



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6/12/08 TIME 4:30 pm

PREPARED BY Naughey

APPROVED BY J. Cas

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS
- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
 - 1. Informational Study Session for the Proposal by the Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority to demolish existing residential buildings and construct between 105 and 155 new residential units with discussion that clarifies a maximum allowable height conflict between 24' in underlying zoning and 16' in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.
- I. OLD BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-08-059. 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to construct a freestanding ATM machine to a height of 7' 6" and install brick pavers on a Landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)
- J. NEW BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-08-066. 564 E. Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Fabiene Montoya, agent/owner, proposes to construct a free-standing entry hall to 9' high with steps, and planter walls, a gas-fired fireplace to 9' high, and a cantera fountain in the front courtyard of a contributing residence. (David Rasch)
 - 2. Case #H-08-067. 716 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jan Wisniewski, Architect, agent for Susan Conway and Patrick Oliphant, proposes to construct an 81 sq. ft. addition to a height of 9'6", or 6" lower than the adjacent parapet height, on a contributing residence. (David Rasch)
 - 3. Case #H-08-068. 233 ½ Delgado Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to confirm the non-conforming historic status of a residential structure. (David Rasch)
 - 4. Case #H-08-070. 453 ½ and 451 Amado Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Nick Heil, owner/agent, proposes to construct stuccoed yardwalls with pedestrian gates and coyote fences to the maximum allowable heights of 5'8" at the streetscape and 6' elsewhere on contributing properties. (David Rasch)

5. Case #H-08-069A. 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes to assign historic status to three structures on a non-status property. (David Rasch)

6. Case #H-08-069B. 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tim Curry/ Design Solutions, agent for Dios Nos Acompaña, LLC, proposes to remodel a primary residence and guest house with approximately 333 sq. ft. of additions at lower than the existing height. Two exceptions are proposed, if necessary, to construct more than 50% of the historic footprint and to place the addition at less than 10 ft. back from a primary elevation, Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d). (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

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 June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, June 24, 2008.

INDEX OF
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

June 24, 2008

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
A. CALL TO ORDER		
B. ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved	1
D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	None	1
E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS	None	1
F. COMMUNICATIONS	None	1
G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR	None	1
H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS		
1. Informational Study Session for the Proposal by the Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority to demolish existing residential buildings and construct between 105 and 155 new residential units with discussion that clarifies a maximum allowable height conflict between 24' in underlying zoning and 16' in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.		1-4
I. OLD BUSINESS		
1. <u>Case #H-08-059</u> . 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to construct a freestanding ATM machine to a height of 7' 6" and install brick pavers on a Landmark property.	Approved	4-6
J. NEW BUSINESS		
1. <u>Case #H-08-066</u> . 564 E. Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Fabiene Montoya, agent/owner, proposes to construct a free-standing entry hall to 9' high with steps, and planter walls, a gas-fired fireplace to 9' high, and a cantera fountain in the front courtyard of a contributing residence.	Postponed	6-9
2. <u>Case #H-08-067</u> . 716 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jan Wisniewski, Architect, agent for Susan Conway and Patrick Oliphant, proposes to construct an 81 sq. ft. addition to a height of 9'6", or 6" lower than the adjacent parapet height, on a contributing residence.	Approved	9-10
3. <u>Case #H-08-068</u> . 233 ½ Delgado Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to confirm the non-conforming historic status of a residential structure.	Approved	10

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
4.	<u>Case #H-08-070.</u> 453 ½ and 451 Amado Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Nick Heil, owner/agent, proposes to construct stuccoed yardwalls with pedestrian gates and coyote fences to the maximum allowable heights of 5'8" at the streetscape and 6' elsewhere on contributing properties. Approved	10-12
5.	<u>Case #H-08-069A.</u> 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes to assign historic status to three structures on a non-status property. Approved	12-13
6.	<u>Case #H-08-069B.</u> 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tim Curry/ Design Solutions, agent for Dios Nos Acompaña, LLC, proposes to remodel a primary residence and guest house with approximately 333 sq. ft. of additions at lower than the existing height. Two exceptions are proposed, if necessary, to construct more than 50% of the historic footprint and to place the addition at less than 10 ft. back from a primary elevation, Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d). Approved	13-16
K.	MATTERS FROM THE BOARD	16-17
L.	ADJOURNMENT	17

MINUTES OF
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

June 24, 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 at approximately 6:00 p.m. on this date in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sharon Woods, Chair
Karen Walker
Cecilia Rios
Jake Barrow
Dan Feathergill
Deborah Shapiro

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Robert Frost (excused)

STAFF PRESENT:

David Rasch, Supervising Planner Historic Preservation
Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner Historic Preservation
Kelley Brennan, Assistant City Attorney

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch made the following corrections to the agenda: under new business, 3rd item, Case #H-08-68 – it is Delgado Street, not Lane and they are confirming the non contributing status, not the non-conforming status.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the agenda as presented, Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS - None

F. COMMUNICATIONS - None

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR - None

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Informational Study Session for the Proposal by the Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority to demolish existing residential buildings and construct between 105 and 155 new residential units with discussion that clarifies a maximum allowable height conflict between 24' in underlying zoning and 16' in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "1."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "1."

Staff recommends:

This conflict may be resolved by following both standards. Staff recommends that, for this specific affordable housing project, the height ordinance is followed for street-facing structures with a potential for one-story buildings only and the underlying zoning is followed for non-street facing structures with a potential for two-story buildings.

Oliver Michael Duty, Duty and Germanas Architects, stated that the work began about a year and a half ago with preliminary study sessions with the neighbors and others. The purpose was to acquaint the City with the need to redevelop this project and define the direction. He said the questions were whether the City would lease the land to the Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority which is required prior to development and what their position was on affordable housing. With answers to those questions, they reassembled and the plan is to go forward. The schedule for review will include hearings, ENN's and then they would come to the Board.

Mr. Duty said during the discussion with Mr. Rasch, they agreed it would be wise get some clarity on the height issue. It is in the community and City's interest to maximize affordable units and preserve and respect the existing neighborhoods. He reviewed the three schemes after explaining that there are two sites with one site being one story elderly no matter what is decided for the rest of the site and then to the left there are 1, 2 and 3 bedroom family units of any sort of mix of heights. The east site is all family units and a small area of offices. This may require a zoning change, although that is not an issue for this hearing unless there are particular concerns. He said they want to review the ramifications of the strict height or meeting in the in between.

Scheme A is all one story units; 51 units of elderly no matter what and the family site will be 36 units and then the east side market mix will be 18 units for a total of 105 units. This scheme exceeds the City's requirements for affordable units. Scheme B has the same number of elderly one story units and the family units of all two stories will go to 68 units and then 36 market mix units for a total of 155 units. Mr. Duty said this will deliver the maximum number of units and provide something that they can support. Scheme C is a compromise and is the most preferred plan. The elderly units remain the same. There are 62 tax credit units and 26 market mix units for a total of 139 units. The code says that this is in the west side Guadalupe District falling under the historic height restrictions. The height shall be 24 feet maximum. There are currently 24 feet high buildings in the development. The compromise is that those buildings are in the middle and the perimeter has one story buildings.

Mr. Feathergill noticed that the parking has not changed from one iteration to the other. He asked if there is a way they can reconfigure the parking to gain more one story units

because they have reduced the units to meet halfway. He said in the east site there is probably room for another block of units.

Mr. Duty assumes when they do a final plan they will pick up density wherever they can. He said they do want to preserve some areas for expansion because in the future there may be a need for some four bedroom units. The parking will have to conform. The danger is that it begins to look more and more like a project when you close the buildings in together. The feedback was to get it as single family looking as possible. With the amount of affordable housing the City wants they will not have many market rate units. He did not think they will have resistance when working with one story units.

Mr. Barrow commented that in order to preserve the existing neighborhood it would have been helpful to see what the existing looks like for the setback, not just the height. He wanted to see that they improve upon the existing streetscape harmony and setback. He hopes that this does not become cookie cutter looking. He was comfortable with the idea of a compromise.

Ms. Walker asked if these will be rentals only and what percent are affordable.

Mr. Duty stated that they will be rentals only. He referred to scheme C, the affordable would be at least 67%.

Ms. Walker asked how they define senior.

Ed Romero, Executive Director Housing Authority, stated that the seniors are required to be 62 or over.

Ms. Walker asked what the difference is between a clubhouse and a community building.

Mr. Duty explained that it is necessary for the seniors to have a separate facility and the family housing will have its own as these are both funded different under different programs. He is not sure what they will actually be called in the end.

Ms. Walker asked if there are vouchers for these people being thrown out.

Mr. Romero stated that out of the residents being relocated; there were 104 vouchers for the 104 units that they currently have. Some have accepted transfers to other sites and some have accepted vouchers and moved forward. There are 40 units still occupied. There are roughly 20 that have transferred and 40 that have taken vouchers. They receive \$750,000 from this point forward in vouchers which will help residents come back to this neighborhood and pay market rents. The resident will be able to cover the increased rent at this site required to cover the mortgage fees at this site. The residents with the vouchers have first right for relocation to the site.

Ms. Rios stated support for the affordable housing and agreed with the compromise. She referred to plan C and asked how many units exist presently.

Mr. Duty replied 104 units.

Ms. Rios asked for a comparison in terms of density and lot coverage to what is existing.

Mr. Duty stated that numerically the density is not vastly different. They are under the zoning allowed. He said it is relatively close to what is shown on the plan and this gives a sense of the spacing between buildings. He said the project is by no means dense, although it is denser than the existing facility although it will appear less dense because they will be separated more. The intent is to look as much like a family neighborhood as possible. The portion of the housing development that is served off of San Francisco Street is served off of the street rather than the interior. This attempts to make the street frontage appear like a family neighborhood. Under the Santa Fe Ordinance they cannot be too creative as they are prevented from backing out onto the street. He said they may apply for a variance on this issue. The ordinance requires creating parking lots.

Ms. Rios suggested not making it as cookie cutter looking as illustrated.

Ms. Shapiro was glad to see some work being done on this project. She asked if there will be space for play yards and gardens as currently exists.

Mr. Duty said the development plan will address this. There are security issues, but they will be careful with solid walls and do not want chain link fencing. He said there are some serious requirements regarding the funding for an affordable community. He said at times there has to be a cookie cutter aspect although they will try to get away from that while maintaining the economics. They will develop open space and ideally the spaces will be defensible and easy to maintain. There is a lot of work to do before this is designed. He said to get the approval they may debate windows and scale and the nature, but they will not be hung up on what they are trying to achieve with density.

Ms. Shapiro asked which neighbors they spoke to.

Mr. Duty replied they spoke to all neighbors, but primarily to the neighbors along West Alameda that are permanent residents. They have known that this development would need to be removed for quite some time. He said they also met with the people that live in this project.

Ms. Shapiro wondered about the neighbors concerns with the view shed and two story units along the arroyo.

Mr. Duty replied that every two story will be in someone's view shed.

Chair Woods stated that she personally thinks this is a tough project, but everyone seems fine with the compromise on the height issue.

Ms. Rios asked if there is a timeline in place.

Mr. Duty said the existing buildings will not be demolished until there is a final design and approval. There are some concerns because as people move out it becomes a security problem. It is not good to have a bunch of empty buildings sitting around for a long time. He would like to have approval on the development plan by October. They expect to come back after they have a development plan in place.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-08-059. 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to construct a freestanding ATM machine to a height of 7' 6" and install brick pavers on a Landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)**

Memorandum from Marissa Barrett, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "2."

Ms. Barrett presented the staff report included in Exhibit "2."

Staff recommends:

Approval of Option 2 since this redesign is more in keeping with the Board's Action on June 10, 2008 and that the new structure and paving do not attach to the Landmark building or cause the building to lose its Landmark status. The approval also includes the condition that the exposed building concrete is an approved earth tone or the building is stuccoed using an approved earth tone color.

Public Hearing

Mark Hogan, 994 Old Pecos Trail, was sworn. He said he has the Railyard design standards with him. He showed some photographs of the area. He said they are trying to get this to look like the rail crossing equipment and streets. The intent was to work with the vernacular of the railroad. He reviewed the different options. He stated that option 2 is least favored by the applicant.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Ms. Walker asked for the height on the third proposal.

Mr. Hogan stated that all the proposals are 7 foot 6 inches.

Mr. Barrow understood that option 1 has form boards which gives it an industrial design and can be a rustic solution while option 2 has the simpler design which he favors, but there is no indication of how the concrete would be finished. He prefers option 2, but does not agree with the stucco and asked if the applicant would consider wood to soften the design.

Mr. Hogan said the intent was to make it as simple as possible so they left off all the adornment, but agreed to consider this. He said these would be earth tone colors.

Mr. Feathergill notices that option 3 is the only one that has the sign on the side.

Mr. Hogan said the sign should be on all three schemes.

Mr. Feathergill asked what the existing enclosure is.

Mr. Hogan stated that this is pre-existing equipment. The only difference is the finish as they prefer the finish on the sign.

Mr. Feathergill commented that the design of the box resembles option 2, but suggested some detailing to make it more acceptable.

Mr. Hogan said they could take the detailing to the top, but it has to lift up to get to the computer equipment.

Mr. Feathergill preferred option 2 with the detailing from option 3. He liked the fact that it looks like a lid.

Mr. Feathergill moved to approve Case H-08-059 per staff recommendations with the modifications as follows: steel structure resembling existing metal building offered in corner of option 3, using the steel in the existing sign structure, no ATM all around the top, but the two signs as shown in option 3 no larger than as drawn, Ms. Rios seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H-08-066. 564 E. Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Fabiene Montoya, agent/owner, proposes to construct a free-standing entry hall to 9' high with steps, and planter walls, a gas-fired fireplace to 9' high, and a cantera fountain in the front courtyard of a contributing residence. (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "3."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "3."

Staff recommends:

Approval of this application with the condition that the original primary elevation porch treatment and stair entrance be restored to its historic appearance. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Guidelines and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Woods clarified that there is not an elevation of what was approved.

Mr. Rasch said that is correct.

Public Hearing

Fabiene Montoya, 564 E. Alameda, was sworn. He gave some history on this project. A year ago, he came to propose some landscape and modifications to the front entrance with John Padilla, architect. There were some agreements to a specific amount of work that would be done with plans submitted. The Board agreed to allow him to take the front gate and make it a side gate and create a freestanding fire place. He went back to the landscape architect and created a disc of what he was planning to do. He said Mr. Padilla told him he had a permit, but he did not have a permit. Mr. Padilla told him the only thing he could not do was put the vgas in.

Chair Woods noted that Mr. Padilla is not present, so they need to go with what he has.

Mr. Montoya stated that he would not spend money on something that he knows he would be asked to tear down. In his opinion, the additions are common within the road or the area. He wants to either propose to get the plans approved or determine what piece will approve. He said the situation should not have occurred because he felt he did his due diligence to do what the Board asks applicants to do. He showed the landscaping plan he created from a hotel plan he saw in Mexico. There were elevation plans that did not make it to the Board.

Mr. Rasch stated that the planters were approved. The stairs and fireplace were not on the plan and were not approved.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Chair Woods clarified that the applicant is asking for approval of what has been built.

Ms. Rios asked what the proposed changes are doing to the contributing status.

Mr. Rasch explained that the freestanding fireplace would be minimal as attached to the wall. The entry gate is a little out of proportion for most entry gates, but the wall was already shielding the vision of the house, so the entry gate does not make it worse. The spur walls, tile steps and the white stucco removal changed the character. He said those three things could possibly be considered a downgrade.

Ms. Rios asked if Mr. Rasch studied the motion because she doubts the Board would have agreed to the spur walls or front portion removed.

Mr. Rasch said there was a lot of discussion during numerous hearings and the Board was ready to approve the project when the applicant brought forward the site plan at the last minute.

Chair Woods asked what the legalities are if the site plan was approved. She is unclear what the legal rights are of the applicant as it is hard to tell if this site plan was part of the application.

Ms. Brennan stated that the site plan would be approved assuming the Board had the information they needed. She agreed it is hard to tell from the site plan what was approved. She said this might need more exploration in the minutes.

Chair Woods expressed concern with the front gate. She believes that was done without permission as it would have never been allowed. She reviewed the gate ordinance provisions for the Board. She does not believe this gate is appropriate for Alameda.

Ms. Rios asked what was there prior to this entrance.

Mr. Rasch said there was some of this wall. He explained that the Board did approve the angled wall, a pedestrian gate, the planters and rectilinear staircase. The difference is the curvilinear staircase and the structure has depth and more massiveness than what was approved.

Ms. Shapiro reviewed the minutes and found that there was agreement from the applicant to remove the planters.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that the applicant approved removing the planters but it was not in the motion.

Ms. Brennan said if the applicant agreed then it does not necessarily have to be in the motion.

Mr. Feathergill asked if the previous staff report is available. He believes staff recommended denial.

Mr. Rasch said it appears the application focused on the remodel of the residence and the site plan came in at the last minute, so the recommendation was to deny the application because staff did not have time to review the site plan. An exception was required to add up to 50% of the residence and this was the primary concern at the previous hearing. The Board did not question the applicant further on the site plan.

Mr. Feathergill recalled that the primary elevation was not to be changed.

Ms. Shapiro referred to page 21 and reviewed the minutes. The double gates were then on the side and the applicant wanted them to be at the corner.

Mr. Rasch stated that the double gates are on Escondido.

Ms. Shapiro said she thought the double gates would be moved to the corner.

Mr. Montoya stated that they were going to leave the gates there, but duplicate them by matching the color and style.

Chair Woods asked the applicant what he is willing to do before the Board tells him what he has to do.

Mr. Montoya did not believe what he brings is obtrusive or an eyesore, so he wants the minimal amount of demolition. He said this has already cost outrageous amounts of money. He likes the plans. He has proposed taking the roof off and putting some latillas. He would prefer not taking anything down.

Chair Woods understood it is hard to build something and have the Board require it to be taken down. She finds it obtrusive every time they drive by. She said leaving it as a structure is overwhelming. She suggested something like cutting out the depth and leaving the very front at 1-2 feet. In her opinion, the planters and steps are livable. She reviewed the three issues: the gate, fireplace and changing of the spur walls with circular steps.

Mr. Feathergill agreed with the modifications on the front gate. He did not recall hearing the fireplace would be taller than the front wall. He added that the front of the house has to go back as that was what was approved.

Mr. Barrow agreed on the façade and reducing the massing, but he is not sure on the final design. He could accept the planters and round steps at this location. He agreed

with Mr. Feathergill regarding the chimney as there was no elevation. His impression was that the fireplace would not be visible from the street. He would like to see transparency on the gate.

Ms. Walker expressed concern with proceeding with something when a Board has not seen elevations as that can be a disaster. This is not an entry gate, but an edifice; the fireplace is an intrusion into the neighborhood.

Ms. Rios agreed with her colleagues and thought the case needs to be postponed for a redraw. She said it needs to be very clear what the Board is approving.

Ms. Shapiro agreed and would like the steps squared off. She proposed a redraw of the plan.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case #H-08-066, Ms. Rios seconded the motion which was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods suggested the applicant get the modifications on the plan and bring it back.

Ms. Rios wanted to give the applicant as much direction as possible.

Chair Woods reviewed the direction. There was agreement to leave the planters and circular stairs since the applicant has so much to change. The applicant should reduce the entry and get the front back with the spur walls, so it looks more like what was there previously. The fireplace has to be lower so it is not seen over the height of the wall.

2. **Case #H-08-067. 716 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jan Wisniewski, Architect, agent for Susan Conway and Patrick Oliphant, proposes to construct an 81 sq. ft. addition to a height of 9'6", or 6" lower than the adjacent parapet height, on a contributing residence. (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "4."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "4."

Staff recommends:

Approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Guidelines, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Public Hearing

Jan Wisniewski, 401 Delgado, was sworn. As a neighbor, he thanked the Board for the direction to the previous applicant. He said this project is a closet addition, so it is relatively straight forward. He said it does not exceed the allowable by any calculation that he has done. He said the materials will match the existing structure. The neighbor that will see this the most has given their support as evidenced by a letter included in the packet.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Ms. Rios asked if the visibility is non-existent.

Mr. Wisniewski said it is visible from Calle La Paz on the side.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-08-067 with staff recommendations, Ms. Walker seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-08-068. 233 ½ Delgado Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to confirm the non-conforming historic status of a residential structure. (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "5."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "5."

Staff recommends:

The Board maintain the historic status as non-contributing due to non-historic date of construction and replacement of original materials with non-compliant materials.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-08-068 as staff recommendation, Ms. Rios seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-08-070. 453 ½ and 451 Amado Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Nick Heil, owner/agent, proposes to construct stuccoed yardwalls with pedestrian gates and coyote fences to the maximum allowable heights of 5'8" at the streetscape and 6' elsewhere on contributing properties. (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "6."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "6."

Staff recommends:

Approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Guidelines, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Public Hearing

Nick Heil, 453 ½ Amado Street, was sworn.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Mr. Barrow asked about the relationship of the walls to the streetscape. The wall on the proposed elevation looking south appears to be close. He did not see anything that

matches that streetscape along either side of the street. The south and west elevation wall appear disturbingly close.

Mr. Rasch said the wall in front of 453 ½ Amado is approximately 10 feet from the front elevation, so it is a smaller front yard. There are other walls of this height and he believes some of the others are contributing as well. Typically a wall of five feet or lower will block the primary elevation partially. The house is closer to the street, so you may get a good view of the house for ¾ of the home. He agreed it is tight.

Mr. Barrow commented that along that side of the street and the other side it is predominantly transparent yard walls.

Mr. Rasch said there is a mixture.

Ms. Walker asked if 451 Amado is contributing.

Mr. Rasch replied yes and recalled that it was upgraded in status last year.

Ms. Walker thought the west elevation would be blocked.

Mr. Rasch said that one is taller because it is set back behind the parking, so it goes to six feet and then there are two arches that go above the gate. The view of that would be blocked more than the view of the other one.

Ms. Walker asked if it would affect the status.

Mr. Rasch stated that it is visual or physical character, so usually it is not whether the structure is fully visible. The integrity is more important.

Ms. Walker had a problem with blocking a contributing wall.

Chair Woods expressed concern with the height. She asked the applicant what he would be willing to do.

Mr. Heil explained that he centered the gates to the north elevation out of a feeling that they should be centered in the wall portions, rather than preserving or blocking the view of 451. He said the arches could be separated.

Chair Woods asked if the applicant would be willing to not do the arches.

Mr. Heil was open to that. The reason for the arch over the door is that the other stuccoed walls on the street have that feature. This style is more in keeping with what is existing along the street rather than removing the arches.

Ms. Rios asked how low they could place the wall. The Westside neighborhoods traditionally had very few high walls and no fences. She wanted to honor what was there.

Mr. Heil said the reason they wanted to go five feet is because there is a one foot drop to where the wall would start, so the effective height is about four feet. The sight lines are only going to be blocked to four feet above street level. He said directly across the

street there is a five feet wall level with the finished floor height and it is not particularly intrusive to the visibility of the structure. He wanted the Board to consider the real impact of what will actually be constructed. He intends to preserve the character and streetscape.

Mr. Barrow asked if at 451 he would be open to transparency in the gates. This would keep some of the contributing buildings from being more than half blocked by the wall.

Chair Woods suggested a window in the gate or using iron.

Mr. Heil stated that he would be more interested in transparency in the wall with iron areas that you can see through. He said it is more for security reasons as this neighborhood is in transition.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve H-08-070 with the following modifications: walls on 451 Amado Street have the arches eliminated and transparency provided in the walls with at least two openings. The height of the wall at 453 ½ be reduced by 12 inches as measured from the street. Mr. Feathergill seconded the motion and amended the motion to step the wall at the lot line 12 inches. Mr. Barrow accepted the amendment.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Barrow to specify the height of the walls.

Mr. Barrow asked what the height of the west wall at the south end is.

Mr. Rasch replied 5 feet.

Mr. Barrow asked the applicant to reduce the north end wall to 4 feet and eliminate the window.

Mr. Feathergill said effectively it is only five feet high at the south elevation.

Ms. Shapiro wanted any amended lighting details to come back to staff.

Mr. Barrow amended the motion to reduce the south end at 453 to four feet and reduce the wall at 451 also by one foot and two windows installed in the wall.

There being no abstaining or dissenting votes, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods left the meeting at this time and Ms. Rios took over as Vice Chair.

- 5. Case #H-08-069A. 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes to assign historic status to three structures on a non-status property. (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "7."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "7." He read the definitions of significant and contributing structures.

Staff recommends:

The Board assign the historic status for the three buildings as recommended by the 1991 Historic Cultural Properties inventory: significant main residence; contributing guest house; and contributing garage due to historic dates of construction, historic integrity, unique character, and association with a prominent Santa Fe individual.

Public Hearing

Eric Harris, 2816 Pueblo Bonito, was sworn. He said they do not contest the status of the structures.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Mr. Barrow questioned the garage as the height is not consistent with something in the 1950's. If that has been changed, he asked if that would change the recommendation.

Mr. Rasch stated that the existing garage has the same footprint and location on a 1953 plat. He understands the point. He does not think the height is significant enough.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H-08-069A with staff recommendations, Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-08-069B. 830 El Caminito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tim Curry/ Design Solutions, agent for Dios Nos Acompaña, LLC, proposes to remodel a primary residence and guest house with approximately 333 sq. ft. of additions at lower than the existing height. Two exceptions are proposed, if necessary, to construct more than 50% of the historic footprint and to place the addition at less than 10 ft. back from a primary elevation, Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d). (David Rasch)**

Memorandum from David Rasch, prepared for June 24, 2008 Historic Design Review Board meeting is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "8."

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report included in Exhibit "8."

Staff recommends:

Denial of this application unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the two exceptions needed for this project. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Guidelines, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Public Hearing

Tim Curry, 574 West San Francisco, was sworn. He said they consider this as a minimal addition to what has been deemed a significant building. He said they have undertaken this with a high level of sensitivity to the structure. There has been an effort to incorporate the attached guesthouse into the existing torreón without undue disturbance. The torreón and small addition with the structure is functionally obsolete in this neighborhood. The owners wish to bring it up to par with what is in this neighborhood.

The public testimony portion of the public hearing was closed.

Questions and comments from the Board

Ms. Shapiro asked where they might re-use the windows as stated in the application.

Mr. Curry said there is one window that will have to be replaced on the inside of the courtyard on the east side elevation. It will be replaced with a window with the same divided light patterns but they will drop the sill. He said that one will not be re-used. There is also one other window on the south elevation that will be replaced with a divided light window. That was an omission from the plans.

Ms. Walker understood the addition is proposed with native stone facing material. She asked if there is another way to differentiate such as subtle shading.

Mr. Curry said it would be fine to use a different shade of the stucco. He said they are proposing a field stone which is a large brown stone that is rectangular and they are not small linear pieces. The area is primarily screened by a courtyard wall.

Ms. Walker said that sounds okay.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there will be any rooftop acoutrements or exterior lighting. She requested any changes in light be brought to staff.

Mr. Curry agreed.

Mr. Barrow understood they are connecting the significant and contributing building. He asked if there is currently a distinction.

Mr. Curry said there is a garden wall that connects the two now, although there is a space between the two.

Mr. Barrow clarified that all the stucco is currently the same. He was troubled with this detail of the wall seperating the two structures. He thought the design works. He was not sure how to deal with the connection of the two structures.

Mr. Rasch stated that this item came up during the site visit. He believes this proposal is a sensitive way to add to these buildings. Technically significant is little or no alterations. He agreed this would alter the significant status of the torroen, but since it is so sensitive in design, he recommends the torreon remain significant and the guesthouse and addition remain contributing.

Mr. Barrow said in the past to make a clear distinction they have created a shadow line recess.

Mr. Curry said there is a small recess where the new wall is going.

Mr. Barrow wanted something a little more pronounced, such as a double thick stucco break that reads like two buildings sitting next to each other.

Mr. Rasch suggested a small notch.

Mr. Barrow thought that this was a better solution than the stone and it is a more pronounced separation.

Mr. Curry offered to create an offset of 4 inches and then set it back 2 inches, so it would read independently.

Mr. Barrow thought that would be great with two different stuccos. The significant should be different than the contributing building.

Ms. Shapiro asked if stucco could fill the crack in the future.

Mr. Rasch preferred the notch be significant enough that it cannot be patched over. He said the exception left out was item 3.

Mr. Curry responded by stating that his understanding is that the inability of the owners to make this modification would significantly diminish the livability and usability in this district. The second floor bedroom is under 7 feet, so the last thing they wanted to do was raise the height. This gives the ability to improve the property so it is compatible with the rest of the neighborhood.

Ms. Walker said you can certainly say this is not taking away the uniqueness.

Guy Barnes, 832 El Caminito, was sworn. He asked what happens to the tree. He also wanted to know how much this exceeds the square footage

Mr. Curry said the tree stays.

Mr. Harris explained that unique to the situation they are not actually exceeding the footprint rule, but due to attaching the guesthouse they do exceed. He said they are not building the guest suite but the attachment makes it be an addition. The proposed addition is 338 square feet which does not exceed.

Mr. Barnes said visually it is difficult and he disagreed with the different stucco. He thinks if they are going to put something across the street it should appear to blend in. He agreed about the rock and hates to see that trend continue. There is an ugly wall at the back of the property and he requested they make it blend in.

Vice Chair Rios explained that the ordinance urges them to differentiate contributing and significant structures.

Mr. Barnes would prefer that be an architectural difference rather than a color change. He lives 60 feet away so he asked the applicant to be considerate in the remodel.

Vice Chair Rios pointed out that the applicant has to meet the two exceptions and setback.

Karen Walker left the meeting at this time.

Ms. Rios reviewed the items discussed.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H-08-069B with the following requirements. No rooftop appertances. Lighting brought back to staff. The connection between the significant and contributing buildings be an architectural connection 2-4 inches to create a visual seperation between the two and the connecting wall be stuccoed matching the contributing side and not be stone. The existing significant building be maintained as is regarding the stucco, but the contributing building and addition be distinguishable but compatible with the solution be brought to staff for review. He suggested the neighbor review that. He said they will require that it be distinguishable. He said regarding the exceptions the applicant has met particularly 3 and 5. He said regarding 6, he believes this is the least negative solution in this case. All the others are fine. He was not clear on the windows, Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. She added that one window on the torreon be rplaced on the south side and one window on the guesthouse will be replaced with divided light. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Barrow commented that the awards should change so they have additional awards commemorating important people in history. He thinks one award for Sara Melton is adequate.

Vice Chair Rios asked Mr. Rasch to remind the Board of this issue when it is the appropriate time such as sometime next March.

Mr. Barrow questioned the church property and percentages of height and elevation that were discussed at the last meeting. He recalls this used to be relational to the square foot percentages of the lot usage and the footprint of the building.

Mr. Rasch stated that 15% of new construction may be third story.

Mr. Barrow asked if this footprint was more or less than the existing footprint.

Ms. Brennan said it was addressed as proportionately the same.

Mr. Rasch stated that it is the new footprint and did not include the existing buildings.

Mr. Barrow wanted to advance the proposal to look at amending the ordinance about fences, walls and gates. He said this is simple work and he has provided a proposal. He said in many areas historically there are no walls, fences or gates, so they should be denied.

Mr. Rasch stated that currently the guidelines allow staff to do up to 4 feet on any property.

Mr. Barrow reviewed the items that should be addressed in the wall, gate and fence regulations.

Ms. Shapiro said only allowing a certain percentage on a street could be considered infringing on the rights.

Ms. Brennan agreed that could be legally difficult. She thought it better to rely on scale and massing tools.

Ms. Shapiro said this also enters the discussion of security because the police cannot secure all these houses. She said there have been tons of break-ins, although she is doubtful that gates and walls actually protect residents.

There was agreement to begin working on this issue and rewrite the regulations.

L. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further matters to come before the Board, and the Board having completed its agenda, Mr. Barrow moved, seconded by Ms. Shapiro to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote and the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Approved by:

Chair Sharon Woods

Submitted by:



Denise Cox, Stenographer