



CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
**Agenda** DATE 10/18/17 TIME 1:00  
 PREPARED BY McClintock  
 REVIEWED BY [Signature]

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP**  
**TUESDAY, October 24, 2017 at 12:00 NOON**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1<sup>st</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING**  
**TUESDAY, October 24, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.**  
**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**\*\*\*AMENDED\*\*\***

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 10, 2017 and September 26, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-012. 60 East San Francisco Street.  
Case #H-17-057B. 806 Don Gaspar Avenue.  
Case #H-17-079. 1120 Canyon Road.  
Case #H-17-087. 451 Arroyo Tenorio.  
Case #H-16-070. 442 Camino de las Animas.  
Case #H-17-066. 415 Camino Manzano.  
Case #H-17-046B. 512 Agua Fria Street.  
Case #H-17-081A. 110 Delgado Street Unit B.  
Case #H-14-108. 317 Hillside Avenue.  
Case #H-17-085A. 3 Plaza Fatima.

Case #H-15-108. 1270 Canyon Road.  
Case #H-17-076B. 122 Delgado Street.  
Case #H-17-086. 738 Agua Fria Street.  
Case #H-17-088. 578 West San Francisco Street.  
Case #H-17-067B. 720 Don Gaspar Avenue.  
Case #H-16-087. 444 Camino de las Animas.  
Case #H-17-080. 312 Lomita Street Unit A.  
Case #H-17-082. 110 Delgado Street Unit E.  
Case #H-17-084. 101 West Alameda Street.

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

1. Case #H-17-048. 520 Jose Street Unit 6. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Michael Wall and Rebecca Entwistle, agents/owners, propose to remodel an existing sunroom and replace windows. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
2. Case #H-17-069. 334 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Hughes, agent for Krista Peters, owner, proposes to remodel a significant free standing garage. Two exceptions are requested to remove historic materials and to create an opening where an opening does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)). (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-17-038. 715½ West Manhattan Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin, agent for Jack Reese, owner proposes to install and screen rooftop appurtenances. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
4. Case #H-16-094. 324 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for the Rios Family, owners, proposes to construct a 72 sq. ft. portal and a 180 sq. ft. portal on a primary elevation and replace historic steel casement windows on a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to remove historic material and not replace in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
5. Case #H-17-089. 1212 Canyon Road. Historic District. Doug Webb, agent for Sigmund Jenssen, owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows and construct a balcony on a contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to install non-conforming windows (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e)). (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](http://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board_hearing_packets) for more information regarding cases on this agenda. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.



# Agenda

DATE 10/5/17 TIME 2:10  
 SERVED BY [Signature]  
 RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, October 24, 2017 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1<sup>st</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, October 24, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 10, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-012. 60 East San Francisco Street.  
Case #H-17-069. 334 Garcia Street.  
Case #H-17-076B. 122 Delgado Street.  
Case #H-17-038. 715½ West Manhattan Avenue.  
Case #H-17-079. 1120 Canyon Road.  
Case #H-17-087. 451 Arroyo Tenorio.

Case #H-15-108. 1270 Canyon Road.  
Case #H-16-094. 324 Camino del Monte Sol.  
Case #H-17-019. 808 Canyon Road.  
Case #H-17-057. 806 Don Gaspar Avenue.  
Case #H-17-086. 738 Agua Fria Street  
Case #H-17-088. 578 West San Francisco Street.

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

1. Case #H-16-038. 1369 Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. J. Nold Midyette, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 1,250 sq. ft. two-car garage to a height of 13'6" at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-17-019. 808 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for David Salazar, owner, proposes to construct a screen for rooftop appurtenances. The screen will be 18' high where the maximum allowable height is 18'9". (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
3. Case #H-17-048. 520 Jose Street Unit 6. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Michael Wall and Rebecca Entwisle, agents/owners, propose to remodel an existing sunroom and replace windows. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
4. Case #H-17-071. 424 Arroyo Tenorio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sandra Donner, agent for Brad and Morgan Moody, owners, proposes to construct a free-standing 235 sq. ft. carport to a height of 11', reconfigure the existing yardwall and pedestrian gate, and perform other minor alterations. (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-16-094. 324 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for the Rios Family, owners, proposes to construct a 72 sq. ft. portal and a 180 sq. ft. portal on a primary elevation and replace historic steel casement windows on a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to remove historic material and not replace in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
6. Case #H-17-057. 806 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Palo Santo Designs, agent for Halley Roberts Strongwater and Daniel Strongwater, owners, proposes to demolish a contributing structure. An exception is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

7. Case #H-17-089, 1212 Canyon Road. Historic District. Doug Webb, agent for Sigmund Jenssen, owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows and construct a balcony on a contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to install non-conforming windows (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e)). (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](http://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board_hearing_packets) for more information regarding cases on this agenda. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
October 24, 2017

<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		
September 28, 2017	Approved as amended	2
October 10, 2017	Approved as amended	2
E. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2-3
F. Business from the Floor	Comments	3
G. Communications	Announcement	4
H. Action Items		
1. <b><u>Case #H-17-048.</u></b>	Approved as recommended 520 Jose Street Unit 6.	4-6
2. <b><u>Case #H-17-069.</u></b>	Partially approved 334 Garcia Street	6-12
3. <b><u>Case #H-17-038.</u></b>	Approved as recommended 715½ West Manhattan Avenue	13-15
4. <b><u>Case #H-16-094.</u></b>	Approved as recommended 324 Camino del Monte Sol	15-22
5. <b><u>Case #H-17-089.</u></b>	Postponed to Nov. 14 1212 Canyon Road	22
I. Matters from the Board	Discussion	23
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 6:45 p.m.	24

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

**October 24, 2017**

**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 Lamy Room at Santa Fe Community Convention Center, 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. Meghan Bayer  
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Mr. William Powell  
Mr. Buddy Roybal

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Planner Supervisor  
Ms. Nicole Ramirez Thomas, Senior Planner  
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney  
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 and available on the City of Santa Fe web site.**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Rasch said there are no findings for Case #H-16-070 and should be removed from the list of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

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

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **1. September 26, 2017**

Chair Rios requested the following change to the minutes on page 8, under questions to Staff, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph where it should read, "Chair Rios wondered, with so many alterations, why this building is designated Significant.

**Member Boniface moved to approve the minutes of September 26, 2017 as amended. Member Katz seconded the motion and it passed with all members voting in favor except Member Biedscheid and Member Bayer who were not present and abstained.**

##### **2. October 10, 2017**

Member Biedscheid requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 24 under Questions to the Applicant, the third paragraph should say "adobe brick", not "vigas."

On page 33, under discussion, in the fourth paragraph, the last sentence should say, "She asked if the red brick was painted."

Chair Rios requested a change on page 34, 13<sup>th</sup> paragraph, to change "is:" to "if."

**Member Boniface moved to approve the minutes of October 10, 2017 as amended. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed with all voting in favor except Member Bayer, who abstained.**

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

**Case #H-13-012. 60 East San Francisco Street.**

**Case #H-15-108. 1270 Canyon Road.**

**Case #H-17-057B. 806 Don Gaspar Avenue.**

**Case #H-17-076B. 122 Delgado Street.**

**Case #H-17-079. 1120 Canyon Road.**

**Case #H-17-086. 738 Agua Fria Street.**

**Case #H-17-087. 451 Arroyo Tenorio.**

**Case #H-17-088. 578 West San Francisco St.**

**Case #H-16-070. 442 Camino de las Animas.**

**Case #H-17-067B. 720 Don Gaspar Avenue.**

**Case #H-17-066. 415 Camino Manzano.**

**Case #H-16-087. 444 Camino de las Animas.**

**Case #H-17-046B. 512 Agua Fria Street.**

**Case #H-17-080. 312 Lomita Street Unit A.**

**Case #H-17-081A. 110 Delgado Street Unit B.**

**Case #H-17-082. 110 Delgado Street Unit E.**

**Case #H-14-108. 317 Hillside Avenue.**

**Case #H-17-084. 101 West Alameda Street.**

**Case #H-17-085A. 3 Plaza Fatima.**

Member Katz said in Case #H-15-108 at 1270 Canyon Road, #9 should be stricken because it is not a finding. He moved to strike that. He explained that there had been a condition imposed regarding sound from the mechanical room and the City Attorney said we cannot do that. We can impose where a room is but no jurisdiction on the sound.

**Member Katz moved to Approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Case #H-15-108 as amended, deleting #9. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote except Member Powell abstained.**

**Member Katz moved to approve all the rest of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as submitted. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote except Member Bayer abstained.**

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

Ms. Stefanie Beninato reminded the Board again of 616½ Galisteo which now has more cracks on the adobe wall and how the City is working to get it closed in.

In thinking about the decisions a few meetings ago, it was very disappointing that a primary façade on a garage no longer reads as a garage. It is not typical and that was primary. There was no discussion of using other walls for light to come in and still have it read as a garage. She knew the Board gets tired, but it was disappointing. The other one was the road that is below the Cross of the Martyrs. It is a driveway, but it does read as a road up to the Cross of the Martyrs. And dogs are running onto the street, so they needed a gate because of Air BnB. She thought they could use a sign instead of a gate. Santa Fe was once not a gated community and had a varied diverse economy. One of the leading causes of poverty is isolation of rich from the poor. It really is not his full-time home and it was only about protecting his property.

There were no other speakers.

## G. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch passed out next year's calendar. The asterisk means the meeting will probably not be in this room because of a Monday holiday and a committee that has a Councilor on it would pre-empt the HDRB in Council Chambers.

## H. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case #H-17-048, 520 Jose Street Unit 6.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Michael Wall and Rebecca Entwisle, agents/owners, propose to remodel an existing sunroom and replace windows. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Thomas presented the staff report as follows:

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

520 Jose Street Unit 6 is a 1250 square foot vernacular style residential structure and is part of the Jose Street Condominiums. The estimated date of construction for the house was post-1935 based on information from a Santa Fe directory. The historic status of the property is contributing and the north and east elevations at the northeast corner are designated as primary and the south elevation excluding non-historic material is also designated as primary.

The applicant proposes the following seven items.

- 1) Remove a portion of the existing non-historic sunroom on the south elevation. The remodel of this room will include the removal of the sunroom windows, a new roof, and the construction of walls. Two windows will be added to the south façade of this room. The front door on the east façade of this room will be replaced in the same six-panel style but the hardware on the door will be changed. No additional square footage will be added to the house.
- 2) Replace a window on the east side of the north elevation (see east elevation drawing).
- 3) Replace a canale on the south elevation.
- 4) Replace a screen door on the south façade of the west elevation.
- 5) Replace a 6" vent pipe at the mechanical room.
- 6) Re-stucco the house in cementitious El Rey "Adobe."
- 7) Window color will be Jeldwen "Mesa Red."

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**



Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(I) Westside-Guadalupe.

#### Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Jue Tan, Michael Wall and Rebecca Entwisle were sworn. Mr. Tan had nothing to add to the Staff report.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios understood the sunroom is non-historic on this Contributing house. She thought this project would be an improvement on the house.

Member Katz asked if he knew when the sunroom was built.

Mr. Tan said it was converted in the 1970's.

Member Katz said the revision is attractive, but he did miss the old sun room style.

Mr. Tan said the general intent is to render it more usable and secondly, to conform to historic design and proportion of the windows.

Member Biedscheid thought she recalled the other windows are deeply inset and asked about these.

Mr. Tan said they will be inset to mimic the windows on the south side. The low wall under those windows is what they think is adobe and will use 2x12's for the windows on the primary façade.

Chair Rios asked him to describe the red color.

Mr. Tan showed a swatch and pointed out the one that was closest. He said it pretty much matches existing.

Chair Rios asked if there would be nothing on the roof.

Mr. Tan agreed.

#### Public Comment

Ms. Stefanie Beninato P.O. Box 1601 was sworn. She agreed it is an attractive redesign. She heard about replacing the window on the east but thought that was a primary façade but might have misunderstood.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained that it is a non-historic window. She pointed it out (a narrow vertical window).

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Roybal moved in Case #H-17-048 at 520 Jose Street Unit 6, to approve the application as recommended, items 1-7. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Member Katz recused himself from the next case and left the room.

2. **Case #H-17-069. 334 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Hughes, agent for Krista Peters, owner, proposes to remodel a significant free-standing garage. Two exceptions are requested to remove historic materials and to create an opening where an opening does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report as follows:

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

334 Garcia Street, known as the Frank Leonard Smith Residence, is a single-family residence and free-standing garage that was designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style by Isaac Hamilton Rapp in 1920. Both structures are listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and all façades are designated as primary.

On August 24, 2017, the HDRB postponed action on a request for exceptions to significantly alter the garage structure. Now, the applicant has scaled back the proposal to remodel the garage by conversion into a guest house, with the following two items.

1. An opening will be created on the north elevation for an ingress/egress door in a proposed bedroom. Paired 6-lite doors with what appear to be two panels below each will be installed. The applicant proposes to install French doors. If, indeed, these are French doors, then the bottom glass panels exceed the 30" lite standard and an exception has not been requested. An exception is requested to create an opening on a primary elevation where an opening does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.

2. One of two 6-over-6 historic wood windows on the rear west elevation will be removed and the opening dimension altered for installation of a 15-lite French door. Staff is unsure if the header height is changing. An exception is requested to remove historic material and change opening dimensions (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(1)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.

#### 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 Significant Structures in the Historic Districts**

###### **(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; and
- (d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

#### **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 in any historic district, the following standards shall be met:

- (1) General
  - (a) The status of a significant structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant 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.
  - (b) If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent structure to lose its significant status, the application may be denied.
- (5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features
  - (a) For all façades of significant 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 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 CREATE AN OPENING ON A PRIMARY ELEVATION**

- 1) Do not damage character of district:

Response: Permitting us to make this change will not damage the character of the district as this elevation is not visible from the streetscape.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement. The north elevation is not publicly-visible.

2) Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

Response: This opening is necessary in order to provide egress from the new bedroom in case of an emergency.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement, an exterior door or a compliant window opening is required in bedrooms.

3) Strengthen the unique and heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic District:

Response: We are proposing the opening on the north side since this elevation is not visible from the streetscape. Another option would be to alter the garage door to provide an opening which meets egress requirements. Yet another would be to place the bedroom towards the west side of the building and the existing door would meet egress. However, this would be a poor design choice as entering through a bedroom is not desirable. Given these factors, it is necessary to create a new opening on the east side to convert the building to a guest house.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement; options design options are not better choices.

#### EXCEPTION TO REMOVE HISTORIC MATERIAL

1) Do not damage character of district:

Response: This elevation is not viewable from the primary streetscape and so will not negatively impact the character of the district. Furthermore, the divided lights on one of the historic window sashes have been removed, thus requiring that the sash be rebuilt using new non-historic material. If we are granted this exception to remove this window all the existing windows can be restored without using new non-historic material. The wood door which we propose would be painted to match the existing windows and from outside of the property one would not be able to discern that this is, in fact, a new door. The new door will maintain the same header and width as the existing window.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The proposed west elevation shows a lowered header height and wider door framing than the existing windows, so the lite dimensions do not match those of the adjacent window. If the header height and the framing dimensions were consistent, then there would be no visible change when viewed from Paseo de Peralta above the yardwall.

Additionally, if this exception is approved, then the removed window could be exchanged with the damaged window on the same elevation.

2) Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

Response: This change is required to prevent hardship to the applicant by eliminating the claustrophobic feel that this structure has due to poor circulation. This door will provide a means to directly access and utilize this private outdoor space and, at the same time, create a more spacious and open

feeling within. Another reason the client feels that this is necessary is to gain direct access from the kitchen to an outdoor space for eating and entertaining. Having to rely solely on the existing door on the south elevation restricts the flow and circulation and feels disjointed.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. The building is small enough to use the south entry door for all other exterior access, other than the new bedroom doors which may also be approved with this application. The building does not need three exterior access doors.

- (3) Strengthen the unique and heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic District:

Response: Adding a door is our only means of improving the circulation and providing an open feeling within the structure. In this application we have greatly scaled back the project from our original design which best fit the client's desires. We are proposing the minimum number of changes with the least impact in order to have a livable space and a means of re-purposing the garage, which currently has no use, to a guesthouse. We think that this alteration of the existing structure is much less detrimental to this historic property than a new free-standing guest house would be. Historically the construction on the large lots in this neighborhood occupied a relatively small percentage of the square footage available. We think it is a unique and special feature of this property that no new buildings have been added since the original construction.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. The applicant has not provided other design options that would not require a second of four primary elevations to be altered.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the exception to create an opening where an opening does not exist has been met, but that the exception to have a third pedestrian access door in this small building has not been met. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked why Mr. Rasch felt the exception to remove historic material has not been met.

Mr. Rasch said on criterion 1 that the west elevation shows the window with a lower header and wider, so it doesn't match the existing window. On criterion 2, the building doesn't need three access doors. On criterion 3, the applicant did not provide other design options.

Member Biedscheid said Mr. Rasch agreed with that criteria on the north elevation door but the header of that door is also not the same.

Mr. Rasch said the north is not publicly visible but the west is and there was only one window and now a window and door. If it were the same header height, it would not look different.

### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Thomas Hughes was sworn and said he was sure the applicant would maintain the same header height and width and still be preferable.

### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked what the square footage is.

Mr. Hughes said the building is 600 square feet.

Chair Rios asked why a third door is needed.

Mr. Hughes said it is not needed but there is a good quiet patio space to sit and eat outside with proximity to the kitchen. The would most likely be used.

### Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought it was important to acknowledge this is a significant building and changes should be made carefully and conservatively. She didn't hear anything about hardship. So what if you have to walk around a small building to the patio. It isn't needed, or a hardship and three doors is a lot. She was not sure the double doors exist, but it would be better to make changes to the north side that is not visible from the street. For the door to look like the window, the Board must consider the whole door.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Powell asked Mr. Rasch to single out one of those doors.

Mr. Rasch said they need the door on the north for bedroom egress but not the one on the west.

Member Powell noted that the door on the west already has an opening there and it could be turned back into a garage. The double door on the north is a very large opening.

Mr. Rasch said the north and south façades are not publicly visible.

Member Powell commended the applicant for making concessions from last time. The west studio door is somewhat appropriate, but the north is a very large opening. It is not the back of the building and he might have to agree that three doors are probably inappropriate. If we are talking about two, the existing south and the west are okay instead of the north.

Member Bayer asked if in the proposed doors on the north, the bottom panels are solid.

Mr. Hughes agreed. They are wood.

Member Boniface said the need for the door on the north is for egress. He didn't agree with the west façade. If they replaced the window with a door and matched the head height, they could still have the same number of lites. But that is the most visible part of this project, whereas the north is almost completely hidden. His feeling would be to have the north door allowed and not the west.

Mr. Hughes said if it is one or the other, the north door would be preferable, even though to make an entry through the bedroom is not ideal. The door on the north is needed. It is a small house, but it never feels right to enter through a bedroom. To work within it without changing any openings didn't work with us.

Member Biedscheid asked if they considered a window for egress on the north.

Mr. Hughes said he did, but it is only a small area, so it would be nice to walk out there. The adjacent property has a six-foot wall and that house is close to it. The neighbor is somewhat conscious of it, but it can't be seen from any other part except the neighbor's property.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-069 at 334 Garcia Street, to approve the application as recommended and that the exception criteria to create an opening on a primary elevation is met but the criteria to create the new opening on the west is not met and to deny that part of the application. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by majority (3-2) voice vote with Member Biedscheid and Member Powell voting against.**

Member Katz returned to the bench after the vote.

Member Boniface recused himself from consideration of the next case and left the room.

- 3. Case #H-17-038, 715½ West Manhattan Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin, agent for Jack Reese, owner proposes to install and screen rooftop appurtenances. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)**

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the staff report as follows:

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

715½ is a vernacular style residential structure currently designated as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The residence is 1550 square feet and is constructed of concrete block and stucco. The historic status of the property was upgraded from noncontributing to contributing on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017. The south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) was designated as primary. The primary elevation includes



the attached garage and excludes the portal. The current parapet height is 11'-2".

The addition of the rooftop heating and cooling unit was discovered during the interim Historic Preservation inspection and as a result of a call from a concerned neighbor.

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

- 1) Addition of a heating unit and duct work. The applicant proposes to screen the ducting and heating with a framed screen which will be stuccoed in El Rey stucco color "Buckskin." The maximum height of screening will be 13'-0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'-2".
- 2) Addition of skylights to the roof. The flashing on the skylights will be painted to match the stucco which is El Rey "Buckskin."
- 3) Addition of a trex plank gate at the southwest corner of the house between the existing fence and the stucco wall.
- 4) Addition of sconces at entryways.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff defers to the Board to determine if painting the visible portions of the skylights is acceptable, otherwise the application complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(I) Westside- Guadalupe Historic District.

She referred to a letter and photos from Mr. Hays and is of the wrong building.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked if there is visibility of the rear from a public way.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is considered public but is a private road leading to multiple units. Technically is considered a public way.

Chair Rios asked how many screens there would be.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas understood there were two screens; one to screen the ductwork and one to screen the unit.

Member Bayer asked to see a photo of the west elevation.

Mr. Rasch didn't have one to display.

Member Bayer asked if the unit is seen on the west.

Mr. Rasch pointed it out and the ductwork.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there is also a skylight that will be painted to obscure it above the screen.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Marc Naktin, 1304 Luján, was sworn. He said they are putting a screen on the back for ductwork and around the unit. It will also obscure most of the skylights. A person can't stand far enough back to see them.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Member Katz asked him to describe the screen.

Mr. Naktin said it will be stucco on a wood frame with a small gap for drainage.

Member Powell asked if it would be visible to the large parking area.

Mr. Naktin agreed. That is considered public.

Member Powell asked if the shed roof to the west needs no screening.

Mr. Naktin agreed.

Member Roybal asked for the height of the screen.

Mr. Naktin thought it was 11' 6".

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified that the parapet is at 11' 2" and about 3' for the screen.

Mr. Naktin said the screen goes only one inch above the unit.

Member Biedscheid said in the proposal letter, it says the screen is flush with the parapet.

Mr. Naktin said it is just the sides because it has a shed roof.

Member Biedscheid asked if it is set back on the north from the roof.

Mr. Naktin agreed.

#### Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) applauded the owners for trying to hide the equipment. It will make the building look better. Unless the skylights could just be lowered instead of painting them, the sun will shine on them and make it obvious what they are.

She didn't understand why they don't make the parapets high enough to hide the equipment. They would still be under the allowable height.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Chair Rios asked him about raising the parapet to hide all the equipment.

Mr. Naktin said this is sort of a parapet.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained that some areas have the shed roof and didn't want to request exception to change the roof style.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Roybal moved in Case #H-17-038 at 715½ West Manhattan Avenue, to approve the application as recommended by staff and items 1-4. Member Powell seconded the motion and it passed by majority (4-1) voice vote with Member Biedscheid dissenting.**

Member Boniface returned to the bench after the vote.

Chair Rios recused herself from consideration of the next case and left the room. Member Katz chaired this case in the absence of the Chair.

- 4. Case #H-16-094. 324 Camino del Monte Sol.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for the Rios Family, owners, proposes to construct a 72 sq. ft. portal and a 180 sq. ft. portal on a primary elevation and replace historic steel casement windows on a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to remove historic material and not replace in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Thomas presented the staff report as follows:

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

324 Camino del Monte Sol is a residential and commercial structure built in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, and is one which is currently listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is constructed of adobe and the fence is constructed of wood slab fencing. The house was

designated as contributing in 2016. The east and south elevations were designated as primary. Non-historic material on the south elevation was excluded.

Design elements particular to the home include stone buttresses which were a signature of Applegate's construction style at homes along what is today Camino del Monte Sol. The home size was increased from a four room structure to a home with six additional rooms and a large kitchen. The manner of increasing the size of the home to accommodate a growing family is common of vernacular style structures within the district. The east elevation of the home is a longstanding contribution to the streetscape of the north end of Camino del Monte Sol.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following three items. Relevant code citations and exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.

- 1) Addition of a 72 square foot portal on the north elevation of the residence. The north elevation of the home is not primary so no exception is required.
- 2) Addition of a 180 square foot portal on the east elevation of the residence. An exception is requested to add to a primary elevation (14-5.2(D)(2)(c)).
- 3) Removal of a historic steel casement window and replacement of the window with wood windows which are similar to a previous style of window that was removed. The window opening dimensions would not change. An exception is requested remove historic material and not replace in kind (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)).

#### RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

##### **(D) General Design Standards for All H 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:

##### **(2) Additions**

(c) Additions are not permitted to *primary façades*.

##### **(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.

#### EXCEPTION RESPONSES

##### **EXCEPTION RESPONSES TO CONSTRUCT PORT ON PRIMARY FAÇADE**

1. Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

Constructing a Spanish Pueblo Revival porch will not damage the streetscape. Portals are prominent feature of structures in the historic districts. Portals add an element of diverse character and scale to the streetscapes of most historic neighborhoods. The façade of the current Camino del Monte Sol two-story structure is in some ways, out of character in that it goes straight up, so the massing of the elevation will be improved and softened by adding a porch. It will also more effectively define the entrance of the home to be more welcoming. It will also provide much needed weather protection to the occupants of the home.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. Portals are a common element on homes in this district and a portal would not damage the streetscape.*

2. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

The homeowners are permanent long term residents of this home, including those that were born here. It has been in the family for over 75 years and they want to continue living in a safe home. Adding a porch will provide added outdoor shelter during inclement weather for both the family and the many visitors that cross the threshold. The existing small entry pad is unsafe and presently has broken outdoor tiles. The tiles will be replaced as much as possible in-kind and will be surrounded by full brick pavers to keep them as a highlighted feature the tiles will be protected by the porch as well. The residents are all reaching advanced ages and the porch will protect them and visitors by preventing slipping and potential injury.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The portal would provide essential protection to the entry of the home.*

3. 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 character of this residence is lacking in diversity and is somewhat in conflict with the streetscape on the front façade.

Different design options were considered to provide the necessary protective covering at the front entry as follows:

- a) Putting a small eyebrow over the door only: This option was not chosen, because the eyebrow was not prominent enough to give the two-story massing relief and it would not achieve adequate protection from the weather.
- b) Making the porch very simple, by not adding corbels or protruding vigas without a simple stucco parapet. This option did not give the home the characteristic diversity it deserves.
- c) Providing a full wrap around portal from east to north. This option is elegant and desirable, but may mask too much of the historic fabric.
- d) a reasonable depth portal (8-9 feet) and a reasonable length (approx. 21 feet) long and 8 feet height up to the main support beam provides a good shelter at the right proportions to the streetscape and for the

existing structure while maintaining the unique character of the structure.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. Several design options were considered.*

4. 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.

This property serves as a home and a business, that which has become historically important to Santa Fe and very unique to this property. The Rios Wood Yard is a beloved institution in this community. The home and business have been in the Rios Family, for over 75 years. The unique character of this residence and business is that there has been a constant change to the windows, doors, and entrance portal areas over the years. The vernacular nature of the architecture is grounded in the original small Applegate created adobe but the current and ongoing structure has been created through the Rios family generated salvage business is ongoing and in constant change. Jesus and Teresa Rios added 6 rooms and expanded the kitchen and other spaces over the span of raising the 9 Rios children and grandchild in this structure. In addition there were many changes to windows and doors as better quality ones became available or there was an internal need to get more light into the house or better access for the business. Vernacular generated change is an accepted path for growth and change in Santa Fe; especially when it is within a single ownership. The Owners want a porch that more effectively separates the Rios Wood Yard and Salvage business entry from the residential entry; while adding safety in inclement weather. There is ample room to build a modest porch at this location without bringing a negative impact to the contributing character of the structure or to the historic streetscape on Camino del Monte Sol.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. There are few places where it would be logical to add a portal.*

5. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the actions of the applicant.

A home and business have been in this location for 75 years, owned by the Rios family. Jesus Rios, the father of the present occupants, added 6 rooms to the original house to accommodate his growing family. In addition; entrances have changed and windows have been replaced when older non-functioning windows needed to be changed.

The current proposal is out of a long standing unmet need that Mr. Rios did not get around to constructing before his untimely death at age 95.

The present members of the Rios Family are continuing the tradition of this vernacular style of architecture by adapting and improving their home as their needs evolve.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The tradition of the house is to evolve with the needs of its occupants.*

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

Adding a beautiful porch of an accepted architectural style will not result in a negative impact on the house or the district. On the contrary, it will give needed relief to the (22 foot) two-story façade of this structure, while creating only a positive impact of enhancing the beauty of the home. In addition, it will provide safety and convenience to the aging occupants of the home.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The porch will not create a negative impact with respect to the district.*

#### **EXCEPTION RESPONSES TO REMOVING HISTORIC FABRIC ON A PRIMARY FAÇADE**

1. Does not damage the character of the district:

The fabric that is being removed is ostensibly steel sash windows that were replacements for wood windows that were in those locations initially.

It is not clear that this is indeed historic fabric because it was installed at an undetermined time. These units probably predated 50 years old but not installed in this location. As long as the replacement windows are set in the exact same openings no "historic fabric" will be removed.

*Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response as the applicant did not address the criterion, or more explanation regarding the response is needed.*

2. Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

The current windows are not considered by the Owner and may indeed not be "historic" from the 50 year installed criteria. Not allowing them to be replaced would create a hardship in that the Owners would need to continue to try to maintain and live with failing steel sash windows with single pane glass lites. It is important for the longevity of a historic structure to have good windows and doors that protect the occupants and the adobe walls in this case from damage from condensation and leaks.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The window poses a hardship to the family in terms of its disrepair.*

3. 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 occupants of this home treasure their home and want to continue to improve it, as their parents did, and continue to reside in the home for the rest of their lives. Removing these two steel sash units would strengthen the unique character of the City while allowing a more homogenous look to the east primary façade. The removal of these units would not deplete the wide variety of window materials and sash types in the district.

*Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response. A full range of design options were not presented.*

#### **EXCEPTION TO NOT REPLACE THE WINDOW IN KIND**

1. Do not damage the character of the district:

The windows that are being proposed would enhance the primary façade by emulating the original wood windows of the home. The proposed windows would give the east façade a more consistent look

and will be similar to the wood windows on the north façade. The present steel casement windows are considered a temporary solution, by Jesus Rios and are not complimentary to the traditional Santa Fe architecture. A return to a more traditional window material and pattern would be enhancement to the historic property and to the streetscape.

*Staff response: Staff agrees. Wood windows are common in the district.*

- II. Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:  
The proposed windows will not only echo the original windows of this home and provide a more pleasing look to the home, but will be more energy efficient and more practical for its occupants.

*Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. New windows would provide energy efficiency not currently possible with the steel casement windows.*

- 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 occupants of this home treasure their home and want to continue to improve it, as their parents did, and continue to reside in the home for rest of their lives. The home was recently stuccoed, and the appearance was significantly improved. The proposed windows will do the same. The occupants will be following the vernacular architectural traditions of many Santa Fe residents in the past: improving their homes with the means available, with the help of family members, and the use of recycled materials.

*Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response as other design options were not proposed.*

Staff received additional responses today and are attached as an Exhibit. With that response, she agreed with #1 and with #3 - the design options were laid out. So she finds the responses have met the exceptions

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that all the exception responses to add to a primary elevation have been met but that the exception responses to remove historic material and not replace in kind have not been met, however further testimony from the applicant may satisfy the Board. Otherwise the staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas handed out additional exception criteria responses. [A copy is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1.]

### **Questions to Staff**

Member Roybal asked if you can make sure, on a contributing building that the addition of porches would change the historic value.



Ms. Ramirez Thomas said no because it can be removed and is a common element and this is a vernacular home and needed for the current use and in style with it.

Member Biedscheid pointed out the new criteria responses for removing historic fabric has six criteria and previously was for three criteria.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified that they just provided more information.

Member Biedscheid asked if it is the same size.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed but it has a little different window style.

Member Bayer noted on #3, that they are just removing a casement window under the portal. There is another casement window, however.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified that both are intended to be replaced.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Dale Zinn, Box 756, was sworn. He said the substitution criteria were submitted two weeks ago but didn't make it into the packet. There are two casement windows being replaced on the east façade. His intent was to do more research on those casement windows. There was a photo they are still searching for that the replacement to a casement window was done in the late sixties. The nature of the house was changed. A window was changed. There have been a lot of changes and they were not anything Applegate thought about.

Mr. Zinn wanted the representative of the owner to speak about the vernacular style.

Ms. Rita Hales Baca, 503 Hillside, was sworn and said she was one of the owners although she doesn't currently reside there but three of her sisters do. The Hales family has owned this home for 75 years. Five of them were born in that house, including her. And to this day, they have family gatherings there pretty much daily. "So our home is very dear to us. I'm asking you to support this because our house needs improvement. Two porches and two windows are needed aesthetically, for energy, and for safety. We want to continue improving it as our parents did - many times with salvaged material. We adapted as our family changed, always with the intention of creating a better home for us to live in. Thanks for your time and I again ask you to support it for our family."

Mr. Sam Baca, 503 Hillside, was sworn. He said he married into the Hales family and has gotten to know the house very well and Jesus and Teresa very well before they passed. He also spent the biggest chunk of his career in preservation with Cornerstones Partnerships and he did a lot in addition of helping with those projects and what he learned in those communities was the real meaning and spirit of vernacular architecture. It was the particular style of historic adobe churches and the houses in those communities were designed and built by those people. With vernacular, you build the best you can with the available materials and when you become more prosperous and have other materials, you improve it.

Jesus and Teresa followed that principle and didn't hesitate to do what was needed to improve it for their family. It is more important to protect the values than to keep the building exactly the same. Their children are carrying on that spirit. And as Mr. Zinn said, they would be the biggest advocates for this project.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Member Roybal asked what other windows are there.

Mr. Zinn said there are some steel casements on the south side. There are a variety of windows and some steel casements are still there. The concern on these two is because they are part of the project, but they won't change any of the others.

Member Roybal asked if the two proposed windows will match those existing windows.

Mr. Zinn said they have the same dimensions and similar light pattern. The building next door has the kind of wood windows he thought were in here. They were two over two double hung windows.

Mr. Zinn asked Mr. Rasch to show the north side. They wanted the portal to extend to the end there, a little bit proud, if the Board would allow it to extend about 8" more.

Member Katz thanked him for providing very good drawings.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained that extending the portal would require an exception.

Mr. Zinn said, "never mind."

Member Boniface liked the fact that it is set back. It gives a sense of involvement of these volumes of room block massing that would be more emphasized with extending it.

Mr. Zinn agreed.

#### Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said Ms. Rios has been here for so long and to hear that the father changed everything. She thought the addition of the portals is perfectly in keeping - primary façade or not. It is very typical and also can be taken down without changing the façade. She also liked that the one on the north doesn't go to the end of the building. It doesn't need symmetry. She had a little heartburn over changing the windows because there is no proof of what was there before the casements to replicate.

Going to an earlier time period is best but Ms. Rios always champions casement windows and she wondered if they would come back later because they are not energy efficient.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Powell said it is wonderful to retain steel casement windows when you can. It is clear from the history this is vernacular and by late sixties, a lot of gas stations and industrial buildings had steel casements that are is wonderful to preserve. It was a brief period when they used casement windows and they were considered avant garde then. He could easily see that they would put them in during the sixties and what they say makes a lot of sense regarding the time frame when they were installed. He just hoped they don't go to the land fill but to a salvage yard for use somewhere else. They are hard to find.

Mr. Zinn said he worked on the inventory of IHS. There are- 350 beautiful perfect casement windows and they won't replace them.

#### Action of the Board

**Member Powell moved in Case #H-16-094 at 324 Camino del Monte Sol, to approve the application as submitted, finding the exception criteria have been met. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Chair Rios returned to the bench after the vote.

5. **Case #H-17-089, 1212 Canyon Road.** Historic District. Doug Webb, agent for Sigmund Jenssen, owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows and construct a balcony on a contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to install non-conforming windows (Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e)). (David Rasch)

The applicant was not present.

**Member Bayer moved to postpone Case #H-17-089 to November 14, 2017. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Member Boniface said he would not be present at the next meeting.

Chair Rios said she would not be present at the second meeting in November.

The second meeting is scheduled for November 28<sup>th</sup>.


**J. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.

Historic Districts Review Board  
October 24, 2017

## **EXHIBIT 1**

**Updated responses top the exception  
criteria for removing historic fabric  
submitted September 26, 2017**

**EXCEPTION RESPONSES TO REMOVING HISTORIC FABRIC A PRIMARY FAÇADE  
324 Camino del Monte Sol**

**1.0 Does not damage the character of the district:**

The Owners contend that the shaping forces for this house is vernacular in nature; and thus fabric that is being removed is ostensibly steel sash windows that were temporary in nature and replacements for wood windows that were previously installed in those exact locations.

It is not clear that these steel sash windows are indeed historic fabric because ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup> installed at an undetermined time. These windows were probably manufactured more than 50 years old but there is some photographic evidence that they may not have been installed until the late 1960's As long as the replacement windows, new or salvaged are set in the exact same openings it is reasonable to assume no "historic fabric" has been removed.

None the less, the window replacements will not damage the historic character of the district. The steel sash windows do not harmonize with the historic character of the pueblo revival architecture. True divided light replacement wood windows echo back to the original intent of Applegate and others who developed and championed this style of building.

**2.0 Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:**

The current windows are not considered by the Owner and may indeed not be "historic" from the 50 year installed criteria. Not allowing them to be replaced would create a hardship in that the Owners would need to continue to try to maintain and live with failing steel sash windows with single pane glass lites. It is important for the longevity of a historic structure to have good windows and doors that protect the occupants and the adobe walls in this case from damage from condensation and leaks.

**3.0 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 occupants of this home treasure their home and want to continue to improve it; as their parents did and they want to continue to reside in the home for the rest of their lives.

Options the were considered were as follows:

1. Replace the windows in kind with more efficient steel cased window with double glazing.
2. Keep the existing windows and install interior storm sashes to marginally improve the energy efficiency of the existing units.

Both of these options were rejected because to the nature of metal sash windows do not harmonize with the district or with the historic character of this house. Removing these two steel sash units would strengthen the unique character of the City by creating a more homogenous look to the east primary façade. The removal of these units would not deplete the wide variety of window designs and materials and window sash types in the district.

**4. Are due to special conditions which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the streetscape.**

The unique character of growth of this residence and the associated business is that there has been constant change to the windows, doors and entrance portal areas over the years. The vernacular "home grown and designed" nature of the architecture survives in the current Owners and occupants as direct descendants of the original driving force of the constant change in the design for this house Jesus Rios.

**5. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the action of the applicant.**

The current proposal is out of a long standing expressed but un-met need that Mr. Rios was unable to implement that was changing and improving the house before his death at age 95.

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

Removing these two units which may or may not reach the level of being "historic " will not create a negative impact on the house, on the neighborhood or on the district. On the contrary, the removing these two windows will be a positive visual improvement while providing energy efficiency for this family home.