



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3/16/16 TIME 11:40

SERVED BY J. M. Ruller

RECEIVED BY Melanie Byers

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, March 22, 2016 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, March 22, 2016 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

\*\*\*AMENDED\*\*\*

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 8, 2016
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-012A. 314 N. Guadalupe Street.

Case #H-16-014. 718 Gregory Lane.

Case #H-16-015B. 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-017. 587 Camino Del Monte Sol.

Case #H-16-013. 164 East Houghton Street.

Case #H-16-015A. 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-016. 500 Camino Rancheros.

- F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- G. COMMUNICATIONS
- H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-16-006. 282 Calle Juanita. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Praxis Design Build, agent for Frank Schneider, owner, proposes to construct a 3,585 sq. ft. residential building to the maximum allowable height of 16'6" and yardwalls and fences to the maximum allowable height of 6'. Three exceptions are requested to Santa Fe style (Section 14-5.2(E)), windows to exceed the 30" lite standard (Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(c)), and openings closer than 3' to a corner (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(b)). (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-16-002B. 450 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. McDowell Fine Homes, agents for Joe Esposito, owner, proposes to demolish two non-contributing accessory structures and remodel a contributing residential structure by removing all post 1958 additions. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-15-042. 355 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Catherine Fletcher-Lerich, agent for John and Marybeth Wolf, owners, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure by removing a historic portal, bay window, and standing seam roof and to construct a 6' high wrought iron fence. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-16-018. 128 and 128A Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman owner/agent, proposes to construct a 1,315 sq. ft. residential structure and a 1,006 sq. ft. guest house to the maximum allowable height of 13'8", a 234 sq. ft. carport, and a 6' high board fence with gate. (Sobia Sayeda)
5. Case #H-16-019. 1340 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Naktin, agent for David and Heather Weir, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure with a 249 sq. ft. addition and to reduce the size of one window. (Sobia Sayeda)
6. Case #H-16-021. 829 Allendale Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas Gray, agent for Paul and Ellen Biderman, owners, proposes to install solar panels on a contributing residential structure and screen them from public view with synthetic fabric. (David Rasch)

7. Case #H-16-021. 829 Allendale Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas Gray, agent for Paul and Ellen Biderman, owners, proposes to install solar panels on a contributing residential structure and screen them from public view with synthetic fabric. (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-16-022. 100 Pena Place. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Scott and Maika Wong, agents/owners, propose to construct a 1,308 sq. ft. residential structure to a height of 13'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'8" and yardwalls to the maximum allowable heights of 49" and 6' on a vacant lot. (Sobia Sayeda)
9. Case #H-16-023A. 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners request a historic status review of a non-contributing residential structure. (Sobia Sayeda)
10. Case #H-16-023B. 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners propose to remodel a non-contributing residential structure including a 331 sq. ft. addition and two portals totaling 429 sq. ft. to the maximum height of 13'10", a 377 sq. ft. deck, and replacing all windows. (Sobia Sayeda)

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check <http://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board-hearing-packets> for more information regarding cases on this agenda.



# Agenda

DATE 3/3/16 TIME 3:59 PM

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, March 22, 2016 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, March 22, 2016 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 8, 2016
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-012A, 314 N. Guadalupe Street.

Case #H-16-014, 718 Gregory Lane.

Case #H-16-015B, 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-017, 587 Camino Del Monte Sol.

Case #H-16-013, 164 East Houghton Street.

Case #H-16-015A, 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-016, 500 Camino Rancheros.

- F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- G. COMMUNICATIONS
- H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-16-006, 282 Calle Juanita. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Praxis Design Build, agent for Frank Schneider, owner, proposes to construct a 3,585 sq. ft. residential building to the maximum allowable height of 16'6" and yardwalls and fences to the maximum allowable height of 6'. Three exceptions are requested to Santa Fe style (Section 14-5.2(E)), windows to exceed the 30" lite standard (Section 14-5.2(E)(l)(c)), and openings closer than 3' to a corner (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(b)). (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-16-002B, 450 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. McDowell Fine Homes, agents for Joe Esposito, owner, proposes to demolish two non-contributing accessory structures and remodel a contributing residential structure by removing all post 1958 additions. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-15-042, 355 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Catherine Fletcher-Lerliche, agent for John and Marybeth Wolf, owners, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure by removing a historic portal, bay window, and standing seam roof and to construct a 6' high wrought iron fence. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-16-018, 128 and 128A Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman owner/agent, proposes to construct a 1,315 sq. ft. residential structure and a 1,006 sq. ft. guest house to the maximum allowable height of 13'8", a 234 sq. ft. carport, and a 6' high board fence with gate. (Sobia Sayeda)
5. Case #H-16-019, 1340 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Naktin, agent for David and Heather Weir, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure with a 249 sq. ft. addition and to reduce the size of one window. (Sobia Sayeda)
6. Case #H-16-020, 618 East Alameda Street Units A&B. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lisa Roach, agent for Susan Clain, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence and contributing guest house by connecting the two structures with a 328 sq. ft. addition, constructing a 99 sq. ft. addition and a 233 sq. ft. carport. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation (section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)). (David Rasch)

7. **Case #H-16-022**, 100 Pena Place. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Scott and Maika Wong, agents/owners, propose to construct a 1,308 sq. ft. residential structure to a height of 13'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'8" and yardwalls to the maximum allowable heights of 49" and 6' on a vacant lot. (Sobia Sayeda)
8. **Case #H-16-023A**, 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners request a historic status review of a non-contributing residential structure. (Sobia Sayeda)
9. **Case #H-16-023B**, 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners propose to remodel a non-contributing residential structure including a 331 sq. ft. addition and two portals totaling 429 sq. ft. to the maximum height of 13'10", a 377 sq. ft. deck, and replacing all windows. (Sobia Sayeda)
10. **Case #H-16-020**, 618 East Alameda Street Units A&B. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lisa Roach, agent for Susan Clain, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence and contributing guest house by connecting the two structures with a 328 sq. ft. addition, constructing a 99 sq. ft. addition and a 233 sq. ft. carport. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation (section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)). (David Rasch)

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check <http://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board-hearing-packets> for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**

March 22, 2016

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
D. Approval of Minutes March 8, 2016	Approved as amended	2
E. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2-3
F. Business from the Floor	None	3
G. Communications	Comments	3
H. Action Items		
1. <b><u>Case #H-16-006.</u></b> 282 Calle Juanita	Approved with conditions	3-10
2. <b><u>Case #H-16-002B.</u></b> 450 Camino Monte Vista	Approved with conditions	10-14
3. <b><u>Case #H-15-042.</u></b> 355 East Palace Avenue	Approved as submitted	14-22
4. <b><u>Case #H-16-018.</u></b> 128 and 128A Quintana Street	Approved as recommended	22-24
5. <b><u>Case #H-16-019.</u></b> 1340 Canyon Road	Approved as recommended	24-25
6. <b><u>Case #H-16-021.</u></b> 829 Allendale Street	Approved with conditions	25-29
7. <b><u>Case #H-16-022.</u></b> 100 Peña Place	Approved with conditions	29-32
8. <b><u>Case #H-16-023A.</u></b> 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio	Designated non-contributing	32-33
9. <b><u>Case #H-16-023B.</u></b> 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio	Approved with conditions	33-34
10. <b><u>Case #H-16-020.</u></b> 618 East Alameda Street Units A&B	Approved with conditions	35-38
I. Matters from the Board	Comments	39
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:48 p.m.	39

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FÉ**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**

**March 22, 2016**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair, on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair  
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair  
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Mr. William Powell  
Mr. Buddy Roybal

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Ms. Meghan Bayer

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Ms. Sobia Sayeda, Planner Technician Senior  
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Nicole Thomas, Senior Planner  
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**

**Member Biedscheid moved to approve the agenda as presented. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 8, 2016**

Member Boniface requested the following changes:

On page 8, 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph, to change the words "property line" to "site plan."

On page 19, 11<sup>th</sup> paragraph, to insert "of unnecessary work and responsibility" between "lot" and "on."

Member Biedscheid requested the following change:

On page 21, first paragraph, the name should be Kate Chapman, not Kay Chapman.

Chair Rios requested the following changes:

On page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, it should say "here," not "there." but here. At the end of the sentence should be added ", that is a hardship."

On page 4, at the top, the first sentence should read, "Chair Rios asked Ms. Gheen if she said the City Council passed a resolution that stated staff should be sworn in." "Ms. Gheen said she did not say that."

**Member Roybal moved to approve the minutes of March 8, 2016 as amended. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote except for Member Katz who abstained.**

**E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Case #H-16-015A. 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-015B. 513 Plaza Balentine.

Case #H-16-016. 500 Camino Rancheros.

Case #H-16-012A. 314 N. Guadalupe Street.

Note: Case #H-16-013 164 East Houghton Street, Case #H-16-014 718 Gregory Lane, and Case #H-16-017 587 Camino Del Monte Sol were also listed on the agenda but were excluded from consideration by the Board as Ms. Gheen explained those cases do not yet have a final Board

decision.

**Member Boniface moved to approve these four Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote except for Member Katz, who abstained.**

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

There was no business from the floor.

#### **G. COMMUNICATIONS**

Ms. Gheen said there are two appeals for Case #H-13-095 at 321-325 San Francisco regarding the zig zag courtyard fence. The other appeal is Case - #H-15-100 regarding the vehicle gate on Canyon Road and they are slated to be heard April 13.

Mr. Rasch announced the nominating form for historic preservation awards is available on the City web page with other information. Nominations due on or before April 1. The ceremony will be held at La Fonda on May 19<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. He briefly reviewed the categories.

Mr. Rasch recalled that on San Francisco Plaza, the Board denied the zig zag wall across the courtyard. Staff can approve such a wall up to 4' high and if they come back with new design, he wanted the Board's advice if the application could be approved by staff or should be brought to the Board.

Chair Rios asked that it come to the Board.

#### **H. ACTION ITEMS**

Chair Rios said public comment is limited to 2 minutes each.

1. **Case #H-16-006. 282 Calle Juanita.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Praxis Design Build, agent for Frank Schneider, owner, proposes to construct a 3,585 sq. ft. residential building to the maximum allowable height of 16'6" and yardwalls and fences to the maximum allowable height of 6'. Three exceptions are requested to Santa Fe style (Section 14-5.2(E)), windows to exceed the 30" lite standard (Section 14-5.2(E)(l)(c)), and openings closer than 3' to a corner (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(b)). (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:



## **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

282 Calle Juanita is a vacant lot at the end of the drive in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following three items.

On February 9, 2016, the HDRB denied an exception to construct a single-family residence not in Santa Fe Style and to approve fencing along the north lotline and walls along the south and west lotlines. Now, the applicant has redesigned the structure and proposes to remodel the property with additional alterations.

1. A 2,193 square foot primary residence, a 659 square foot two-car garage, a 378 square foot casita, and a 355 square foot portal will be constructed to the maximum allowable height of 16' 6". The building is designed in a simplified Recent Santa Fe Style with some rather contemporary details such as steel I-beam for a portal header and an entry door canopy and windows that do not have divided-lites and are long and narrow, which are perhaps not in one of the "old Santa Fe styles."
2. Coyote fence at 6' high will be constructed along the west lotline and the western portion of the south lotline.
3. A steel vehicle gate will be installed, but no scaled drawings were submitted.

## **RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS**

### **14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards**

#### **(2) Recent Santa Fe Style**

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

- (a) No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks or other design elements;
- (b) The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;
- (c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;
- (d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;

(e) The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls **shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles (bold added for emphasis by staff)**; except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic; and

(f) Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

## PREVIOUS HEARING

### EXCEPTION TO SANTA FE STYLE with 30" WINDOW and 3' CORNER STANDARDS

(i) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*;

The proposed design does not damage the character of the streetscape. This house is visible from East Alameda and all of the portions of the home visible from East Alameda meet the historic design criteria. The back of the property runs along Cerro Gordo Rd, but this portion of Cerro Gordo Rd is 23' above the floor elevation of the proposed 16' tall home. This portion of Cerro Gordo is fairly narrow and has no sidewalk. There does not appear to be sufficient right of way for a sidewalk to be added in the future. This property currently has a wall and fence along Cerro Gordo and as part of our design submission, we are proposing to make the top part of this fence opaque by replacing the open hog fencing with coyote pickets. With the fence in place, the design elements which require an exception will not be visible from a public way.

Staff responses: Staff disagrees with this statement. The south elevation, visible from the public way, is not complying with the 3' corner and 30" window standards or traditional window styles.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare;

Making an exception to these three elements of the Recent Santa Fe style prevents a hardship to the applicant and an injury to the public welfare. The exceptions would allow the applicant to move forward with his plans to build a beautiful building.

Staff responses: Staff disagrees with this statement. No hardship has been presented.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the *city* by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts;

The proposed design strengthens the unique heterogeneous character of the city by allowing for a design solution which is unique, historically appropriate and heterogeneous. This is the design approach that has grown around this client and this project avoiding repetition and imitation.

Staff responses: Staff agrees with this statement. The Board needs to find that the design is harmonious to traditional design.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or *structure* involved and which are not applicable to other lands or *structures* in the related *streetscape*;

As discussed above, this property is located 23' below Cerro Gordo Rd. and will be fenced with an uninterrupted coyote and stone fence. These unique characteristics make is such that, for all practical purposes, the property is not visible from Cerro Gordo.

Staff responses: Staff disagrees with this statement. Other structures on the south side of Cerro Gordo are not visible from the street in a similar manner.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; and

The relative elevation of the road and the buildable area of the site are circumstances that were created many, many years ago and have nothing to do with the actions of this applicant.

Staff responses: Staff disagrees with this statement. The elevation of Cerro Gordo and the buildable area of the lot are not the reason for this exception to Santa Fe Style.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

It has been the staff's position that this building will be visible from Cerro Gordo. The staff is not allowed to recognize the fence of the vegetation which screen the house from the road, but the HDRB can and should recognize that in this case the house will not be visible from Cerro Gordo and so the rules which apply to publically visible portions of the building should not be applied here. In the final result, the building will not be visible and so making these exceptions and approving this design creates the least negative impact on the view from the public way as outlined in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff responses: Staff disagrees with this statement. The building is visible from Calle Juanita, a public way.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application, as it meets the intention of Recent Santa Fe Style standards which complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios noted Mr. Rasch said this house meets the intent of Santa Fe Style and asked if it meets the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Rasch said the ordinance does say that windows shall be in one of the old Santa Fé styles. He is relying on the Board's judgment. He pointed out the long narrow window design he was questioning.

Chair Rios asked what is publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch said the south is visible. The north is visible from Cerro Gordo. The west is not visible at all.

Member Biedscheid asked if the distance from the corner to the window at the garage (page 20) would require an exception since it is less than three feet.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Member Katz asked which of the windows was not in a Santa Fe style.

Mr. Rasch said it is the narrow window.

