



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 2-7-08 TIME 9:00

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

**\*AMENDED\***

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2008 – 12:00 NOON**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL**

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2008 – 5:30 PM**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES and FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS
  - MINUTES: November 27, 2007
  - December 19, 2007
  - January 8, 2008

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS: Case #H-07-123. 515 + 519 Cerrillos Road.

- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
- I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-06-103. 718 Gregory Lane. Don Gaspar Area. Monica Montoya, agent for Hart Family Construction Corp., proposes construct an approximately 2,172 sq. ft. single family residence with an approximately 319 sq. ft. attached garage to a height of 13'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15'11", construct yardwalls to a height of 5'6" where the maximum allowable height is 6', and construct a yardwall to the height of 4' where the maximum allowed height is 4'4". (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-06-104. 714 Gregory Lane. Don Gaspar Area. Monica Montoya, agent for Hart Family Construction Corp., proposes construct an approximately 2,319 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 13'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15'11", construct yardwalls to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height is 6', and construct a fence to a height of 4' where the maximum allowable height is 4'4". (Marissa Barrett)
3. Case #H-08-008. 610&612 Miller and 431 Camino de las Animas. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Balsler, proposes to remodel three-non-contributing properties, consisting of 10,348 sq. ft. in three residences and one studio with 2,953 sq. ft. of additions and alteration of yardwalls which will match existing heights. A 1,689 sq. ft. garage-portal will be constructed to a height of 12'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'6". (David Rasch)

## **J. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Case #H-08-005. 554 San Antonio St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter Page, agent for Darrell Dawson, proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors and increases the parapet to a height of 14'7" where the maximum allowable height is 14'11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-08-006. 556 San Antonio St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter Page, agent for Darrell Dawson, proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors and increase the parapet to a height of 14'7" where the maximum allowable height is 14'11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
3. Case #H-08-012. 110 E. Buena Vista. Don Gaspar Area. Gregory Waits, agent for Marion Wasserman, proposes to remodel 523 sq. ft. non-status garage that was converted to a residence with an 88 sq. ft. addition to the rear and a clerestory height increase on the rear to the maximum allowable height of 16'2". (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-08-015. 818 Camino Atalaya. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Rachel Kelly, proposes to construct an approximately 1550 sq. ft. addition to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16'11" to a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-08-016. 808 Galisteo St. Don Gaspar Area. Jeff Seres, agent for Bill and Iris Barkman, proposes to replace a non-historic swinging iron vehicle gate with a 4' high back iron sliding vehicle gate at 49' back from the street on a significant property. (David Rasch)
6. Case #H-08-017. 124 Park Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. George and Felicia Rivera, owners/agents, proposes to remodel a contributing 220 sq. ft. garage by restoring an infilled vehicle door and creating a 7'6" high by 10' wide opening on a non-primary elevation. (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-018. 1030 Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Sarah Nolan and Mary Perry-Miller, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by adding a 106 sq. ft. addition, increasing height on a room to match existing adjacent height, reconstructing the front portal to include a lift, replace a balcony, extend a balcony, construct a 374 sq. ft. ramada and a stone retaining wall. (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-011. 603 1/2A Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Sisneros Jr., owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building with alterations to a non-historic entry room, install storm windows, replace the roof, replace screen doors with iron security doors, restucco, and construct a 6' high coyote fence and gate and a retaining wall on the rear. (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-08-013. 111 N. St. Francis. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. David Naylor, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by applying a stone veneer to 20% of the exterior of the building. (Marissa Barrett)
10. Case #08-014. 612 Gomez #5. Don Gaspar Area. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Christine Wiltshire, proposes to construct an approximately 49 sq. ft. storage shed and approximately 100 sq. ft. portal to a non-contributing building to a height of 9' where the existing height is 11' and to construct a yardwall to a height of 8' where the maximum allowable height is 6'. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height, section 14-5.2 (D,9,C). (Marissa Barrett)

## **K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

## **M. 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 February 12, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, February 12, 2008.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**CITY OF SANTA FE**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Santa Fe, New Mexico  
February 12, 2008

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published .....	2
Approval of Minutes:		
November 27 2007	Approved as submitted .....	2
December 19, 2007	Approved as amended .....	2
January 8, 2008	Approved as amended .....	2-3
Approval of Findings and Conclusions		
<b>Case #H 07-123</b>	Approved as amended .....	3
Communications	Discussion .....	3
Business from the Floor	None .....	4
Administrative Matters		
1. NPS Building Nomination to National Historic Site	Recommended to Governing Body .....	4
Old Business		
1. <b>Case #H 06-103</b> 718 Gregory Lane	Approved with conditions .....	4-6
2. <b>Case #H 06-104</b> 714 Gregory Lane	Approved with conditions .....	6-8
3. <b>Case #H 08-008</b> 610/612 Miller & 421 Cam Animas	Approved with conditions .....	8-16
New Business		
1. <b>Case #H 08-005</b> 554 San Antonio St.	Approved with conditions .....	16-18
2. <b>Case #H 08-006</b> 556 San Antonio St.	Approved with conditions .....	18-19

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
3. <b><u>Case #H 08-012</u></b> 110 E. Buena Vista	Approved with Conditions . . . . .	19-22
4. <b><u>Case #H 08-015</u></b> 818 Camino Atalaya	Approved as recommended . . . . .	22-23
5. <b><u>Case #H 08-016</u></b> 808 Galisteo Street	Approved as recommended . . . . .	23-25
6. <b><u>Case #H 08-017</u></b> 124 Park Avenue	Approved as recommended . . . . .	25-26
7. <b><u>Case #H 08-018</u></b> 1030 Camino San Acacio	Approved as recommended . . . . .	26-28
8. <b><u>Case #H 08-011</u></b> 603½ A Paseo de Peralta	Approved with conditions . . . . .	28-30
9. <b><u>Case #H 08-013</u></b> 111 N. St. Francis	Approved as recommended . . . . .	30-31
10. <b><u>Case #H 08-014</u></b> 612 Gomez #5	Approved with conditions . . . . . Exception granted	31-34
Matters from the Board	None . . . . .	34
Adjournment	. . . . .	34
Exhibits: A-D		

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FE**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**FEBRUARY 12, 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. Deborah Shapiro  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mr. Jake Barrow [excused]  
Mr. Robert Frost [excused]

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Historic Planner  
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
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. Shapiro moved to approve the agenda as published. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**

#### **MINUTES:**

**November 27, 2007**

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of November 27, 2007 as submitted. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**December 19, 2007**

Ms. Rios requested the following change to the minutes:

On page 18, 10<sup>th</sup> paragraph should read, "Ms. Rios reminded the Board that whatever they acted on would be binding."

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of December 19, 2007 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**January 8, 2008**

Ms. Shapiro requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 52, second paragraph from the bottom should read, "Maybe you could plant some Chamisa or irises along the edge of the wall to soften it."

Ms. Rios requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 44, last paragraph and following paragraph: It appears that second paragraph was repetitious of previous paragraph and should be deleted.

On page 63, sixth paragraph should read, "Richard, I have a question with reference to the gate that really looks like a garage."

Chair Woods requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 24, third line: delete the last part of the sentence.

On page 25, seventh paragraph, "Major" should be "Mayor."

On page 30, sixth paragraph, should say, "... didn't need as many parking spaces."

On page 31, second paragraph, last line should be part of the third paragraph to read, "Yes it can happen in a very contemporary way..."

On page 32, last time she spoke. "At" should be "On."

Mr. Rasch requested that the caption on page 10 read "WIVCO."

**Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of January 8, 2008 as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS: Case #H-07-123. 515 + 519 Cerrillos Road.**

Ms. Rios mentioned that the version that was in the packets and the version handed out here at the meeting were different.

**Ms. Rios moved to accept the findings of fact and conclusions of law for Case #H-07-123 as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Mr. Featheringill who abstained.**

The Findings of Fact are attached to these minutes as Exhibit A.

**E. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch said he included a current list of members as well as a schedule for hearings [attached as Exhibit B and C]. He noted that the next meeting was schedule for March 11.

Chair Woods reminded the Board that they would have to do the findings of fact in all motions. She said it would help to make the motions simpler if the conditions already in the staff report were not stated again.

Mr. Rasch added that when there was an exception, they had to go through and say how the applicant met each one of them.

Ms. Rios asked if they had to in a simple case.

Chair Woods said it would apply to every case, starting at the March meeting.

## **F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None.

## **G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

**A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE UNITED STATES PARK SERVICE'S "OLD SANTA FE TRAIL BUILDING" AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE. (Councilor Heldmeyer)**

Mr. Rasch presented the resolution. He said the resolution cited the WPA work and art work on the building itself as additional items of interest for preserving this structure. "We should request that it be a national historic site.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this matter.

**Ms. Walker moved to recommend the resolution to the Governing Body. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **I. OLD BUSINESS**

- 1. Case #H-06-103. 718 Gregory Lane. Don Gaspar Area. Monica Montoya, agent for Hart Family Construction Corp., proposes construct an approximately 2,172 sq. ft. single family residence with an approximately 319 sq. ft. attached garage to a height of 13'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15'11", construct yardwalls to a height of 5'6" where the maximum allowable height is 6', and construct a yardwall to the height of 4' where the maximum allowed height is 4'4". (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The approximately 4,816 square foot vacant lot located at 718 Gregory Lane (lot 8) is proposed for construction of an approximately 2,172 square foot single-family residence with an attached approximately 319 square foot garage. The Spanish Pueblo Revival style building, which contains Mission style shingles and an arched entry on the south elevation portal will be to a height of 13' 4" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 11".

"The building will have single hung wood windows with at least a 6" reveal and rounded edges. Window finish will be blue and the building will be stuccoed with cementitious stucco in the color 'La Luz'. The area under the portal will be stuccoed in a



similar texture in Colonial White. All wood doors and accents including the protruding square beams over the garage and the garage door will be stained for a natural finish. Canales will be wood with a tin lining.

"Two skylights are proposed.

"Also proposed for this project is a CMU stuccoed yard wall on the west elevation to a height of 5' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 6'. A 5' high yard wall is proposed on the north elevation and a portion (other portion is to a height of 4') on the south elevation where the maximum allowable height is 6'. Lastly, a CMU stuccoed wall and a wood pedestrian gate is proposed on the east elevation to a height of 4' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 4". All walls will be stuccoed to match the new residence and the wood gate will be rustic in appearance. Wall openings with vertical latillas will be used to accent the stuccoed wall.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that no skylights or rooftop appurtenances are publicly visible and that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Monica Montoya, 726 Gregory Lane. She introduced project architect, Rudy Fajardo and set up a display for the Board. She pointed out pictures showing architectural features in the immediate neighborhood and said they had implemented a lot of what the Board requested. She showed a sample of the material (tile) they would use on the building and briefly described it for the Board.

She said they would use cementitious El Rey La Luz, as shown on the display and under portals Colonial White stucco. She said they were using a 12' inch thick by 4' high stucco wall and the windows of the building would be inset back further on the front wall. She added that they were using a winding walk way to entrance. Windows would be 2x2 divided lights with rounded edges on parapets.

She showed the drawn elevations on the building and said they might be able to eliminate the garage but use it as a studio. She stood for questions.

Ms. Shapiro referred to page 12 of the elevations, and wondered about the different fenestrations on the windows on the south elevation.

Present and sworn was Mr. Rudy Fajardo.

Ms. Shapiro asked about the windows and the panes of glass, some of which were solid and others had smaller divisions.

Mr. Fajardo said the window on the south elevation would not be a single pane. It was an obscure window there but could have divided lights right over the tub and not be visible from the street.

Ms. Shapiro noted that some divisions were horizontal and some were vertical.

Mr. Fajardo said they only wanted two divisions on each window.

Chair Woods suggested they could take out a divider from narrow windows.

Ms. Rios asked about depth of windows.

Mr. Fajardo said the front would have 8" walls and at least 6" recess there.

Mr. Featheringill noted on page 7 the clay tile roof was rustic looking but there were no samples shown here.

Mr. Fajardo said if the Board wished they could use the clay and explained that they just liked the color contrast.

Mr. Featheringill pointed out another single pane window on the west elevation and with a four-inch jamb, they would have less than six inches.

Mr. Fajardo said they were using Pella and would say not less than 4 inches recess.

Chair Woods asked if they would be willing to put in the muntins for those windows and the owners could use shades if needed.

Mr. Fajardo agreed. He said the window on the west would not be visible but they could easily follow that recommendation.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods reviewed the discussion: two obscure windows have muntin pattern and no vertical patterns.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 06-103 as recommended by staff with conditions that obscure windows be clear and all have vertical division patterns, not horizontal. Ms. Shapiro seconded and adding they approved the cementitious pattern as submitted. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 2. Case #H-06-104. 714 Gregory Lane. Don Gaspar Area. Monica Montoya, agent for Hart Family Construction Corp., proposes construct an approximately 2,319**

sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 13'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15'11", construct yardwalls to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height is 6', and construct a fence to a height of 4' where the maximum allowable height is 4'4". (Marissa Barrett)

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The approximately 4,785 square foot vacant lot located at 714 Gregory Lane (lot 9) is proposed for construction of an approximately 2,319 square foot single-family residence. The Territorial Revival style building, which includes rustic brick coping at the parapet, will be to a height of 13' 4" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 11".

"The building will have single hung, divided light wood windows with wood surrounds. All window finishes will be white and the building will be stuccoed with an El Rey Acrylic stucco in the color Beach and will be finished in a fine to medium texture. All doors will be wood and will be stained with a natural finish. The wood beams and posts at the portal will be painted white. The north elevation also includes an outdoor fireplace and a 1' 6" overhang above the doors. The overhang material was not submitted.

"Five skylights are proposed.

"Also proposed for this project is a 5' high yard wall on the south elevation where the maximum allowable height is 6'. A wrought iron fence with an 8" stuccoed base and 4' high stuccoed pilasters with brick coping is proposed for the east elevation. The fence will include a wrought iron pedestrian gate and is under the maximum allowable height of 4' 4". All walls will be stuccoed to match the new residence.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that no skylights or rooftop appurtenances are publicly visible, that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff, and that the overhang material is clarified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards."

Present and previously sworn was Ms. Monica Montoya.

Ms. Barrett said she spoke with the applicant and determined that the roof would be a standing seam roof.

Ms. Montoya showed pictures in the immediate area and said information on all the details was in the packet. She said they did eliminate the garage at the recommendation

of HDRB last time.

She said the stucco color was "Beach" and was acrylic. They chose the color to match this brick and she showed the tumbled brick and held it up to the stucco color.

Ms. Walker asked what other colors were contemplated.

Ms. Montoya showed the other samples and Ms. Walker thought the second one (Paloma) was better.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved for approval of Case #H 06-104 per staff recommendations and the change of stucco color to Paloma. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case #H-08-008.** 610&612 Miller and 431 Camino de las Animas. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Balsler, proposes to remodel three-non-contributing properties, consisting of 10,348 sq. ft. in three residences and one studio with 2,953 sq. ft. of additions and alteration of yardwalls which will match existing heights. A 1,689 sq. ft. garage-portal will be constructed to a height of 12'6" where the maximum allowable height was 15'6". (David Rasch)

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

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"431 Camino de las Animas is a single-family residence that was constructed in the 1930s in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. A free-standing studio was constructed at a recent non-historic date. 610 and 610½ Miller Street is a two-family residence that was constructed after 1945 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. Significant remodeling was done to both primary residences. Recently a lot adjustment readjusted the two properties to create three properties, identified as Lot 1, 2, and 3 in this proposal. All buildings, consisting of 10,348 square feet, on both properties are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The Historic Design Review Board postponed action on this application on January 8, 2008, pending redesign of four items:

- "1. Redesign that considers the Miller Street infill on Lot 2 to be less of an impact on the streetscape;
- "2. The Animas vehicle gate to be reduced in prominence and located further back on the driveway;
- "3. The pilasters should be deleted on the interior lot coyote fence;

"4. The rock design on the interior garage should be removed from any public view.  
"So those were the four conditions of postponement at the last hearing.

"Now the applicant proposes to remodel the properties with the following changes as shown on the site plan on page 17 of the packet.

"The four items above were addressed by the applicant as follows:

- "1. There does not appear to be any redesign of this item. However the nearby exercise room was slightly increased in footprint on the interior west elevation.
- "2. The Animas gate was not reduced in size nor moved further back, but the applicant additionally proposes low stuccoed spur walls flanking the driveway out to the street and the remainder of the driveway beyond the gate to the interior gate will be brick surfaced like the front area.
- "3. The pilasters on the interior coyote fence were not deleted.
- "4. The rock design on the interior garage was made to look more substantial rather than an application by increasing the width of the return on the west and south elevations. Additionally, the Spanish tile shed roof was removed from the east elevation (visibility of rock work was shown on sheet A 2.0, page 18 of the packet).

"There appear to be no other alterations, but discussion should confirm this.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Mr. Rasch showed several photos of the properties and explained them to the Board. He reminded them of the other alterations from the previous hearing which he did not include in this report.

Chair Woods asked how tall the vehicular gate was.

Mr. Rasch said he would measure it. He explained that if the Board considered it as a structure, the maximum height would be 17' 2". And if considered a wall the maximum yard wall height would be 67". Mr. Rasch said his opinion was that there was no mass behind it so it probably was a wall. He added that this case had not been posted as an exception request.

Chair Woods said she would leave it to the Board but she saw it as a yard wall. If it

was, they couldn't vote on it tonight.

Present and sworn was Mr. Joseph Karnes, 200 West Marcy Street, and attorney with Karl Sommer and Associates. He said Mr. Sommer was looking up the matter of the exception that just arose and Mr. Martínez would go through the changes that were made since the last meeting.

He said he was present on behalf of Richard Martínez, Reinhold and Barbara Balsler to ask that the Board render a decision tonight. He said they hired him to help them get through the application process which, unfortunately, had become somewhat delayed. He said Mr. Martínez' firm has demonstrated great sensitivity on many projects over the years to the historic ordinance and to the contexts of historic districts, including Downtown and Eastside in which this project was located.

Chair Woods interrupted him to say that all on the Board appreciated Mr. Martínez and respected his work. She asked him to get to the points he needed to make on the project.

Mr. Karnes said that Section 14-5.A 4. Placed the full responsibility for the design on the applicant. He read it for the Board and said the Board was charged with making the decision that the project met the requirements of ordinance and staff had concluded that this application met all the applicable zoning requirements and all standards set forth in the historic ordinance and had recommended approval.

He said that in light of that recommendation, he asked that the Board approve the application and, if the Board decided it did not meet all the standards, that it either approve the application with conditions as set forth in code or deny it.

He said he understood the application was tabled in January with directions to carry out specific modifications and Mr. Rasch reviewed those. He added that Mr. And Mrs. Balsler that Mr. Martínez make certain changes in the design and he would go through those. He said the design before the Board now showed the extent to which Balsers were willing to alter the design and he requested that the Board approve it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 460 Cerrillos Road, Santa Fe who first responded to the questions about the gate. He said the Code allowed them to go over the gates with yardwalls and it didn't count in the height requirements. He pointed out that the Balsers' residence already had a gate at the streetline and the mass went over the gate. He said he had done many others and they have gone higher and were approved. He noted one on Alameda about 18 months ago. He said no exception was required for it.

He explained that he thought it would help the Board to see all three at once and began reviewing his drawings in the packet.

He referred first to sheet A5.0 where there were zero setbacks which were allowed for this specific zone. He said it was done here because it allowed for traditional planning as was done historically. He clarified that the oldest houses on this street sat on the street and the newer ones were set back.

He explained that the guest house on Lot 2 had an opening and an entrance from the courtyard. This house would be for the Balsers so they were not going to enter from the other side of the property.

He pointed out that the house on lot 2 was now the guesthouse for the house on the other side. (On the corner of Camino de las Animas) and there were no openings in between them. He showed where they would close the courtyard and have a new entry that looked over to the Balsers' house.

He said the gate was not intended to look like a garage.

Chair Woods asked him to speak more slowly and discuss first the street and point to what he was trying to do.

Mr. Martínez pointed to the gate that went all the way to the back of the property and had a mass around it. He showed the side view. It was beside Camino de las Animas and behind it was a carport. It was 9½' high and all construction was adobe on this street. It has vertical boards and tied in to Miller Street. (Sheet A 3.0). He showed an existing gate there since 1992 with vertical boards and said the new gate was to mimic that design.

He pointed to the stone work and said at the last meeting the Board assumed it was applied to the building but said it was "in" the building, flush with the wall. And it was 8" thick.

He pointed out the existing vehicular gate next to the carport.

On Miller Street, he said the courtyard would be filled in and built up to 9.5 feet and had an existing pedestrian gate. He showed where the wall in the middle would be taken down and the addition would go behind a garden wall.

There was a portal in the middle of the garden (on the site plan). He described the portal which was not intended to be visible from either street. He also showed where the stone work was on the site plan.

Ms. Walker said from a distance, on the south elevation, it showed two cars and to the west, there seemed to be something else.

Mr. Martínez said it was a gate that tied in with the existing carport/studio. Small walls would go out to meet the street. He showed how the wall would be set back for

visibility.

Ms. Walker asked what the function at the corner was.

Mr. Martínez said it was the driveway for the owners on Lot 3. It had brick paving and was only a pass through to their garage. He added that there was also a new fence all the way along that west side.

Ms. Walker asked how he decided to have a 9' high gate.

Mr. Martínez said he tried to keep it relatively low at 7.5 feet with a mass over the top. The vertical board would swing open.

Ms. Rios asked if he had considered a more simplistic design, noting that the other gates on that street were mostly wrought iron and lower in height.

Mr. Martínez explained that the owners were concerned about security, having had break ins at their home and they were happier with this design.

Ms. Rios asked him to explain what he was infilling and the square footage there on Miller street.

Mr. Martínez pointed out where the courtyard would be closed up and where a new space would be opened up (for parking there). To the right he showed a garden area on Miller Street.

Mr. Karl Sommer was sworn and briefly conferred with Mr. Martínez.

Ms. Rios asked about the trees that apparently were removed since the last hearing.

Mr. Martínez said when he told the owners what the Board had said about the trees, they had them taken out right away.

Mr. Rasch clarified that, outside of the historic compound ordinance, trees were not structures. So the Board did not have jurisdiction but could use landscaping as characteristic of streetscape.

Mr. Martínez said they instructed their gardeners to take them out.

Chair Woods asked if there was also a vehicular gate at the carport.

Mr. Martínez agreed and described it as a low gate now on the street and was to be moved back 20' and open onto the driveway.

He showed where the wall on the street was being taken down on Animas and said



the new walls out to the street would be low walls. He added that there was a driveway on the other side of the low wall on the west property line.

Chair Woods concluded that there were two vehicular gates on this little street with one at 7½ feet.

Mr. Martínez agreed and clarified that they were both gates were set back 20 feet.

Chair Woods said she disagreed with Mr. Martínez' attorney that the Board had no right to alter designs and she did not believe that a gate at 7½' with a plastered part above it was harmonious with the streetscape. She said the ordinance said that walls and fences shall not exceed the average of other walls and fences in the streetscape. She thought this looked like the entrance to the Ponderosa and not harmonious and felt they should all work together on it.

She also thought the 8" of rock wall looked like it had been increased.

Mr. Martínez said he had not increased it. He shared a photograph of it [attached as Exhibit D].

Mr. Sommer said the ordinance said "staff shall determine whether or not an exception is required." He noted they had not said so yet. He felt staff's initial decision would govern it.

Chair Woods was not sure that staff's initial determination was what governed.

Mr. Sommer quoted Section 14-5.2 C 5

Chair Woods asked if that would mean if the Board disagreed with staff, they had no right to question that determination.

Mr. Sommer wasn't sure he was going that far. But it was why they were here without an exception request. To answer the second part, he thought the gate qualified as a structure. He said the question was whether it was a wall or a fence and was the gate part of a wall or fence or was it a separate structure. He said it was unfortunate that although the code defined walls and fences as structures it said nothing about gates or what might go over a gate. So the Board had a right to make an interpretation as to whether it was part of a wall of fence.

He said because the Code was not clear about what a gate was it was up to the Board to decide how it would be applied. If there had been a long term application in one way, that interpretation would govern and that application governed it. He said he didn't know the answer.

Chair Woods said what had been applied and been consistent, was to ask if vehicular gates were consistent in the streetscape and also that they be fairly invisible. She concluded that they had two points: if it was consistent with streetscape and secondly if it was part of a structure. She noted that there were very few gates there and they were made of iron (see through).

Mr. Sommer pointed out that the exception issue was not a style issue (and that was the Board's purview) but a height issue. He felt the important point was whether a gate was different than a fence and if a gate had to comply with the height ordinance and the next was the point (a separate question) about whether it fit with the streetscape and the styles ordinance.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch to shed light on this. She felt that gates had to have something on either side and could not sit there by themselves.

Mr. Rasch said this Board has consistently required gates to have an open character and had not been approving solid gates recently. The Board preferred the ability to see into the property and this was a very closed gate design. He added that this was the only gate proposal they have had that was not associated with a wall or fence unless the Board considered those spur walls coming out as an associated wall. He said this Board had typically used the allowable height for walls and fences as the wall or fence height and then allowed accent features like an archway over a pedestrian gate, not subject to the maximum allowable height and not requiring an exception but those were with associated walls or fences, not a free-standing gate as this one was.

Mr. Sommer asked if the gates had been subject to the wall and fence height requirements.

Mr. Rasch said the vehicle gates usually had matched the height of the wall and pedestrian gates have had the arches and didn't have to follow the height ordinance because they were seen as an accent feature.

Mr. Sommer clarified that if the gate was a feature that didn't have to comply with the height ordinance, then they were talking about the structure above it and whether it had to comply, as a legal matter.

Chair Woods said she was not in agreement with his conclusions. She felt they were dealing with extremes here with a gate that was almost 8' high. She felt this was not an accent feature that was about two feet above the wall. She thought he was taking a generality that was very subtle and applying it to a very large structure here. She said she would like that noted in the record that she disagreed with the interpretation.

Mr. Sommer said he understood, but noted that Mr. Rasch had said gates have not generally had to comply with wall and fence guidelines.

Mr. Featheringill said they were typically equal to the wall associated with it but there was not a fence associated with this one and it was much higher than the six feet of the wall.

Mr. Sommer said he understood and was just trying to bring clarity, not to be contentious. He surmised that vehicular gates were to comply with height ordinance and pedestrian gates did not.

Chair Woods asked if there was a wall there.

Mr. Martínez said there was a wall there at the same height as the gate. It was 9½ feet high and the carport was up against the wall there. It was not to look like a vehicular gate. It was as high as the studio.

Chair Woods asked if he could move it back farther so it would not be a vehicular gate right next to a vehicular gate which imposed on the streetscape.

Mr. Rasch noted that was what the Board asked last time.

Mr. Martínez felt if they moved it back, it would become more of a driveway but the six foot fence on the west would go all the way out to the front of the portal. The neighbor wanted that.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the other gate.

Mr. Martínez said it was about 3½ feet.

Ms. Rios said if the gate were lower and simplistic, it would fit with the streetscape.

Mr. Sommer said it was clear what the Board's preference was and that gate would not get approved by the Board. If the Board was inclined to approve the rest, then perhaps the Board could make a conditional approval and that was preferable and his clients would either say yes or no to that.

He agreed that they would have to resubmit drawings to meet that condition.

Ms. Walker said if they wanted it to be a gate they should make it look like a gate.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Martínez for the square footage added right on the street.

Mr. Martínez said it was about 522 square feet; 480 sq ft. without the little corner.

Mr. Featheringill pointed out that they actually had less wall in the new design than now was there.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-008 per staff recommendations and with the following condition:**

- 1. That the gate/wall on Camino de las Animas be redrawn to lower height with a see-through design preferably to be further back than the existing gate.**

**Ms. Walker seconded the motion.**

Mr. Featheringill asked what the allowable gate height would be.

Mr. Rasch said the calculation was 67".

**The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **J. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. Case #H-08-005. 554 San Antonio St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter Page, agent for Darrell Dawson, proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors and increases the parapet to a height of 14'7" where the maximum allowable height is 14'11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single-family residence located at 554 San Antonio Street was built within the last 5 years and is not listed on the Official Map. The building is located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors at a 45° angle. In order to hide the solar collectors from public view the application also proposes increasing the parapet on the north and east elevations. The parapet will be to a height of 14' 7" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 11" and the existing height is approximately 12' 6". The parapet screen will be stuccoed to match the existing building.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the collectors are painted an earth tone color where possible. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Ms. Rios asked if the recommendation that the collectors should be earth tone if she meant the same color as the house.

Ms. Barrett agreed and clarified that she meant the metal portions. The applicant had said part of it was dark purplish.

Present and sworn was Mr. Peter Page, 190 Sanchez, Corrales New Mexico.

He said his company was participating and he could answer technical questions. Regarding the color, he said the tempered glass was non reflective and the coating underneath was very dark purple and the frame was dark brown. He showed the mounting bracket that would be used.

He said all that would be visible would be a little bit of the back of the screen on a third reflector and a little bit of the first reflector closest to the road. He explained that they did a mock up, showing the total span and the owner wanted to screen them completely with parapet build up.

Chair Woods asked if the angle could be decreased slightly for less visibility.

Mr. Page said it could but the original angle was 75 degrees and most of this was for winter heating. If they went lower than 45 degrees, it would impede the performance. Flat would reduce it 80-90 percent. Right now they wanted water and space heating to all be covered seasonally so they would like to not lower them.

Chair Woods asked what part was raising of parapet and what part was screening.

Mr. Page showed the screening close to the collectors and said it would be wood and stuccoed. They wanted it to last forever too. He said he would do whatever it took to mask them. There was a lot of foliage around the structure and that made it difficult to see the collectors on the first building.

Chair Woods pointed out that when going south to north on San Antonio, there was no screening and they were very noticeable. She said the screening had to be along the side but was needed more in front so it was not shading them or to raise the parapet along San Antonio.

Mr. Rasch quoted the rule.

Mr. Page said he would screen wherever needed.

Mr. Featheringill suggested they raise the parapet two feet and it wouldn't be visible and would not require the screen.

Mr. Page showed some photos to the Board of other installations. He explained that there would be four panels total.

Mr. Featheringill asked if he could do two sets of two.

Mr. Page said he could and asked if they would rather have parapets raised.

Chair Woods said they would although it was more expensive that way. She said it would just be the east side and south side parapets.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if the applicant was agreeable to raising it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Darrell Dawson, 556 San Antonio Street, who said he was in favor of it not being visible but he was not a construction person. He felt that restuccoing the whole building would be very expensive.

Chair Woods said it could be "fogged" in.

Mr. Dawson said he was agreeable.

Chair Woods showed where they could put in an interior parapet that would eliminate the need for restuccoing. She said it would be a screen wall that was thick enough to read like a parapet and should be soft at the top to match the existing parapet.

Mr. Dawson said he understood and favored that.

Chair Woods suggested that it be redrawn.

**Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-005 per staff recommendations and the condition that the screen be redrawn to read like a parapet and approved by staff so that solar collectors were not visible. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 2. Case #H-08-006. 556 San Antonio St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter Page, agent for Darrell Dawson, proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors and increase the parapet to a height of 14'7" where the maximum allowable height is 14'11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single-family residence located at 556 San Antonio Street was built within the last 5 years and is not listed on the Official Map. The building is located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes to install roof-mounted solar collectors at a 45° angle. In order to hide the solar collectors from public view the application also proposes increasing the parapet on the north and east elevations. The parapet will be to a height of 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 11" and the existing height is approximately 12' 6". The parapet screen will be stuccoed to match the existing building.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the collectors are painted an earth tone color where possible. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Mr. Page asked if they could do the same thing on this building.

Chair Woods said she would recommend that but have the parapet more parallel with the building rather than the collector and it would be much better looking.

Mr. Dawson noted the drawings got reversed. So the drawing for 554 was actually the drawing for 556

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Shapiro moved for approval of Case #H 08-006 per staff recommendations and the condition that screening be redrawn and approved by staff to mimic the style of the parapets and make the collectors not visible. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case #H-08-012. 110 E. Buena Vista. Don Gaspar Area. Gregory Waits, agent for Marion Wasserman, proposes to remodel 523 sq. ft. non-status garage that was converted to a residence with an 88 sq. ft. addition to the rear and a clerestory height increase on the rear to the maximum allowable height of 16'2". (David Rasch)**

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

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"110 East Buena Vista was originally constructed as a 523 square foot two-car garage for the contributing historic residential building that fronts Don Gaspar Avenue. The date of construction for this Spanish-Pueblo Revival garage is unknown but presumed to be contemporaneous with the residence and it was converted to a residential unit at an unknown non-historic date. The street-facing north elevation does not retain original vehicle door openings or any historic windows and doors. The building is cut into the slope at the rear and the south-sloping shed roof is screened by parapets. Due to high yardwalls at the street and the side lotlines, only the undulating parapets are visible. The building is undesignated in historic status to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following three items.

- "1. An 88 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear south elevation, cut further into the sloping ground with a retaining wall and stairway down from grade.
- "2. The rear half of the building will be increased in height to the maximum allowable height of 16' 2", as determined by a linear calculation. The loft will feature four square awning windows laid out symmetrically on the façade and casement windows on the other elevations.

"Due to a zero-lot line situation on the east elevation, the second story will require a variance from the Board of Adjustment to the 10' setback and fire-rated glazing will be required for the two windows on this elevation.

- "3. The building will be restuccoed to match the existing stucco on the primary residence.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

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

Ms. Rios asked how this building would get approved at the height requested compared to the height of adjacent buildings.

Mr. Rasch explained that the primary residence was taller than allowable height and adjacent buildings were too.



Present and sworn was Mr. Gregory Waits, 901 W. San Mateo, Suite S, Santa Fe, who said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Rios asked for the square footage of the second floor

Mr. Waits said it was eight hundred and five square feet.

Ms. Walker asked if he would consider a slight set back from the east on the second level.

Mr. Waits thought it was simpler to have it flush rather than having several parapets behind the wall. He noted that the plat he had was not the original. It was already set back 10' 4". So he thought an exception would not be needed. He said he went back to a staff member who said he would get it taken care of. He thought it was rather claustrophobic in the back and it brought some presence to the streetscape.

Chair Woods said it was a sweet little building with its undulating parapet and she would lean to have a couple of feet on either side.

Mr. Waits asked if she meant the west and east.

Chair Woods agreed.

Ms. Rios asked about the type of windows and dimensions.

Mr. Waits said the window dimensions were enough to allow egress but he could not give the exact size of them. He estimated they were 4' 5".

Chair Woods clarified that she was asking about the square windows on the north.

Mr. Rasch said they were 18" by 18".

Ms. Rios asked if they set back on the east and west, would it pose a problem.

Mr. Waits said that obviously the client would like as much square footage there. Maybe a foot on either side would work but it would be defeating with any more.

Chair Woods asked if the roof was a shed roof in back.

Mr. Waits said no, the shed roof was existing and low.

Ms. Shapiro maybe you could add to front.

Mr. Waits said that wasn't possible.

Ms. Shapiro noted the present parapet was undulating and new was very straight.

Mr. Waits didn't know to what extent the Board would want that to be altered. The CAD lines were all straight but there would be some organic quality to it.

Ms. Shapiro said she liked the undulation on existing and was concerned the top would look just like a box on top.

She asked if he was changing out windows on the first floor.

Mr. Waits replied that one was being moved back on the east elevation but all the rest would just stay as is and it wouldn't be as hard as shown in drawings.

Ms. Shapiro asked what reveals there would be on the windows.

Mr. Waits said he hadn't determined that and in the next stage it could be worked out.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-012 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:**

- 1. That on the east side the second floor be set back a foot off the existing wall and give a shadow to the existing building structure,**
- 2. That window reveal be 2-3 inches,**
- 3. That the parapet have an organic look rather than a straight line,**
- 4. That there be no visible rooftop appurtenances and**
- 5. That any exterior lighting be submitted to staff for approval.**

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

- 4. Case #H-08-015. 818 Camino Atalaya. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Rachel Kelly, proposes to construct an approximately 1550 sq. ft. addition to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16'11" to a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The approximately 5,600 square foot single-family residence located at 818 Camino Atalaya was constructed in 1998 and is not listed on the Official Map or has a complete Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The building is located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes the following alteration:

"Remove an existing garage door and window on the east elevation. The garage door and window opening will be infilled and two new window openings will be constructed. Windows will be wood divided lights painted white and will include a simplified territorial surround to match the existing.

"Construct an approximately 1,450 square foot addition to the Southwest corner of the building to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16' 11". The windows will be wood divided lights painted white and will include a simplified territorial surround to match the existing. The addition will also include brick coping that will match the existing brick in color but will be simplified in design.

"Five skylights are indicated on the site plan.

"Also proposed is the addition of an approximately 1,000 square foot portal which will be below the existing height. All woodwork on the portal will be painted white to match the existing.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the skylights are not publicly visible. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, 227 East Palace #W-1, who said there was a drawing error, the infill was done at time of construction and was not part of this application.

Chair Woods asked what the semicircular shape was on the drawing.

Mr. Purvis said it was for the young man seeing if basketball could be played there and should not have been on this drawing.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-015 per staff recommendations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**5. Case #H-08-016. 808 Galisteo St. Don Gaspar Area. Jeff Seres, agent for Bill and Iris Barkman, proposes to replace a non-historic swinging iron vehicle gate with a 4' high back iron sliding vehicle gate at 49' back from the street on a**

significant property. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

“808 Galisteo Street is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner by 1912. The Board previously approved remodeling of the building and awarded the applicant with a Sensitive Restoration Award during the 2006 Heritage Preservation Awards Ceremony. A recently constructed yardwall at the rear stands off from the primary north elevation by 6". The building is listed a significant to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District and the street-facing east and north elevations may be considered primary.

“The applicant proposes to remove the 4' high non-historic iron swinging gate at the northwest corner of the building, which is located 49' from the street. A 4' high sliding vehicle gate will be installed so that the gate slides in the space between the west elevation of the residence and the yardwall. The opening mechanism will be hidden from view behind the yardwall.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Sections 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Jeff Seres, 301 Staab, who said he had nothing to add.

Ms. Rios asked for clarification of the design of the gate.

Mr. Seres said it was a see through design and it would be set back. He said it matched a railing on the stairway going to the basement.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Marla McKinna, 804 Galisteo was sworn. She said she was unsure about the project because she could not understand where it was. She explained that the wall there was her wall and didn't know if it was supported by that wall.

Mr. Seres said it was not supported on that wall but would butt up to it.

Ms. McKinna said it was okay then.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Rios moved for approval of Case #H 08-016 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 6. Case #H-08-017.** 124 Park Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. George and Felicia Rivera, owners/agents, proposes to remodel a contributing 220 sq. ft. garage by restoring an infilled vehicle door and creating a 7'6" high by 10' wide opening on a non-primary elevation. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"124 Park Avenue is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style in 1928. A 220 square foot free-standing, single-car adobe garage, attached to neighboring garages at a zero-lotline to the north, is presumed to have been constructed at approximately a similar historic date. The street-facing, east elevation vehicle door was infilled with a pedestrian door and a window in the 1980s which retains a shadow recess of the original opening dimension. A low parapet conceals a shed roof to the rear, west elevation. Both the residence and the garage are listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The east elevation may be considered as primary.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the garage with the following three items:

- "1. The pedestrian door and window on the east elevation will be removed and the opening dimension with exposed wooden header will be restored. The applicant's letter states that, 're-opening east side where the garage door was,' i.e., the opening twill be restored. But, drawings appear to enlarge the opening width to create a symmetrical façade. No exception is requested or posted. This item should be clarified during the hearing.
- "2. At 5' back from the east elevation, an approximately 7' 6" high x 10' wide opening will be created with an exposed wooden header. This opening will facilitate a car door opening once parked inside the carport.
- "3. The building will be restuccoed to match the existing stucco on the residence.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the east opening dimension be restored to the original dimensions rather than altered or an exception be requested to alter the opening dimension on a primary elevation. Otherwise, this application complies with Sections 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District

design standards.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Joel McHorse, 31 Turtle Circle, Santa Fe.

Ms. Rios asked him if he were in agreement with staff recommendations.

Mr. McHorse said he was in agreement with them.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-017 per staff recommendations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion.**

Mr. Featheringill noted there was a dimension of 9' 1" and in the picture it looked like it was more than 18". She said it was just to the left of the door.

Mr. McHorse said he would shorten it to staff's recommendation.

**The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**7. Case #H-08-018.** 1030 Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Sarah Nolan and Mary Perry-Miller, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by adding a 106 sq. ft. addition, increasing height on a room to match existing adjacent height, reconstructing the front portal to include a lift, replace a balcony, extend a balcony, construct a 374 sq. ft. ramada and a stone retaining wall. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

“1030 Camino San Acacio is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the 1990s. It is located behind another residential building that has street-frontage; but this building has public visibility. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District although there is no Historic Cultural Properties Inventory on file.

“The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following nine items.

“1. The front entrance to the residence and associated garden will be altered to allow for a lift next to the garage along with a bricked grand staircase, fountain and bricked terraces on the north elevation.

“2. The existing balcony over the garage will be extended to create more shelter

near the lift area. Another balcony will be constructed at the end side of the same north elevation by removing a balustrade and extending the new brick terrace.

- "3. A 106 square foot bathroom addition on the southwest corner will be constructed to match the adjacent height and exterior finishes.
- "4. The dining room on the southeast corner will be increased in height to match the adjacent height.
- "5. On the rear elevation, a pair of windows will be removed and replaced with French doors and a pair of casement windows will be removed and replaced with four folding doors all to match existing finishes.
- "6. The existing interior fireplace on the east elevation will be redesigned with a slight change to the chimney that follows the Pueblo style and another fountain will be installed at the southeast corner of the residence.
- "7. An existing hot tub in the rear yard will be removed and replaced with a similar hot tub that is located beside a bricked courtyard and a wooden ramada that will be 9½ feet tall.
- "8. A 9¼ foot tall BBQ ramada will be constructed on the south east side yard.
- "9. Additional hardscaping includes tone retaining walls and steps.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Sections 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District design standards."

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 460 Cerrillos Road.

Mr. Martínez said that at the last meeting the Board saw the gate that was at the end of the driveway. He said the design was approved with neighbor approvals and the letters were in the Board packet.

He clarified that the owners were elderly and they needed a lift so it had a gradual stairs and a gravel area in front for the cars. All the rest was in the back away from visibility.

Ms. Walker asked if he were saying the gate was missing.

Mr. Martínez said he was not. He clarified that it was approved at the last meeting.

Chair Woods asked him to show the Board where the lift was.

Mr. Martínez pointed it out and added that he had used this before in Historic Districts. He said it was not very tall. He showed where it was hidden behind a wall. It was not as black as shown here. He showed its location on the floor plan.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he was using stone that would be seen from the street.

Mr. Martínez pointed it out and said it was for drainage purposes and they were redoing a retaining wall using existing stone, laid in stone but looked laid.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it would not change the look.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked about a structure that looked like a wishing well.

Mr. Martínez said it was a low fountain on the west side and near the front and not intended to be visible from the street.

What Chair Woods thought was a wishing well was a ramada for the BBQ. He said it had a 3½ foot wall.

Ms. Rios asked if there was a nicho in front.

Mr. Martínez agreed and pointed it out.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-018 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 8. Case #H-08-011. 603 1/2A Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Sisneros Jr., owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing building with alterations to a non-historic entry room, install storm windows, replace the roof, replace screen doors with iron security doors, restucco, and construct a 6' high coyote fence and gate and a retaining wall on the rear. (David Rasch)**

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



## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"603½ A Paseo de Peralta is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner in the 1930s or earlier. The residence is situated away from the streetscape down a narrow drive and it shares a common wall with another residence to the south. Original single-pane double-hung wood windows remain on the rear, east elevation. Deep door and window recesses provide character-defining features, especially along the west, publicly-visible elevation. At the northwest corner a shed roof entry porch was constructed in the 1960s. The applicant received a stop work order in 2007 for altering the roof, canales, and entry porch without a permit. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the west and east elevations may be considered primary.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following seven items.

- "1. According to the applicant, the original dirt roof was damaged beyond repair due to poor drainage. The roof was removed down to the vigas and resloped from draining toward the hill to the east to draining to the driveway on the west. The reroof caused the replacement canales to be set at altered heights. There is no change to the parapet heights.
- "2. The non-historic wood-sided entry porch will be remodeled to remove the shed roof, increase the height to 8" less than the adjacent parapets, and retain the existing footprint. Non-historic windows will be replaced with thermal-pane sliders.
- "3. Historic wood single-pane double-hung windows on the east and wood single-pane casement windows on the north will be retained behind exterior storm installations. Discussion should clarify the light patterns of the storm windows, placement within the deep recesses, and the discrepancy between drawings and photographs of the north elevation windows.
- "4. Wooden screen doors will be removed and replaced with metal security doors, 'in a more traditional-looking style,' although designs do not show on elevation drawings.
- "5. The building will be restuccoed, color/type are not identified.
- "6. A 6' high coyote fence and pedestrian gate will be constructed between the east elevation of the residence and another residential unit to the northeast.
- "7. A 4' high stone retaining wall will be constructed at the rear in order to hold back drainage and soil erosion for the nearby steep dirt slope of Ft. Marcy Park.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends approval of this application with the conditions that the storm windows match the light patterns of the double-hung and casement windows or be single light and that the stucco be cementitious to match the existing color. Otherwise this application complies with Sections 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District design standards.”

Ms. Rios asked if this property could this retain its Contributing status if this were approved.

Present and sworn was Mr. Joseph Sisneros Jr, P. O. Box 250, Chimayó who said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Rios asked about the design of the screen doors.

Mr. Sisneros explained that the old ones were rotten and there had been break ins. He said this was his mother’s property and wanted something with more security. She wanted it to have the traditional screen door look and it was in process.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked about stucco color.

Mr. Sisneros said they would stay with an El Rey color that matched the existing.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-011 per staff recommendations and that the unknowns be approved by staff (storm door design, stucco, and window design). Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 9. Case #H-08-013. 111 N. St. Francis. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. David Naylor, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by applying a stone veneer to 20% of the exterior of the building. (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

“The building located at 111 St. Francis is a commercial building that was constructed in the 1980s as Sandia Federal bank and is now used to house Visions Design Group, Inc., an interior design firm. This building is listed as non-contributing and is located on the edge of the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

“The owner was issued a stop work order in October Of 2007 for remodeling the exterior of the building without a building permit or Historic Design Review Board approval. The owner stopped work immediately and contacted City Historic Preservation staff.

“This application proposes applying an earth tone exterior stone veneer to approximately 20% of the structure. The stone veneer will be located on the north, east, and west elevation as well as the large portal columns at the northeast corner of the building and will be slightly lighter than the existing stucco. Steel colored stripes will run throughout the stone tile which will tie into the building’s steel entrance.

“No other alterations are proposed.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.”

Ms. Barrett said the applicant was not present but she had talked to them earlier in the day and they were planning on being present.

She said the applicant submitted a sample of the stone and showed it to the Board.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-013 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**10. Case #08-014.** 612 Gomez #5. Don Gaspar Area. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Christine Wiltshire, proposes to construct an approximately 49 sq. ft. storage shed and approximately 100 sq. ft. portal to a non-contributing building to a height of 9’ where the existing height is 11’ and to construct a yardwall to a height of 8’ where the maximum allowable height is 6’. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height, section 14-5.2 (D,9,C). (Marissa Barrett)

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

“The building located at 612 Gomez #5 is one of five units located in a multifamily residential compound. The unit, which is connected to the others in the compound, is to the rear of the property. The building is described on the 1995 Historic Cultural

Properties Inventory as Vernacular. The building which has a second story portion was built in 1987 and is listed on the Official Map as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

“The owner of 612 Gomez #5 was issued a stop work order in August 2007 for construction without a building permit and Historic Design Review Board approval. The owner stopped work immediately and contacted City staff.

“This application was taken to the Board of Adjustment at the December 18, 2007 hearing for a variance to exceed the maximum allowable wall height of 6' and for a variance from the required rear and side setbacks. The Board of Adjustment approved both variances.

“This application proposes the following:

“Construct an approximately 49 square foot storage shed addition and 100 square foot portal to the west elevation to a height of 9' where the existing height is 11'. The storage addition will be stuccoed with cementitious stucco to match the existing color and texture. The portal, which was designed to mimic the existing portal on the north elevation, will include round wood posts and wood beams. All wood elements will be finished with a natural stain. The portal also includes a shed standing seam roof to match the existing.

“Lastly proposed is the construction of a 8' high rear and side yard wall where the maximum allowable height is 6'. 6' of the wall will be stuccoed CMU to match the residence and the top 2' will be cedar latillas. The wall is adjacent to the Arroyo Tenorio Acequia on the south and to a commercial property to the west. The Board of Adjustment approved the variance to exceed the maximum building height of 6' for residential walls allowing the height to reach 8'.

“An exception has been requested to Section 14-5.2 (D, 9, c) to exceed the maximum allowable wall height of 6'. As required by City code, the applicant has answered the questions in Section 14-5.2 (C, 2, c, I-vi).

“The Commissioner of the Acequia Madre de Santa Fe has reviewed the proposed project and has submitted a letter with their approval conditions.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends denial of the exception to exceed the maximum allowable height of 6' for the rear and south side yard wall unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exception. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (I) Don Gaspar Area Historic District Design Standards.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas, 421 St. Michael's Drive, who said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case 08-014 allowing the exception having met the criteria as follows:**

- 1. Do not damage the streetscape – The character of the streetscape is not compromised. The applicants' home is not publicly visible from Gomez Street and is the last home at the rear of a 5-unit multi-family building;**
- 2. Prevent a hardship to the public welfare – The proposal will not create a hardship for the public welfare. In fact public welfare will be increased as the wall will act as protection from the vagrants who are loitering in and around the ditch next to the applicant's property;**
- 3. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents reside within the Historic Districts – Staff concurs that the request to construct the wall in the design that has been proposed strengthens the unique heterogeneous character of the City;**
- 4. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structures involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape – Due to the location of the site, well away from Gomez Street and tucked into the rear of the Gomez Street Compound, and adjacent to a large commercial development, this unique heterogeneous feature will not be seen from any streetscape;**
- 5. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant – The home of the applicant is adjacent to commercial property and along a ditch, and there are no adjoining neighbors. An eight-foot wall would have been allowed to be built by the developer of the commercial property, but since it was not built by the original commercial developer, the applicant is now requesting approval to provide a buffer from the parking lot and dumpsters at her expense.**
- 6. Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of the section as set forth in 14-5.2(A)(1) – The request is in keeping with the general provisions and purpose of the section as set forth in 14-5.2(A)(1);**

**and subject to the conditions by Acequia Madre de Santa Fe:**

- A. The owner/architect/contractor is to assure that the Acequia was not damaged or changed in any way and is to make sure that construction debris, trash, waste water, surplus water, concrete, plaster or stucco slurries that may have been allowed to get into the Acequia or in its right-of-way are removed.**
- B. The three drainage pipes installed in the yard wall are to be removed and the wall grouted and sealed.**
- C. The old wire fencing and fence posts are to be removed along the section of the new yard wall.**

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

**K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

None.

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Rios moved to adjourn the meeting. /Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m..

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer