changing of the door opening.

Ms. Rios asked if they could talk about the light fixtures. She pointed out that if the carved door was not allowed, the north elevation showed there would be no light fixtures there.

Chair Woods asked if there would be lights on either side of the door.

Mr. Gonzales said there would not be.

Mr. Rasch said if it had been a zaguan, then there would not be a requirement for a light fixture. He said if it went directly into the heated space it would require them.

Mr. Featheringill said the code would require them.

Mr. Rasch said he thought it should be minimal but not contemporary.

Mr. Featheringill asked about the gates and the wall in the back.

Ms. Walker said she liked the one not in color.

Ms. Rios said the back gate was not publicly visible.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case # H 08-094 with the staff recommendations to deny the exception and restore the door and lights, to be reviewed and approved by staff, and with the following conditions:

- 1. That it not be visible from streets,**
- 2. That the gate drawing as submitted by applicant be approved,**
- 3. That the back wall be 3-4' with the gate, and**
- 4. That changes to the drawing would need staff approval.**

Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Ms. Rios asked about the proposed yard wall gate on the side.

Mr. Rasch said it was on the northwest elevation.

Ms. Rios said she thought the drawing had to be done accurately and submitted to staff, and said the lights should be simplistic and small.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods said Mr. Rasch would explain everything the Board had just done.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Chapter 14 Rewrite Discussion

Greg Smith came forward.

Chair Woods asked if they wanted to hear from Ms. Walker or from staff first

Ms. Walker said she thought staff should talk first.

Mr. Rasch said Mr. Smith had done a summary of the issues for that night.

Mr. Smith said they could use another microphone. He said they did not have a prepared presentation. He said Mr. Rasch had collected the history and Mr. Smith himself had worked on the summary that identified the issues from the discussion in 2005. He explained that did not mean that those would be the only issues, but said it meant that they would be the major topics as they were in 2005.

Mr. Smith said staff had been concerned on two points. He said the funding the Council had assigned for the consultant was limited. He said also that staff did not want to go painstakingly line by line through the ordinance, but rather wanted to find a way to effectively get the input from the Board and then proceed with a manageable list.

Chair Woods said that was the general framework. She asked where they should go specifically from there.

Mr. Smith asked if they were comfortable going to the topics as listed by Mr. Rasch.

Ms. Walker said they had discussed the process on the field trip. She said there had been some extremely pressing issues, as Ms. Rios had brought up. She said the Board wondered if the issues were more pressing and the attitudes had changed, whether they should include them urgently in the mix before extra historic districts or Conservation districts. She said she thought each of the Board members could come up with the top issues they had trouble with and set up a team to pull the issues together for their next meeting and start there. She said the minutes reflected something else.

Chair Woods asked if they were in addition to the 7 items.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He said Ms. Walker had been referring to things like Public Works changing the character of their streets. He said those might be some additional concerns of the Board.

Chair Woods asked if anyone was prepared for the pressing issues that night.

Ms. Walker said she had come up with some, and said by the end of the week they could redistribute the list to the other members so they could formulate concrete ideas.

Chair Woods asked if she was referring to board members or staff. She said she wanted to know who would collect them, and said she wanted to know where they were going.

Ms. Walker said she was suggesting that they collect those issues that were pressing at that time, and not in 2005. She said there had been references to murals being approved by the Arts Commission and said she thought they should be approved by the HDRB. She said they needed walls, fences and gates

Mr. Smith agreed.

Ms. Rios agreed as well. She said that, having sat on the board for so long, the issues were ongoing and had to be addressed in the ordinance so they had something to stand on. She said they wanted to make a decision based on the ordinance.

Ms. Walker said in the Clarion draft they had talked about vehicle gates and said they had to be fenestrated. She said they should go further with longer setback.

Chair Woods asked if Ms. Rios and Ms. Walker would bring a list for the next meeting so they could add to the Clarion list.

Ms. Walker agreed. She said she had emailed her response to the 17 items to Mr. Rasch and Kelley.

Mr. Smith said it sounded appropriate to him, and said he thought it would sound appropriate to their consultant. He asked if there was a way to communicate with the members of the Board who were not there. He suggested they could email their summary.

Chair Woods said she really liked the form Mr. Smith had done. She asked if it would make sense to have each of the Board members put their recommendation on it over the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Walker said if they stayed with the format, the first three categories would not apply.

which hadn't been fleshed out. She said they needed to address roads, and sidewalks, and other things that were not structures or open space, like bulb outs. She said they were historic roads. She said Guadalupe was a historic road, as was Federal Place. She said it was a whole new subject or section.

Mr. Rasch said he also wanted clarification. He said he believed the 17 items Ms. Walker was suggesting would also be accepted, but said he thought they needed to start with the Clarion draft of June 10th.

Ms. Walker agreed. They brought up a tree ordinance.

Mr. Rasch said they had corrected several things, and said he thought they had some good ideas.

Mr. Smith said if that was what they wanted, it matched for them.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the summary had been based on Clarion.

Mr. Smith said it was the response of the Board members to the Clarion draft. He said there were about four drafts from February 2004 and discussion of the June 10, 2004 draft.

Chair Woods asked if that was another form of the 17 items.