Member Katz pointed out that particular window is the most visible window in the whole building.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Fernando Garcia, 3095 Jemez Road, was sworn. He explained that they were here last time for the 36" rule, overhang supports and Santa Fé Style. He said all windows have been shifted 3' away from corners.

He said he was not at liberty to make any changes but can answer questions for the new design. If something is unacceptable to the Board, he would ask for the case to be tabled to the next meeting.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked if the corners will be sharp.

Mr. Garcia agreed. They will be sharp.

Member Powell asked if the Board could require the garage window now at 2' 9" from the corner to be changed to 36".

Member Powell asked if there was any reason for the long narrow window.

Mr. Garcia said it was just for aesthetics.

Mr. Rasch referred to the floor plan on page 23 and said it is at a seating area.

Chair Rios asked why his client chose steel instead of wood.

Mr. Garcia said they were striving for a more contemporary, modern look and were hoping to keep the steel.

Mr. Rasch said the steel is on the header of the portal and the entry door canopy.

Member Katz noted that it is hidden by the casita.

Mr. Rasch thought the canopy might be visible from Cerro Gordo.

Member Katz asked if there is a rule about how far out something like that can protrude.

Mr. Rasch said there are three rules of thumb. Cantilevered eyebrows can be up to 18" deep. Beyond 18" requires a support like a corbel or bracket. Once the depth reaches 4' it requires a vertical post.

#### Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. Randy Bell, 314 Garcia Street. He said he didn't come to speak to this but was troubled with the new style concept allowing steel into architecture on the east side. He was not aware that the ordinance has been changed nor that an administrative rule suddenly has deemed this as appropriate. So he asked under what language steel beams are allowed in new Santa Fé style.

Mr. Rasch said the ordinance has not changed but strangely, it doesn't say that wood is required or that steel is not allowed. It must have similarity of details. Often in other districts, for walls and fences it specifies what is allowed and what is not but not for the Downtown and East Side District.

Mr. Bell said that harmonizing with traditional materials would not encompass large, very contemporary, visible metal beams. He knew the Board did approve one that has not been built yet but that is the only time in decades that he had ever seen one, especially with this amount of steel. He strongly disagreed with this new interpretation.

Also, hard edges have been strongly discouraged. They are not in keeping with traditional Santa Fé Style.

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

### Board Discussion

Member Roybal asked Mr. Rasch to address the corners.

Mr. Rasch said Territorial has sharper corners than Pueblo. There is nothing in the ordinance to specify corner radii. The Board is usually approving about a 2" radius.

Member Katz said in recent Santa Fé style, the Code says it shall be "like adobe."

Chair Rios added that it also says, "achieve harmony with buildings in Historic Districts. But this is still very contemporary. The applicant indicated he would be willing to come back with any suggestions the Board has.

Member Biedscheid noted that harmony does include some variation; not matching. The old loses the characteristic charm to be preserved. Contemporary materials should be something to consider.

Member Boniface agreed. Otherwise the Board is just looking at cookie-cutter designs. It takes away from true historic fabric already here with fake pseudo adobe. Territorial style is square edged like brick. There are great old Territorial buildings made out of brick.

Member Powell thought buildings should reflect their time. The essential tenets are really important. Bricks were marvels at the time. We run the risk of losing validity. The windows, to him, should be changed (from what it proposed).

Member Katz agreed with Member Biedscheid about the cookie cutters. He didn't have trouble with the steel because it is rather hidden, but that one window is troubling because it is so prominent and "in your face."

Chair Rios commented that in 1957, we got the ordinance and it was clear in what we should follow. Everyone knows what Santa Fé Style is and it is not having a contemporary look.

Member Roybal asked if this is harmonious with other houses in the area.

Mr. Rasch said the way it harmonizes with streetscape is definitely the Board's jurisdiction - not a staff decision. But in his opinion, if it has brown stucco, room block massing, smaller openings to wall areas, there is a lot of harmony there. But getting into the details, is a steel beam like a wood beam and are narrow window in harmony with traditional windows? Even John Gaw Meem did things that were not typical. The buildings around it are very traditional in style.

Chair Rios countered that just because it is brown and has windows doesn't mean it is harmonious.

### Action of the Board

**Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-16-006 at 282 Calle Juanita to have a finding that it is harmonious and to approve the application with the condition that the south elevation window on the garage door is moved to 3' from the corner. Member Roybal seconded the motion**

**Member Powell asked for a friendly amendment to change the narrow window. Member Biedscheid did not accept it as friendly.**

**Member Boniface asked for a friendly amendment that there be no visible rooftop appurtenance or visible skylights from Juanita Lane and Alameda (leaving out Cerro Gordo). Member Biedscheid accepted the amendment as friendly and the motion passed by majority (3-2) voice vote with Member Katz and Member Powell dissenting.**

- 2. Case #H-16-002B. 450 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. McDowell Fine Homes, agents for Joe Esposito, owner, proposes to demolish two non-contributing accessory structures and remodel a contributing residential structure by removing all post 1958 additions. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch).**

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

450 Camino Monte Vista is a single-family residential structure that was constructed before 1949 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building features rounded and battered walls, exposed wooden headers, an inset portal on the north, a sculpted fireplace and chimney on the west, and historic windows. The north elevation garage door has been sensitively infilled. A series of three additions have greatly expanded the footprint and a Cultural Properties Inventory from 2007 suggests a range of dates for the additions without substantiating the source of the estimated dates. A 1966 aerial image of the property shows that the east and south additions were in place by that time, while the last addition on the south is not of historic construction date. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the original north and west elevations are designated as primary, excluding the additions.

Two free-standing sheds on the south side of the residence do not appear on the 1966 aerial image and are therefore of non-historic date of construction. These structures are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The single-lite picture window with flanking 8-lite sidelight casements on the north, primary elevation will be removed and replaced with two 6-over-6 windows in the same location with the existing height and lowered sills. These replacement windows match the existing historic windows

on the primary west elevation. No professional assessment has been provided regarding the window preservation and an exception is requested to remove historic materials (14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)) and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.

2. The two 4-light casement windows on the wooden garage door infill will be removed and replaced with one 6-over-6 window in a changed opening location and surrounded by a recessed stuccoed wall. No professional assessment has been provided regarding the window preservation and an exception is requested to remove historic materials (14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)) and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.
3. All additions to the original footprint will be removed in addition to removing roof-mounted solar panels. The resulting east elevation will have two 6-over-6 windows and one smaller 6-over-6 window. The northernmost window is less than 3' to the corner on a publicly-visible elevation and an exception has not been requested. The resulting south elevation will have three windows and a pedestrian door.
4. The two non-contributing free-standing sheds will be demolished. The demolition standards have been met.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the exception request to remove historic material has not been met and staff recommends that the proposed non-compliant window on the east elevation shall be moved to provide a 3' corner or an exception request shall be requested. Otherwise, staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked how old the picture window is.

Mr. Rasch didn't know but it could be approximately 50 years old.

Chair Rios asked for the measurements for the northernmost window to the corner.

Mr. Rasch said it is nearly 3'.

Member Biedscheid understood the north and west elevations are primary and asked what character-defining features they had.

Mr. Rasch said the west elevation has an exterior chimney mass and with flanking historic windows. On the north, it has massing of the portal with buttresses on the side. The picture window is a character-defining



feature as well.

Member Biedscheid asked, if windows were all the same, if the primary façade would include the portal.

Mr. Rasch agreed. If the Board approves of the exception to remove the historic window, he didn't think it would downgrade that elevation.

### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Douglas McDowell, 1317 B Cerro Gordo, who recalled they were talking about replacing that window and also doing something with the old garage door. But even though it was suggested that was a good idea, it was mentioned it would be nice to restore those windows. So even though we discussed it, it was not part of the motion. So it made him consider for the future that, because it wasn't made part of the motion, it was not made part of the record.

Regarding more information about the age of the window, he didn't have any. He did cut into the window on the outside and the inside and determined that the header is of a totally different material on the picture window. It is approximately 8-10" higher than the window on the west side, which is the original six over six window. It was blocked up with brick material that was totally different than the block construction of the rest of the building. It was red bricks put in roughly. The 8" is also the sill height difference, higher in the picture window and the windows on the portal and the window in the living room and the window in the bedrooms. So there appears to be a consistency of head height and sill height and window type throughout the historic part of the building. It was clear in excavating the top and the sides and bottom of this window, that it had been filled up with concrete, the new header had been blocked up with brick and an attempt was made to make a window with more of a view for them.

He understands that just because it wasn't part of original building doesn't mean it is not historic. And the fact that putting it back makes it look better might be subjective. Maybe part of that off kilter look is just part of the nature of the east side.

But having said that, he thought being true to the spirit of this building and doing the excavations into the wall, they end up with a building that has more historic significance by putting those two windows in instead of this window that is so different from the rest.

The garage door is an old beat up door but still could be a historic feature. So he planned to recess that stucco around the new window the same as the other windows in the house in order to acknowledge that garage door was there at some time. He wasn't aware the window on the east side was less than 3' from the corner and will adjust it.

He felt strongly that what they ended up is a more finely tuned interpretation of what it was originally.

### Questions to the Applicant

Member Roybal asked what the overall condition of the house and windows is.

Mr. McDowell said the windows are all single pane wood double-hung and some will need to be rebuilt and the new windows will be single pane wood windows with storm windows to match the existing historic windows. The house otherwise is in good condition. It needs new stucco and a new roof but isn't falling down.

Member Boniface said on page 24, there is a photograph of the chiseling into the wall and asked if that is on the north elevation.

Mr. McDowell agreed. That is the picture window.

Member Boniface asked if it is new construction above and the original construction below.

Mr. McDowell agreed.

Member Boniface noted that page 18 has handwritten notes. He asked if Mr. McDowell's intent is to leave the lintel where it is or lower it.

Mr. McDowell said he intends to put in a new lintel to match height of the others in the living room and the same sill height as the others in the living room.

Chair Rios thought he should save the picture window because it reflects a certain time and place. The rest is okay but to her that reflects the window of time and place.

Mr. McDowell said he would agree that just because it is different doesn't make it bad. But it is newer than the rest and installation was very substandard.

Member Biedscheid said it seems we are not certain it is historic. The HCPI describes it. She wished they had a photo of the restoration of old windows. We don't know if was originally two windows. So it might be worth retaining the picture window.

Mr. McDowell felt it is a subjective decision whether that should be preserved.

### Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. John Eddy, 227 East Palace, Suite E, who said he was one who spoke up last time and really likes what he sees. It is taking a property, making it smaller, and improving it at the same time. That is what they accomplished here. His opinion is that the pair of windows on the west and brings it closer into harmony. He thought the picture window is an aberration.

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

#### Action of the Board

**Member Katz moved in Case #H-16-002B at 450 Camino Monte Vista, finding that the criteria for exception to remove historic material has been met, to approve the application as submitted with acknowledgment by the applicant that the three-foot rule of window to corner will be followed. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

3. **Case #H-15-042, 355 East Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Catherine Fletcher-Leriché, agent for John and Marybeth Wolf, owners, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure by removing a historic portal, bay window, and standing seam roof and to construct a 6' high wrought iron fence. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

355 East Palace Avenue, known as the Francisca Hinojos House, is a single-family residence that was converted to office use in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. It was constructed in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Territorial style. The building was damaged by fire and substantial remnants of the building survive. The property contains two additional structures to the north of this structure: a casita and a garage. The casita, also known as 118 Martínez Street, was the kitchen for the Hinojos House in historic times. All three structures are listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The Hinojos House is a good example of the Americanization Period in Santa Fe's history, when we consciously imported eastern architectural styles in order to "look American". Subsequently, those efforts lead to our successful plea for statehood.

On April 10 and June 26, 2013, Historic Preservation Division staff granted administrative approvals to stockpile historic materials for reuse, shore up the damaged structure, and subsequently to fully restore the building by reconstructing the damaged portions and excerpts of those approvals are attached to this report. The restoration project was never initiated.

On April 28, 2015, the HDRB denied an exception request to demolish the contributing historic structure finding that the building represents an essential street section on both Martínez Street and East Palace Avenue.

The present owner removed the historic porch, the historic bay window, and the historic roof without approval or a permit. Now, the applicant requests approval to remodel the property with the following two

items:

1. The historic materials will be replaced in-kind and an exception is requested to remove the porch, bay window, and roof (14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a) and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.
2. A wrought iron fence will be constructed on the south side of the building at the maximum allowable height of 6'.

#### RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

##### 14-5.2(B) MINIMUM MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

All buildings and structures in the historic district over which the board has jurisdiction to determine whether a demolition permit should be approved or denied and all landmark structures over which the governing body has such jurisdiction shall be preserved against decay and deterioration and free from certain structural defects in the following manner, by the owner thereof or such other person or persons who may have the legal custody and control thereof. The owner or other person having legal custody and control thereof shall repair such building or structure if it is found to have any of the following defects:

- (1) Those which have parts thereof which are so attached that they may fall and injure members of the public or property;
- (2) Deteriorated or inadequate foundation;
- (3) Defective or deteriorated flooring or floor supports or flooring for floor supports of insufficient size to carry imposed loads with safety;
- (4) Members of walls, partitions or other vertical supports that split, lean, list or buckle due to defective material or deterioration;
- (5) Members of walls, partitions or other vertical supports that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads with safety;
- (6) Members of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports or other horizontal members which sag, split or buckle due to defective material or deterioration;
- (7) Members of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports or other horizontal members that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads with safety;
- (8) Fireplaces or chimneys which list, bulge or settle due to defective material or deterioration;
- (9) Fireplaces or chimneys which are of insufficient size or strength to carry imposed loads with safety;

(10) Deteriorated, crumbling or loose plaster;

(11) Deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, foundations or floors, including broken windows or doors;

(12) Defective or lack of weather protection for exterior wall covering, including lack of paint, or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering; or

(13) Any fault or default in the building or structure that renders the same structurally unsafe or not properly watertight.

#### 14-5.2(C) REGULATION OF CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

(a) Each structure to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken;

(b) Changes to structures that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most structures change over time;

(c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure be preserved.

#### 14-5.2(D) GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS FOR ALL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

In any review of proposed additions or alterations to structures that have been declared significant or contributing in any historic district or a landmark in any part of the city, the following standards shall be met:

(1) General

(a) The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.

(5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

(a) For all façades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary façades of contributing structures:

(i) Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal

double pane glass may be used. No opening shall be widened or narrowed.

(ii) No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.

(iii) No existing opening shall be closed.

(b) For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures, architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.

#### EXCEPTION TO REMOVE HISTORIC MATERIAL (14-5.2(D)(1)(a) and (5)(a))

*(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;*

**Response:** The catastrophic fire has negatively affected the character of the Palace Avenue and Martínez Street streetscapes; which effects are ongoing. The complete restoration in-kind of the structure will restore the character of these streetscapes as close as possible to their pre-fire condition and removal of the remains of the porch, bay window and roof is necessary for this to be accomplished.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

*(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;*

**Response:** The public welfare was injured when the fire occurred. The condition of the remaining structure and the regulatory framework constitute substantial challenges, along with the major investment necessary to achieve the complete restoration in-kind of the structure that the Applicants propose. Due to their condition, removal of the porch, bay window and roof is necessary and granting the requested exceptions will facilitate completion of the restoration that will enable the Applicants to occupy the structure and eliminate the ongoing injury to the public welfare until the restoration is complete.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. There was no professional assessment performed regarding the preservation of these items before their removal.

*(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts;*

**Response:** Achieving the proposed complete restoration in-kind of the structure will strengthen the character of the Palace and Martínez streetscapes. Removal and in-kind replacement of the porch, bay windows and roof are necessary for this to occur.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. Again, the necessity for removal has not been established.

*(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;*

**Response:** The conditions giving rise to the exception request resulted from the catastrophic fire, which fortunately affected only the Property and not neighboring structures.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; and

**Response:** The catastrophic fire giving rise to the exception request was not a result of the actions of the Applicants.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The applicant is responsible for the professional assessment of historic materials before removal and the applicant is responsible for the removal of these materials.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

The Applicants have gone to great lengths to preserve the portions of the structure that can viably be integrated into the complete restoration in-kind of the structure.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The least negative impact would have been to preserve as much historic material as possible. This additional removal after the fire damage may have caused the structure to lose its contributing status.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the exception request to remove historic material has not been met and a historic status review due to loss of historic integrity may be necessary. However, if the Board finds that the exception criteria have been met to remove historic material, then the contributing status shall be preserved. In addition, staff recommends approval of the fence which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios said under the first owner, Staff gave administrative approval. She asked if that was because of the emergency nature of the circumstance.

Mr. Rasch said no. He and the Land Use Director saw it as maintenance and repair in kind.

Chair Rios said the present owner took off the historic material. She asked if they retained it.

Mr. Rasch didn't know if they retained it but the applicant is willing to talk about their very detailed documentation of that material - measurements and such - so that they can reproduce it truly in kind.

Member Roybal asked if there was fire damage of that material.

Mr. Rasch said the photo of the porch looks like there was no damage. It looks like it is in perfect condition, so he didn't quite understand.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Karl Sommer, P.O. Box 2476, Santa Fe, representing the owners.

He said the applicant doesn't request any change in status. It retains a great deal of the integrity of those walls that are more than 100 years old are being preserved. The significance of this property is also associated with important elements of our history; namely, the Cathedral, the artisans, the materials used on the property and the adobes have a significance with the Hinojos family. So there is no desire to downgrade this house.

The fire largely destroyed the property and it sat for a long time and the Trust that owned it struggled with what to do. The Trust had hired Mr. Sommer to appeal the denial of demolition because they firmly believed no restoration was possible. It was at the last moment that John Wolf, who has 45 years' experience in high quality construction in this community, and his wife decided this property would be perfect for them to live in and were willing to pour into it their resources to restore it and avoid its demolition. Ms. Wolf loves the property, but also, they felt this was an important part of the downtown area that deserved restoration. In the minutes of the hearing on the demolition, there was a lot of talk about restoration of this property and doing everything possible to restore this property.

The Board saw the quality of the building after the fire and the damage by the fire and water.

Mr. Sommer said Mr. Wolf and his architect and foreman are here. They could address the condition of the property now.

The bottom line, however, is that Mr. Wolf decided a permit was in place that included removing windows completely and replacing them. The permit was for a commercial building. "It implied a great deal of removal of materials." That removal involved the removal of historic materials. That permit was converted by Mr. Wolf into a residential permit and that's why they are in front of the Board to ask approval of it.

The Staff Report said there was no professional assessment done of the materials on-site. But Mr. Wolf and Ms. Leriche can tell the Board what the condition of that property was. These plans are a complete and almost identical restoration of this property - almost every single detail.

The Board will hear about the bay window on the east façade. "It's date of construction is not known. That bay window was tacked onto the outside of the building and resting in the dirt. And the framing of it was of more recent construction - probably the 1980's. So that bay window, which is now gone, is very



different from the bay window you see right in front. That bay window sits on a rock/stone foundation that is of material like the stone that was used on the Cathedral and used on the wall. That has been completely preserved and Mr. Wolf is in the process of restoring that in every respect. It has been shored up. It has been cleaned up. And they are in the process of doing that. That portion of the building was a character-defining feature and probably as old as that building."

He said the other bay window there has a significant question about its date and clearly, was not built as part of the original building. It was not sitting on a foundation but on dirt - framing on dirt with 2x4s.

Regarding the porch, the engineers all advised that the porch was unstable, was coming down, and the posts were not structurally safe and had to be removed. Those materials were demolished and gone.

Mr. Sommer said, "We are here asking you to allow Mr. Wolf to do what he and his wife saw as a vision. And that is the complete restoration of this property to what it looked like, prior to the fire and to replace the material in-kind - wood, and the kind of roof - the standing seam roof. You can't get the same kind that was there - and to rebuild this so that what the comments at the demolition hearing were - that this building should be restored and the Wolfs agree with that.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Member Roybal noted it is contributing at this point. He asked how the new materials add to the contributing status.

Mr. Rasch said that is the current dilemma. If the Board approves the exception to remove historic material, by default, you are saying you recognize it is a contributing historic building. But the definition of an historic contributing building is that it has historic integrity and the Board hasn't yet heard any kind of assessment for how much of the exterior remains integral to the contributing historic building. We just don't know the percentage of historic integrity.

Member Roybal asked if changing its status would help get it done.

Mr. Rasch didn't think historic status was a hindrance.

Mr. Sommer said this building is not just important with materials but has a very important association with cultural history of this town. You drove by and saw the historic original walls that are there and the materials from the cathedral stone. Those remain and justify keeping it contributing. Most of the historic adobe is still there and it will always have that association.

Chair Rios asked what percent of the original building remains.

Mr. Sommer didn't know.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Wolf, 984 Acequia Madre, who said that 100% of the walls are left and he went to great expense to stabilize them and put up a bond beam to that end. He has saved all the walls. The east wall bay windows were made from fiberglass and fiberglass only became available in the 1980s. He was not going to put the aluminum back in either.

Member Katz was confused about the bay window.

Mr. Wolf said it is there. He removed all the lead paint and spent \$7,000 to remove it.

Mr. Sommer said the plastic is protecting it.

Mr. Wolf said he has a picture from 1890 and that bay window on east was not there

Member Roybal asked when he puts the porch back, if it would be exactly as before.

Mr. Wolf agreed. The fire raged down main corridor and went up into the ceiling of the porch. When we started to remove the soffit, it was all charred wood. What was holding it up was 1x wood that was covered with lead. There were lead pools after the fire. Everything was covered with lead.

He commended that construction techniques were very toxic 150 years ago. It is stabilized now.

Chair Rios asked if he had a record of all dimensions.

Mr. Wolf agreed. He said Richard Martínez had measurements that were out of scale. Katherine Leriche went and measured everything so we have accurately represented what was there. Susan from the Bank Trust got it done before it all went.

Chair Rios asked what the timeline would be.

Mr. Wolf said he would like to move in by October.

#### Public Comment

Mr. John Eddy (previously sworn), said he is speaking in support of this project. He agreed that the bay window needed to go and it is great to see the trim restored in this project.

Mr. Randy Bell (previously sworn) thought that many people in the community felt this house is not being demolished. As a matter of preservation policy, especially with a property of this importance. Even though he understood components of the porch were damaged but the visual elements of the porch were still there and he was shocked that the historic material was all thrown away. He thought that should have been preserved. It is in accord with the administrative approval previously granted. The applicant should have brought the desire to demolish it before doing that. He applauded Mr. Wolf for what he is doing and all

the cost involved. When you replace something in-kind, it is no longer historic.

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

#### Board Discussion

Member Roybal was concerned, if they had that much lead, it was actually toxic so some of those materials should have been removed. He spent money on those that could have been saved. He was trying to justify that removal.

Mr. Rasch said there was no report submitted for lead contamination so he couldn't respond.

Chair Rios asked if Staff going to monitor the work.

Mr. Rasch said there have been two inspection reports from his office but many others will be going on.

Chair Rios commended Mr. Wolf for preserving it.

Mr. Wolf said it does have a wonderful heritage and is quite wonderful.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Roybal moved in Case #H-15-042 at 355 East Palace Avenue to approve the application; that all criteria for exceptions have been met and the applicant is doing what needs to be done to preserve it. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 4. Case #H-16-018. 128 and 128A Quintana Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriaman owner/agent, proposes to construct a 1,315 sq. ft. residential structure and a 1,006 sq. ft. guest house to the maximum allowable height of 13'8", a 234 sq. ft. carport, and a 6' high board fence with gate. (Sóbia Sayeda)

Ms. Sayeda gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

128 and 128 A Quintana Street is a 5,572 Sq. Ft. vacant lot in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant proposes to build a 1,315 Sq. Ft. single family residence with a 2 car garage, a 1,165 Sq. Ft. guest house with a 115 Sq. Ft. partially covered carport to a maximum allowable height of 13'-8".

The main residence is designed in Spanish-Pueblo Revival style featuring room-block massing, rounded edges, an entry portal with pro-panel roof "white" color, exposed wooden elements including exposed beams, carved corbels. Wood entry door and other wooden elements are stained medium to light stain, the windows and doors are white trim color. Stucco to be cementitious "Straw" color. Garage door is painted to match stucco "Straw" color.

The guest house is designed in Spanish-Pueblo Revival style featuring room-block massing, rounded edges, a rear portal with pro-panel roof, exposed wooden elements including exposed beams, carved corbels and one viga post. Wood entry door and other wooden elements are stained medium to light stain, the windows and doors are white trim color. Stucco to be cementitious "Adobe" color.

A 115 Sq. Ft. partially covered carport at guest house entry has exposed wooden elements stained medium to light brown with pro-panel roof "white" color.

A board fence and gate at the East elevation at 4' height, painted "White" color.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Standards.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked if there was already an existing stone wall on this property.

Ms. Sayeda agreed.

#### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Ms. Veronica Angriman, 126 Quintana, who said Ms. Sayeda said it all.

#### **Questions to the Applicant**

Chair Rios asked if on the north elevation, that is a window.

Ms. Angriman agreed. It is behind the existing wall.

Chair Rios thought it seemed awfully low.

Ms. Angriman agreed. It is just for light and nothing else to see.

Chair Rios asked if there would be anything on the roof.

Ms. Angriman there will be one skylight but covered by the parapet. The building has two mechanical rooms.

#### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Katz moved in Case #H-16-018 at 128 and 128A Quintana Street to approve the application as recommended by staff. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Member Boniface recused himself for the next case and left the room.

- 5. Case #H-16-019. 1340 Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Naktin, agent for David and Heather Weir, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure with a 249 sq. ft. addition and to reduce the size of one window. (Sóbia Sayeda)

Ms. Sayeda gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1340 Canyon Road is approximately 3,754 Sq. Ft. single family residence, originally a log cabin built in 1920's with substantial additions to the East and West side in 1983. The additions consist of stuccoed and pitched metal roof. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. Existing pergola on the North East side is enclosed with a 249 Sq. Ft. addition to the height of 11'-4", one skylight that is not publicly visible.
2. An existing window on the East elevation at the upper level above addition is replaced with a smaller window to accommodate new roof.
3. The addition has synthetic stucco "Pueblo" color to match existing synthetic stucco. The door and windows are metal clad color "white" the lite pattern matches the existing.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

There were no questions to Staff.

#### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Naktin, 1305 Luján, who said this is virtually non-visible and he had nothing to add to the Staff report.

#### **Questions to the Applicant**

Chair Rios noted the north elevation faces street and asked if it would have no changes.

Mr. Naktin agreed.

#### **Public Comment**

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### **Action of the Board**

**Member Roybal moved in Case #H-16-019 at 1340 Canyon Road, to approve the project as recommended by staff. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Member Boniface returned to the bench after the vote.

6. **Case #H-16-021. 829 Allendale Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas Gray, agent for Paul and Ellen Biderman, owners, proposes to install solar panels on a contributing residential structure and screen them from public view with synthetic fabric. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

## **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

829 Allendale Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in a blended vernacular and minimal Spanish Colonial/Mission Revival styles before 1924. The building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the structure by installing solar panels on the roof. The roof sheds to the east in two sections with visibility from the adjacent public way, Houghton Street, and also the alley. Three panels will be installed on the northern section and placed back from the roof edge to screen the public view with the intervening parapet. Five panels will be installed on the southern section with the installation of a screening fabric across the front of the roof to block public visibility. This is a creative method to propose screening in compliance with 14-5.2(H)(1)(c)(vii) [see below], instead of building a stuccoed parapet with slot or canale drainage. In this district, solar is encouraged and >>> screened by... listed 7 choices.

### **RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS**

#### **14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts**

- (3) Remodeling to Increase Height; Rooftop Appurtenances
- (b) For contributing buildings solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment if publicly visible shall not be added.

#### **14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District**

##### **(1) District Standards**

Compliance with the following structural standards shall occur wherever those exterior features of buildings and other structures subject to public view from any public street, way, or other public place are erected, altered, or demolished

- (c) The use of solar and other energy collecting and conserving strategies is encouraged. The use of large glazed areas on south facing walls for trombe walls or other solar collectors, greenhouses, garden rooms, direct gain, or other energy collecting purposes is allowed. When in view from any public street, way, or other public place, solar equipment shall be screened by the following methods:
  - (i) raising the parapet;
  - (ii) setting back from the edge of the roof;
  - (iii) framing the collector with wood;
  - (iv) in the case of pitched roofs, by integrating the collector into the pitch;
  - (v) in case of ground solar collectors by a wall or vegetation;
  - (vi) in the case of wall collectors by enclosing by end or other walls;
  - (vii) other means that screen the collector or integrate it into the overall structure.Non-glare materials shall be used in solar collectors.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff defers to the Board as to whether or not the screening fabric is an appropriate and acceptable method to block public visibility of rooftop appurtenances on a contributing residential structure. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked if Mr. Rasch was familiar with this type of fabric.

Mr. Rasch agreed but this is the first time he had seen it used for solar screening.

Mr. Rasch showed a photo where it is already screened.

Member Roybal asked about screening the other side.

Mr. Rasch said that would be from the alley. A wooden panel could screen them from the side. The applicant felt it was set back far enough from the alley that they would not be seen.

Member Boniface was concerned about longevity of this material. Also when it gets sold, whether the new owners would replace it regularly. He liked the idea of it. It is very creative idea but concerned about what it would look like 15 years from now.

Mr. Rasch agreed that is a good point and Staff cannot monitor it perhaps.

Member Powell asked if there is a warranty on the fabric.

Mr. Rasch didn't know.

Member Powell had concerns about quality. He thought there are no safeguards in the future.

Chair Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Rasch said from Allendale, it is not visible. But it is slightly visible from Houghton. It is set back. He explained that he practices public visibility by adjacency. The applicable streetscape is where he views it. The alley is one property away so it is not adjacent and non-screened panels would be visible.

#### **Applicant's Presentation**

Mr. Thomas Gray, 823 Rio Vista Street, was sworn.



### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked him to describe the fabric.

Mr. Gray said it was awning material used for shade. The local awning company said it has microholes so it doesn't turn into a sail. It is like the mockup he set up today and attached to the north and south parapets.

Chair Rios asked why they made this choice.

Mr. Gray said their idea was to do something that is reversible. They liked not making a permanent change to it. A future owner may not want solar there. In terms of cost to meet the requirements. It was felt this was a reasonable cost.

Chair Rios asked about longevity.

Mr. Gray said it does have a 20-year warranty and can be replaced easily. Owners of historic properties are required to maintain properties too.

Member Powell explained that this is a precedent of using fabric in the Historic District and didn't know where it would lead. He had reservations.

Member Katz asked how he would screen the back.

Mr. Gray said they had models on the roof two years ago and would move them away from the edge. They did not consider the alley as public.

Present and sworn was Mr. Paul Biderman, 829 Allendale Street, who said he and Ellen are concerned that they are making this decision not because they saw a great financial savings but that they were committed to clean energy for the City. Clean energy is to be encouraged in this neighborhood. They are trying to strike a balance between the value of preservation and green energy. This body does a very good job of preserving neighborhoods but the City administration wants also to be free of carbon emissions as soon as possible. One thing in particular for them, in order for the parapet to cover these panels, would be to use a 10% incline but that is not efficient. This won't pay off for about 20 years. That would make him 89 years old. So they are doing this because they share the vision about climate change and moving themselves toward a renewable system. He thought their solution keeps preservation. "Please don't prevent us from doing it."

Member Powell asked to see the roof plan view and asked about the angle of incidence.

Mr. Gray said it is 10 degrees. With the primary view from Allendale, they said there was no way to get it approved except on the east. So they are trying to work with the neighbors.

Member Powell wondered if the parapet could be raised and the panels moved to the west.

Mr. Gray said it would be more visible from Allendale and they have to have an engineer's certificate on load of the roof. To the west is a roof area that won't allow solar panels on it.

Mr. Biderman said they also are a contributing house.

Member Biedscheid said it is hard to say it doesn't comply with screening by other means and it does allow for renewable energy in this district.

Chair Rios said this house is 92 years old and a favorite of hers. They have kept it pristine. She asked if that is the exact fabric they would use.

Mr. Gray agreed.

Chair Rios thought it actually looks like stucco.

Member Boniface said now that it is clear that this is publicly visible from the alley, he would like to see the three panels on the roof plan screened as well. He didn't see any difficulty on running it on the next part of the roof. This only covers up half of the solar panels and they need to hide all of them. He wanted to hear of any issues that would prevent them from installing fabric on the north side.

Mr. Rasch said if they screen the north, there is room for more panels.

Mr. Gray said it is a longer run but he saw no reason why the northern section could not be screened. Technically, it might require a few stanchions going down to the structure to be able to hold it up. The company told them that anything over ten feet would require more support.

Member Katz asked why it could not be ten feet.

Mr. Gray explained that it would require a stanchion.

#### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-16-021 at 829 Allendale Street to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the solar panels depicted in the roof plan (three panels on the north side) be screened in the same manner as the five panels on the south side. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Member Powell, who dissented.

7. **Case #H-16-022. 100 Peña Place.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Scott and Maika Wong, agents/owners, propose to construct a 1,308 sq. ft. residential structure to a height of 13'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'8" and yardwalls to the maximum allowable heights of 49" and 6' on a vacant lot. (Sobia Sayeda)

Ms. Sayeda gave the staff report as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

100 Peña Place is a 3,000 Sq. Ft. vacant lot in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following four items:

1. A 1,308 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 13'-6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'-8". The building is designed in Spanish-Pueblo Revival style featuring room-block massing, rounded edges, a portal with exposed wooden elements including carved corbels, and viga posts, one opening with wood shutters, kiva fireplace, and canales. The windows are Sierra Pacific "Linen White". Wooden elements will be stained off white color. Stucco is El Rey "Sahara" color, entry door and window shutters are Mesquite wood.
2. 4'-1" stuccoed yard wall with 5'-6" pilasters at the South. A 4'-1" high stuccoed enclosure at the trash area on East side with coyote gates, stucco is "Sahara" color. A 4' high 12' long coyote fence along West property line.
3. Existing side yard walls on East and West to be raised to 6'-0" height. Existing board fence along the west site line is replaced with a 6'-0" high stuccoed fence, stucco is "Sahara" color. Existing height of site line fences and yard walls not provided.
4. 6'-0" high stuccoed yard wall at the rear site line, stucco is "Sahara" color.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

### Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked if no part will be higher than 13' 6".

Ms. Sayeda agreed.

Member Roybal asked if that includes the top of fireplaces.

Ms. Sayeda clarified that fireplaces are not included in height calculations.

### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Scott Wong, 641 Garcia Street, who had nothing to add to the Staff report.

### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked him what the heights are of the yard walls that was not provided.

Mr. Wong said it is 5' high and neighbor asked for six feet. The west varies from 7' down to 3' in front.

Member Powell asked, according to the site plan, if there is no off-street parking.

Mr. Wong agreed.

Member Powell believed cars would take up that whole corner and he thought there might be a better way to address that.

Mr. Wong said the parking to the left is shielded by a coyote fence. He looked at it as guest parking. In front of the vehicle is proposed to be a garden. There is parking on Closson Street-

Mr. Rasch clarified that two spaces off street are required.

Mr. Wong said they are placing the mechanical in back.

Member Powell said it is a nice design.

Chair Rios asked if this meets the open space requirements.

Mr. Wong said with the square in front and back it is above 40%.

Mr. Rasch referred to page 4 and said 313 square feet is required.

Chair Rios asked if anything would be visible on the roof.

Mr. Wong said no. They might remove the fireplace but haven't decided yet.

#### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Katz moved in Case #H-16-022 at 100 Peña Place, to approve the application per staff recommendations. Member Biedscheid seconded with the condition that the fences be 6' high on the west and the east wall is 7' down to 3' at the front and a little higher for hiding trash containers. Mr. Katz accepted the amendment as friendly and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 8. Case #H-16-023A. 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners request a historic status review of a non-contributing residential structure. (Sóbia Sayeda)**

Ms. Sayeda gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1067 ½ Camino San Acacio is an approximately 1,616 Sq. Ft. single-family residence with a 202 Sq. Ft. portal. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, HCPI form is non-substantive and the applicant has provided an affidavit containing information. The house was built in 1946 in adobe construction.

Windows were replaced in the living room around 1953, yard walls were constructed around 1960. An adobe addition on the west including a portal and a basement was constructed around 1963 and a kitchen remodel including new windows took place in 1965. Finally, a pitched roof was constructed in 1985.

The staff has clear evidence that there are substantial alterations made to a pre-1966 historic residence which suggests that this structure is a non-contributing structure.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

### Questions to Staff

Chair Rios noted that just status is addressed here. She asked if this house had a flat roof at one time.

Ms. Sayeda agreed.

Chair Rios said it dominates all façades.

Member Katz went back to read the staff recommendation which did not give a recommendation. He asked her what she recommended.

Ms. Sayeda said she recommends non-contributing status.

### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Eddie Trujillo, 1067 San Acacio, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked Mr. Trujillo if he agreed with the staff recommendation for non-contributing status.

Mr. Trujillo agreed, noting that many changes have been made since it was built in 1947.

### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### Action of the Board

**Member Roybal moved in Case #H-16-023A at 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio to designate it non-contributing. Member Powell seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

9. **Case #H-16-023B. 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eddie and Sandra Trujillo agents/owners propose to remodel a non-contributing residential structure including a 331 sq. ft. addition and two portals totaling 429 sq. ft. to the maximum height of 13'10", a 377 sq. ft. deck, and replacing all windows. (Sóbia Sayeda)

Ms. Sayeda gave the staff report as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1067 ½ Camino San Acacio is an approximately 1,616 Sq. Ft. single family residence with a 202 Sq. Ft. portal. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following 4 items:

1. The 202 Sq. Ft. portal on the South will be removed and replaced with a 331 Sq. Ft. addition to a height not to exceed existing building height of 13'-4", existing main residence windows and the windows on the addition are double hung, single pane vinyl "white" color, stucco is Cementitious El Rey "Buckskin" color, the roof is pitched roof pro-panel "brown" color which matches the existing roofing.
2. A 155 Sq. Ft. portal on the South of addition will be constructed to a height not to exceed existing building height of 13'-4".
3. A 377 Sq. Ft. portal on the East of main residence over a new wood deck will be constructed at a height not to exceed existing building height of 13'-4", a metal railing and a gate is proposed on the floor plan, details are not provided.
4. A 4'-0" wide opening will be cut into the existing yard wall on the South of the residence connecting to the deck.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

**Questions to Staff**

Member Katz asked if the windows on the bottom are under the portal.

Ms. Sayeda agreed.

**Applicant's Presentation**

Mr. Trujillo (previously sworn) had nothing to add to the Staff Report but would answer questions.

### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked about the metal railing and gate.

Mr. Trujillo said the railing would be made of wood or metal and the gate would be a metal Santa Fé style gate but he hasn't designed it yet.

### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### Action of the Board

**Member Powell moved in Case #H-16-023B at 1067 ½ Camino San Acacio to approve the application as submitted and a condition that the railing and gate be submitted to staff for review and approval. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 10. Case #H-16-020. 618 East Alameda Street Units A&B. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Lisa Roach, agent for Susan Clain, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence and contributing guest house by connecting the two structures with a 328 sq. ft. addition, constructing a 99 sq. ft. addition and a 233 sq. ft. carport. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation (section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

618A and B East Alameda Street is a single-family residence and a free-standing guest house to the south that were constructed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The buildings are listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The north elevation of the residence and the west and south elevations of the guest house are designated as primary.

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

1. A 99 square foot portal will be constructed on the north, primary elevation of the residence in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation (14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.



2. A 328 square foot addition will be constructed between the two structures at a height equal to or lower than the existing adjacent guest house parapet height.
3. The parapets of the residence and guest house will be increased no more than 6" to screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment.
4. Additional alterations include the construction of roof-penetrating fireplaces, installation of low-profile skylights, repairing a historic window and adding thermal panes, and replacing a non-historic door.
5. Rigid insulation at 2" thick will be applied to the structures and they will be stuccoed with El Rey cementitious "Buckskin".
6. A 233 square foot carport will be constructed at the north side of the property to a height of 10' 9".

EXCEPTION TO PLACE ADDITION ON PRIMARY ELEVATION (14-5.2(D)((2)(c))).

- (i) Do not damage the character of the district;

Applicant Response: The addition of a portal to the north façade of Unit A at 618 Alameda Street would not in any way damage the character of the district, but would rather enhance the character of the historic structure and help to preserve the last remaining original window on that façade. All of the homes along the private drive on which the residence is situated have been substantially altered or are new construction. This minor alteration would have no adverse effect on the character of the immediate neighborhood.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare;

Applicant Response: The proposed north portal would serve to perform two essential functions on the north façade of the home. First, the portal would protect the last remaining historic window on this façade from the elements and prolong its functional life. Second, the portal would provide a means to redirect the roof drainage from an existing north-facing canale, off of which hangs an immense icicle for most of the winter months, to a new west canale that would direct runoff via a proposed downspout to a new French drain. These functions would prevent the hardship of having to extensively maintain and possibly replace an historic window due to damage from the elements and would prevent a potential injury to the public welfare posed by the risk of a large icicle located directly west of the front entrance falling on the homeowner or a visitor to her home. Redirecting this drainage would also assist in preserving the integrity of the primary façade, as moisture would be more effectively directed away from the structure.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the *City* by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

Applicant Response: The proposed north portal strengthens the unique heterogeneous character of the City by employing the best possible design solution for the issues created by the existing configuration of

the north canale and historic window. Other design options were considered, such as a simple bracketed overhang over the front door and window and moving the canale to the west façade. However, an overhang would not be as effective in protecting the window or new custom front door, and it was not possible to move the canale to the west façade without re-roofing the entire structure to correctly direct drainage to a new location. The proposed portal is the best, most practical solution.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or *structure* involved and which are not applicable to other lands or *structures* in the related *streetscape*;

Applicant Response: The subject lot is a maximum of 37' in width and 117' in length. As a result of the long and narrow shape of the parcel and the footprint of the existing historic structures, there are few options for placement of a portal. With the proposed heated addition connecting the two structures, only the north façade of Unit A and the south façade of Unit B, both of which are primary façades, offer locations for placement of a portal. Because the north entrance of Unit A is the main entrance to the home and includes the last remaining historic window, the applicant has prioritized this location to propose a narrow portal. Other parcels nearby are larger, offering more advantageous conditions for compliance with this stipulation of the code.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; and

Applicant Response: The narrowness of the lot (~37'x117') and configuration of the existing structures are not a result of any action of the applicant. As a result of these conditions, there are limited options for placement of a portal except on the primary façades of Unit A and B and few alternatives to redirecting roof runoff from the north façade. The applicant has selected the north façade of Unit A to propose a portal, in order to protect the last remaining historic window and the main entry of the home and to most effectively redirect moisture to the west façade.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Applicant Response: The applicant has made every effort to design a portal that is in keeping with Santa Fe Style and harmonizes with both the existing home and the streetscape. All homes along this private drive off of "dirt Alameda" have been substantially altered or are new construction. Many have portals in a similar style. As described above, the applicant has considered other design solutions for protecting the historic window and front door on the north façade while redirecting moisture away from the home and creating an attractive and minimally obtrusive outdoor living space. We submit that there would be no negative impact as a result of the proposed portal addition.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to place an addition on a primary elevation and otherwise recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

### **Questions to Staff**

There were no questions to Staff.

### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Ms. Lisa Roach, 1224½ Cerro Gordo Road, who stated that her client is a recent retiree and who had been visiting Santa Fe for years and is excited to make this her home and made every effort to comply with guidelines.

### **Questions to the Applicant**

Member Boniface asked if the project would include any rooftop equipment or ducts that might be visible publicly.

Ms. Roach said it will have a low profile HVAC unit that is not publicly visible since they requested to raise parapets by six inches to screen it.

### **Public Comment**

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### **Action of the Board**

**Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-16-020 at 618 East Alameda Street Units A&B, to approve the application, finding that the criteria for an exception have been met and it otherwise complies with the ordinance. Member Powell seconded the motion.**

**Member Boniface asked for a friendly amendment that there will be no visible rooftop equipment or ducts. Member Biedscheid accepted the amendment as friendly and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Chair Rios asked members to fill out nomination forms and submit them by April 1.

After a brief discussion, the Board decided to consider the nominations at the April 12 meeting.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

**Member Roybal moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Approved by:

  
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.