Chair Woods said the spreadsheet was great. She said it helped her get a better handle on where they were going.

Mr. Rasch and Mr. Smith agreed.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Rasch to get it out to absent members so they could respond by Friday.

Chair Woods said they had started a list. She asked if they wanted to continue that.

Ms. Walker said walls, fences, and gates were on page 32 and 47, roads was on page 65, with a reference on page 72 to scenic roads. She said she would change that to "historic roads." She said she believed Clarion said signs needed to be approved by HDRB. She said murals should be added to the ordinance. She also said the criteria for exceptions needed to be re-done.

Mr. Rasch said that was #17.

Ms. Walker said the use of financial impact was not the issue; it was height. She said height determined density.

Mr. Rasch said style was important, too.

Ms. Walker said #12 needed to be both design and preservation. She also said they needed accurate heights on the map.

Ms. Rios said Ms. Walker addressed many of her own concerns. She said height was the most important one. She said the map was totally inaccurate, and said someone needed to be hired so they could get an accurate map.

Mr. Rasch said once they verified heights, they could get away from adding two feet.

Ms. Walker said they could not average the height if they didn't know what they were. She asked how they would get accurate heights.

Mr. Rasch said they could get a contract with surveyor, but said it would cost a lot.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Smith the chances of that.

Mr. Smith said the Board could discuss if it should be done case by case or if they had to do all of them at that time.

Mr. Rasch asked what it would cost.

Chair Woods said the certified surveyor would have to do it. She said if the Board thought the height was incorrect, they would have to pay for it.

Mr. Rasch said they were systematically clearing all lots on the case by case basis.

Ms. Rios asked if the averaging principle working. She asked if they used the same formula for commercial and residential properties. She asked what was included and what was excluded. She said they should think of all the applications that had come to them with those specific issues. She said roof decks needed to be addressed as well.

Chair Woods said she thought they should also look at how to decide what a contributing building was. She said she thought it should be done by licensed survey. She said she thought they looked too much to just at the age being more than 50 years. She asked what a contributing rule was. She said she disagreed that it was just age. She said when she had helped write the preservation ordinance, the casement single-pane windows were the worst energy waster.

Mr. Rasch said whether there were green elements was very different than height or design, so he thought categories of exception were needed with different criteria for each one.

Ms. Walker said there was a Camino de Monte Sol case that used the word "vernacular," and said she wondered if it was defined in the code.

Ms. Rios said contemporary structures would also be a big discussion. She said they needed to have something to address Trey Jordan-type buildings.

Chair Woods said they had been scolded by a few councilors for citing conditions for things that were not in the ordinance, things like Cementitious stucco, see through vehicular gates, and uneven-topped coyote fence. She said their conditions had to be reflected in the ordinance. She said they also did not want cookie-cutter architecture. She said Santa Fe had evolved and would continue to evolve.

Mr. Rasch said they could do it by districts as well.

Ms. Walker said they did need to reference it. She said she looked at other districts when she did slides. She said South Capitol had some low wire walls, but said the streets on the east side were also very open. She said a vast preponderance of homes were not walled off. She said they did not want a gated community.

Mr. Smith said they had discussed that guidelines might be adopted by resolution that didn't have the full force of an ordinance. He asked if there was a cut off on standards that applied in most cases but without such specific standards that it had to be 125 pages long. He said, in the ordinance, they had to have findings for exceptions. He said specific standards gave defense.

Ms. Walker asked where it would be placed.

Mr. Smith said it would be guidelines.

Ms. Walker asked about appeals.

Mr. Smith said it would be a normal appeal process.

Ms. Walker said the Council could say it was just a guideline.

Chair Woods said in court would be the place where it would be a problem.

Mr. Smith pointed out that only one or two HDRB decisions have gone to court. He said his sense was that the Council sometimes used the lack of a specific standard as a justification for a decision they wanted to make for whatever reason.

Ms. Brennan agreed. She said sometimes there might not be an appreciation by Council for the subjectivity. She said what they wanted was the framework. She said they had the authority.

Ms. Rios said the Board did have a lot of power. She said they were citizens judging another citizen's proposal, and said even judges had to do that. She said she thought they had plenty to stand on.

Chair Woods said they needed definitions of styles. She said she didn't think they had to be one style.

Mr. Smith said style was one item on the list that needed more attention. He said Clarion had taken out Santa Fe Style and new Santa Fe Style. He said the majority of the Board in 2005 had thought it was a mistake to take them out. He said the Clarion consultants tried to be more specific on the mandatory elements of those styles.

Ms. Walker said she had run into Mayor Coss who had said it was too bad no one was there to explain streetscape to the Council. She said she had said it would be nice if they had to go by and visit the site before hearing the appeal.

Ms. Brennan said they could also see a video, and said maybe that was worth doing to address that issue. She said she would like to see a somewhat explicit list of things that staff could approve administratively.

Chair Woods gave the time. She said there was a lot of complaining about the ordinance, and said this was their opportunity to come and address them.

Ms. Walker said Mr. Rasch and Ms. Brennan had an obligation to address them, too by Friday.

Chair Woods said she would be out of town for the next Board meeting

L. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Walker moved to adjourn. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:37pm.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer