



# Agenda

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

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

### CALL TO ORDER

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 28, 2019
- D. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-18-105, 635 Garcia Street.

Case #H-19-033A, 808 Gildersleeve Street.

Case #H-19-041, 202 Gonzales Road.

Case #H-19-043, 225 Johnson Street.

Case #H-19-016A, 803 Agua Fria Street.

Case #H-19-039, 113 Vigil Lane.

Case #H-19-042, 576 1/2 Camino del Monte Sol.

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

1. Case #H-19-041, 202 Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. E3 Design Lab, agent for Greg Dye, owner, proposes to raise parapets and construct a 220 sq. ft addition to a maximum allowable height of 15'1", to add a 390 sq. ft. portal and a 670 sq. ft. casita, construct 48" to 72" high yard walls and fences, replace windows and doors, add exterior lighting and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora, [cagemora@santafenm.gov](mailto:cagemora@santafenm.gov), 955-6670)
2. Case #H-19-046, 1658 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Pringle and Vivian Peitit, agents/owners, propose to construct a 5' high latilla fence and a 5' high latilla trash enclosure with pedestrian gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
3. Case #H-19-0047, 133 Romero Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Joan Aon, owner, proposes to demolish a shed, construct a 189 sq. ft. portal, and a 11 sq. ft. construct addition, and infill a window and door on a non-contributing non-residential structure. (Lisa Roach, [lxroach@santafenm.gov](mailto:lxroach@santafenm.gov), 955-6657)
4. Case #H-19-044, 1011 Camino Santander. Historic Review Historic District. Tiho Dimitrov, agent for Tierra Realty LLC, owner, proposes to demolish a non-stated residential structure. (Lisa Roach)
5. Case #H-19-045A, 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, responds to a staff request to designate status and primary elevations, if applicable, for a non-stated accessory structure. (Carlos Gemora)
6. Case #H-19-045B, 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, requests retroactive approval for an approximately 222 sq. ft. portal to a height of 8'7" on a non-stated residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

- H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD
- I. 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 <https://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board> 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.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: June 5, 2019

TIME: 11:39 AM



# Agenda

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

### CALL TO ORDER

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 28, 2019
- D. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-18-105, 635 Garcia Street.

Case #H-19-033A, 808 Gildersleeve Street.

Case #H-19-040, 336 Don Cubero Place.

Case #H-19-042, 576 1/2 Camino del Monte Sol.

Case #H-19-043, 225 Johnson Street.

Case #H-19-016A, 803 Agua Fria Street.

Case #H-19-039, 113 Vigil Lane.

Case #H-19-041, 202 Gonzales Road.

Case #H-19-043, 225 Johnson Street.

Case #H-19-044, 1011 Camino Santander.

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

1. Case #H-19-046, 1658 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Pringle and Vivian Peitit, agents/owners, propose to construct a 5' high latilla fence and a 5' high latilla trash enclosure with pedestrian gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora, [cegemora@santafenm.gov](mailto:cegemora@santafenm.gov), 955-6670)
2. Case #H-19-0047, 133 Romero Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Joan Aon, owner, proposes to demolish a shed, construct a 189 sq. ft. portal, and a 11 sq. ft. construct addition, and infill a window and door on a non-contributing non-residential structure. (Lisa Roach, [lroach@santafenm.gov](mailto:lroach@santafenm.gov), 955-6657)
3. Case #H-19-044, 1011 Camino Santander. Historic Review Historic District. Tiho Dimitrov, agent for Tierra Realty LLC, owner, proposes to demolish a non-statused residential structure. (Lisa Roach)
4. Case #H-19-045A, 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, responds to a staff request to designate status and primary elevations, if applicable, for a non-statused accessory structure. (Carlos Gemora)
5. Case #H-19-045B, 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, requests retroactive approval for an approximately 222 sq. ft. portal to a height of 8'7" on a non-statused residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
6. Case #H-19-019, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121 Camino Santiago and 104, 105, 107, 109, 111, 116/120 Camino Matias. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, historic status review and designation of primary façades, if applicable, for all residential structures in the Plaza del Monte Subdivision, except those reviewed for historic status in Case #H-17-098A (122, 124, 125, 126, and garages south of 126 Camino Santiago). (Lisa Roach)

### H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

### I. 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 <https://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board> 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.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: May 23, 2019

TIME: 8:33 AM

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
June 11, 2019

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION TAKEN</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE(S)</u></b>
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
D. Approval of Minutes - May 28, 2019	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	None	3
H. Action Items		
1. Case #H-19-041. 202 Gonzales Road	Approved with conditions	3-7
2. Case #H-19-046. 1658 Cerro Gordo Road	Postponed with directions	6-13
3. Case #H-19-047. 133 Romero Street	Approved with conditions	13-15
4. Case #H-19-044. 1011 Camino Santander	Approved demolition	15-19
5. Case #H-19-045A. 917 Acequia Madre	Designated as non-contributing	19-21
6. Case #H-19-045B. 917 Acequia Madre	Approved	21-26
I. Matters from the Board	Discussion	26-28
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:30 p.m.	28

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
200 LINCOLN AVE.  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  
TUESDAY, June 11, 2019 at 5:30 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe 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 Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**A. 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. Anthony Guida  
Ms. Flynn G. Larson  
Mr. Herbert Lotz  
Mr. Buddy Roybal

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Carlos Gemora, Senior Planner  
Ms. Lisa Roach, Planner Manager  
Ms. Sally A. Paez, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Linda Vigil, Stenographer, for Carl Boaz

**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.

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Roybal, to approve the

**agenda as published.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 28, 2019**

Member Biedscheid requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 28, Paragraph 6, it should say, "Member Biedscheid said that the South Capital area is characterized by small lots and is in scale in keeping with the \*streetscape." With regards to the color, she suggested green is not a favorite color. It is not an earth tone color."

On page 39, under the Board discussion, she was not sure she asked about the purpose of the area and was not sure who did.

Chair Rios requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 2, under approval of minutes, the third paragraph should say "during the break."

On page 13, under questions, the second sentence should say, "This is also very common in this historic district."

**MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Roybal, to approve the minutes of May 28, 2019 as amended.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

**D. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**Case #H-18-105. 635 Garcia Street.**

**Case #H-19-033A. 808 Gildersleeve Street.**

**Case #H-19-041. 202 Gonzales Road.**

**Case #H-19-043. 225 Johnson Street.**

**Case #H-19-016A. 803 Agua Fria Street.**

**Case #H-19-039. 113 Vigil Lane.**

**Case #H-19-042. 576 ½ Camino del Monte Sol.**

**MOTION: Member Roybal moved, seconded by Member Katz, to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

#### **E. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None.

#### **F. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **G. ACTION ITEMS**

Chair Rios explained to the audience, if there are any objections to the Board decisions tonight they can appeal it to City Council within 15 days after the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law have been approved.

- 1. Case #H-19-041. 202 Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** E3 Design Lab, agent for Greg Dye, owner, proposes to raise parapets and construct a 220 sq. ft addition to a maximum allowable height of 15'1", to add a 390 sq. ft. portal and a 670 sq. ft. casita, construct 48" to 72" high yard walls and fences, replace windows and doors, add exterior lighting and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora, cegemora@santafenm.gov, 955-6670)

Mr. Gemora presented the Staff Report as follows:

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

202 Gonzales Road is an approximately 1,800 sq. ft. residence built with simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival features in 1967 and designated non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. In May of 2019, the Board approved raising

parapet heights to 15'-1", a 220 sq. ft. addition, a 390 sq. ft. portal, and a 670 sq. ft. casita. The Board, however, postponed action on the proposed windows, doors, fences, walls, and gates.

**Windows and Doors:** The Board requested additional details regarding color and also requested that the all existing windows were replaced with divided lites rather than retaining the existing, non-divided-lite units.

1. The applicant proposes the following clad colors ordered by preference: Kolbe "Smokestack," Kolbe Khaki," Kolbe "Sahara," and Sierra Pacific "Slate Grey." Approved building stucco is El Rey "Buckskin."
2. The applicant proposes replacing the two most prominent, street-facing windows with divided lite units but the front-facing windows beneath the portal will remain with undivided lites.

**Front Fence, Parking Area, and Trash Enclosure:** The Board requested a reduction or simplification of materials and styles and either more details and examples of what horizontal, viga fencing might look like or, alternatively, using conventional vertical latillas.

3. For the front fence, the applicant has removed the request for horizontal viga fencing and requests only a puddled adobe wall with mud stucco and vertical latilla fencing to the maximum allowable height of 4'-0". Two sections of latilla fencing will break up the main wall mass.
4. For the parking area and trash enclosure, the applicant proposes a 5'-0" tall adobe wall with mud stucco with a vertical latilla gate and a 6'-0" tall vertical latilla trash enclosure.

**Front Gate:** The Board requested additional information on the proposed design and materials.

5. The applicant proposes a 5'-10" tall gate flanked by two 6'-0" tall mud-stuccoed pillars. One half of the gate would be cleaned and sealed steel, the other half would have vertical latillas to match the latilla fence. Hardware would have a black finish.

**Exterior Lighting:**

6. The applicant proposes cylindrical exterior lighting with an antiqued black finish. Bulbs will be completely shielded, and light is directed downward in compliance with "Night Sky" guidelines.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts – Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Staff recommended removal of the requested latilla to the maximum 4 feet

because it will break up the wall mass. The trash enclosure will be 5 feet tall with mud stucco. The front gate materials will have a 5-foot gate with two 6-foot pillars. One half of the gate is steel and vertical latillas to match. The hardware is black. For the exterior lighting they proposed a black finish and the lights will be directed down.

#### Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked if the windows will comply. Mr. Gemora agreed. The windows will be replaced with divided lights. It appears non-divided under the portal. Those are sometimes allowed but it is still a discrepancy.

Chair Rios asked if they want to keep any existing windows.

Mr. Gemora said they could but could change them if they wanted.

Member Biedscheid asked if the height of the fencing that is 4 feet will have mud stucco and vertical latillas. She asked if the pillars for the gate are allowed.

Mr. Gemora said they are allowed because they are set back (at the trash enclosure). The Board could determine they are not allowed but Staff believes they are allowed. The pillars and gate are generally allowed additions to the maximum allowable height and it is not forbidden but it is up to the Board.

Member Biedscheid asked about the gate. It appears to be a latilla gate but on page 23 it is a half steel and half latillas. She asked if it is wood or steel.

Mr. Gemora clarified that one foot to the left side there is a one-foot wing opening made of steel.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Estevan Trujillo, 133 W. Houghton Street, was sworn. He stated the gate will have latillas in the open section and he will add a hardwood stain, so they last and be sturdy.

He brought the color samples for the windows and doors and presented them to the Board.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked which windows he would keep.

Mr. Trujillo said he wanted to keep the window under the portal.

Chair Rios asked about the divided lights.

Mr. Trujillo shared an image showing the proposed design on the windows and doors. If the Board requests it, he would add a divided lite window under the portal.

Chair Rios thanked him for being cooperative.

Member Katz asked about the original horizontal vigas and the bottom why he broke up the latillas with some mass.

Mr. Trujillo felt it needed some mass to close it up. At the last meeting, he thought he could have done it with the horizontal.

Member Roybal complimented him for doing a great job complying.

Member Lotz asked what the term "puddled" means regarding the adobe wall.

Mr. Trujillo explained the Taos pueblo used this process. It is framed and adobe compressed with mud and straw. He will have some adobes and wanted to reuse it in the wall.

Mr. Guida thanked him for the drawings and reuse ethic. He asked about the steel finish on the gate, whether it will be natural and clear coated.

Mr. Trujillo said it would be raw but cleaned and sealed so it does not rust. He did not want the rust finish because it comes off on clothes.

Mr. Guida asked if rather than the reddish rusted color it will be dark gray.

Mr. Trujillo agreed it would be a more grayish tone and go with the windows.

#### Public Comment

John Eddy, 227 E. Palace Ave. Suite D, was sworn. He said he is always gratified when he sees a native Santa Fean bring back a house from decay. It is creative work, and he liked the idea of bringing the window under the portal to match the other windows. The tin roof was unclear, and he was concerned about seeing bright steel.

Mr. Trujillo explained the steel will tamp down and get a patina finish over time.

Mr. Eddy asked if the rigidity in the walls will be changed in the front yard where

he saw hard lines. He felt the adobe wall will keep it in character. It has a vernacular look. It was plastered. It would keep the character.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, was sworn. She agreed with Mr. Eddy that the wall needs softening. The divided window under the portal will keep more with the look.

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

#### Board Discussion

Chair Rios asked about the color of the tin on the roof.

Mr. Trujillo stated it has a galvalume color and does not have reflectivity. It is a traditional material used on churches. He is tapering the parapets so there will be some curvature to the corners and the wall.

Chair Rios asked about the window under the portal. If it is existing and she did not suggest the Board force him to divide it. He would like to keep it if he could.

Member Roybal asked to see the color of the portal roof.

Chair Rios noted the tin has a matte finish.

Member Guida asked about the window detailing on the corners of the house. He was also curious if there is an inset.

Mr. Trujillo said the windows will be recessed. He will use foam insulation on the walls.

Member Guida asked how far they will be recessed.

Mr. Trujillo said the recess would be about 3 inches or maybe more.

Member Guida asked about the corners of the windows.

Mr. Trujillo said he would taper them, and the corners will be rounded.

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION: Member Guida moved, seconded by Member Roybal, in Case #H-19-041 at 202 Gonzales Road, to approve the application per Staff recommendations for Item 1 to Colby smokestack, that two divided**

light windows be required, with the condition that all corners be rounded, and all other items accepted as proposed.

**VOTE:** The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

2. **Case #H-19-046. 1658 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Robert Pringle and Vivian Peitit, agents/owners, propose to construct a 5' high latilla fence and a 5' high latilla trash enclosure with pedestrian gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the Staff Report as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1658 Cerro Gordo (recently changed from 1660 ½) is a non-contributing residential structure set back approximately 70' and down a 15' embankment from Cerro Gordo Road. Along the roadway there currently exists an existing latilla fence of varying height and a section of overlapping lattice material serving as an impromptu fence amidst trees and shrubs.

The applicant proposes to construct a latilla fence, trash enclosure, and gates to the maximum allowable height of 60" (5'-0" as measured above finished grade on the streetside elevation). All latillas will have varying and irregular heights and the horizontal stringer supports will be located toward the inner side of the property.

Approximately 10' of fencing is proposed on the eastern property line to the northeast corner. Approximately 92' of fencing is proposed along Cerro Gordo from the northeast corner to a power pole near the northwest corner which would still leave 16' to 20' of non-fenced area between the power pole and the northwest corner. Nearest the power pole, the applicant proposes to two 3'-6" wide gates and an 8' x 8' latilla trash enclosure which will screen the trash cans for the property owner and some of the neighbors.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project with the conditions that the fence shall have vertical latillas of varying heights and that the horizontal structural supports do not face the exterior of the property and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts – Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown

and Eastside Design Standards.

### Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Robert Pringle, 1658 Cerro Gordo Rd., was sworn. He said this is a simple project. He wants to keep the fence on his property. He found the markers and they go back 6 inches. It will be an improvement to the look of the property. The current fence is falling over. The new fence should make it look more beautiful.

### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios said the Board noticed there is a portion of the fence that is still in good condition.

Mr. Pringle said he would use those parts and would trim them. There are some that are leaning back which he would have to remove.

Member Lotz asked if the new fence would come up the edge of the road.

Mr. Pringle said it will be on the property line. He will find the markers and stay back 6 inches. There is a good two feet there. He plans to stay back from the hump. The power pole, he wants to be equal with or behind it. After he finds the markers he will have a better idea where to put it.

Member Lotz explained he was asking because it is very narrow.

Mr. Pringle said there is a fair number of trees and foliage. The current fence is at a different angle along the road.

Mr. Gemora noted that the site plan provided has some approximate lines and so the existing fence is set back 8-10 feet now. It is a bit unclear. The Board could ask for it to be set back as opposed to the property.

Mr. Pringle explained there has been a pole in front of the telephone box. Drivers have hit it. He would not go past that point and would find the property lines.

Member Lotz noted he saw a lot of earth moved and asked what that was for.

Mr. Pringle explained over the years the water channels down through the ditch under the road. Periodically it overflows and creates a lake and has washed away a foot of dirt. A few summers ago it almost took off the stucco. The stream was going along the house and the porch and washed out landscaping and plants. He has been trying to fix it himself.

Ms. Roach explained to him that he needs a grading permit for that project.

Mr. Pringle was not aware he needed one.

Ms. Roach explained that he could be cited without a permit.

Mr. Pringle said he was not building a driveway.

Mr. Gemora clarified that all grading and drainage is handled by technical review and is not the purview of this Board.

Member. Biedscheid asked if the coyote fence will face the street. The report states the supports should be on the inside.

Member Katz thanked him for his willingness to use the existing latillas.

Mr. Pringle said he has found other latillas on the property that he can reuse.

#### Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought it might be a good idea to have the fence set back since the utility poles may be in the City ROW. She did not remember how close they are, perhaps a few feet back.

Ms. Priscilla Romero, 1654 Cerro Gordo, was sworn. She said her family has been there from the 1800's. Her aunt and uncle lived there and there was already a latilla fence that is set back intended for the trash of several elderly residents. At his ownership, Mr. Pringle removed other trash cans. He states he would allow them but for a fee. If there is an easement to allow them to put them there that could be a better solution.

Ms. Romero had photos of the dirt movement and parking area on the bottom that is for his personal use. He rents rooms to people they do not know. She was concerned about the movement of dirt and she knows there are statutes in place about that. A permit is required for that.

Ms. Romero said her uncle once lived there and she has lived there and knows the rainfall can be drastic. Robert made a nice arroyo that captures the runoff into the acequia.

She said she heard with that dirt Mr. Pringle was going to create a new driveway and close it off to the three properties owned since 1956. That was a concern. For the enclosure, she wanted to know if that fence is the front or if it is just walkways or if his intention is to leave a driveway and, if so, he needs a permit.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Romero to clarify where the trash cans are.

Ms. Romero said they are along the existing fence which was specifically set back to allow for them.

Chair Rios understood that he must go through the proper channels for a permit.

Mr. Gemora explained the existing fence is on top of the rock wall.

Mr. Mike Lofton, 1660½ Cerro Gordo, was sworn and said he has lived there 15 years now,

He encouraged the Board to postpone this matter. The trash cans have been there a long time. He had been told that Mr. Pringle told one neighbor he is moving the driveway. He sent a letter saying he will let the neighbors use it if they pay for the coyote fence. The neighborhood was great and then he cut up the house and rents rooms to unrelated adults. He has not been a good neighbor with whom they would like to get along. The drainage is going to change, and the water cannot permeate. So, it will flood the acequia.

Ms. Paez reminded Mr. Loftin that this case is limited to the design of the structure.

Mr. Loftin said he would like to meet with Mr. Pringle and figure out a way and to be informed what is going on.

Chair Rios asked if the project was posted.

Mr. Gemora said it was advertised and posted.

Chair Rios said the yellow sign should have been up.

Mr. Loftin said the yellow sign was how he found about it. It would be good to understand the whole context. He understood the driveway was separate, He wanted to understand the earthwork because there is no posting of that. He asked if that part follows the Land Use Code.

He said he was willing to be openminded and encouraged the Board to postpone this case until they all agree.

Member Katz agreed there are aspects of it that are not under the Board's jurisdiction. There is a certain vagueness where the fence is going to go and that made him uncomfortable, It is vague when the Applicant is not getting permits for grading.

Ms. Suzanna Barela Romero. 1668 Cerro Gordo Road, was sworn and said she was concerned. The trash is kept there and is close to the road. It is a sensitive area with the acequia there and was concerned that they know each other. It was stressful to her to not be sure who was living there.

Mr. Eddy (previously sworn) also agreed the Board should postpone the case. There are too many issues. The water draining into the acequia may not be legal. It is not legal to drain water from their right of way. There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

#### Board Discussion

Chair Rios asked Mr. Pringle to respond to the public comments.

Mr. Pringle explained when he bought the property, it showed on Google Earth where they kept trash there 365 days a year. The City has actually ticketed them. He believed it ruined curb appeal and it ruined the chances of an elderly neighbor selling his home.

Ms. Roach wanted to keep the discussion on the design and placement of the fence. Mr. Pringle states he wants to keep the fence on his side of the property and says he is not trying to do something bad.

Chair Rios asked where the proposed trash enclosure will be and how many bins could be held.

Mr. Pringle said the enclosure would only keep four bins: his and his neighbors to the back. The others can put their trash containers on their own property.

Chair Rios asked if he was proposing two enclosures.

Mr. Pringle clarified it would be one enclosure with room for four cans. He will take it right up to the adobe wall and would not go passed it.

Member Roybal said his concern was about the layout, the location of the fence and the dirt.

Mr. Pringle was upset and stated the trash was disgusting. He said he is

withdrawing his application and will get a lawyer.

Ms. Roach said the Board needs to make a decision on this case either way.

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION:** Member Roybal moved, seconded by Member Larson, in Case #H-19-046 at 1658 Cerro Gordo Road, to postpone the application until further information is presented, with a date certain of June 25, 2019 if the Applicant is ready and the property is surveyed, and the area is flagged.

**VOTE:** The motion passed by majority (4-2) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Guida, Larson, and Roybal voting in favor and Members Katz and Lotz voting against.

**3. Case #H-19-0047. 133 Romero Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Joan Aon, owner, proposes to demolish a shed, construct a 189 sq. ft. portal, and a 11 sq. ft. construct addition, and infill a window and door on a non-contributing non-residential structure. (Lisa Roach, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657)

Ms. Roach presented the Staff Report as follows:

#### BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

133 Romero Street is a 5,196 square foot non-residential structure listed as non-contributing to the Westside Guadalupe Historic District. The present building comprises former residences addressed as 133 and 135 Romero Street, which were constructed by 1935 in a simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style and modified extensively since.

The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

1. Demolish an attached 94 square foot shed on the north elevation of the building, and replace it with a 189 square foot portal with wooden structural members stained "walnut" brown and brick paving;
2. Remove small wing walls at the west portal, and reconstruct the portal steps;
3. Remove and infill one non-historic window on the west elevation;
4. Replace a non-historic window on the west elevation with a metal clad Pella window in "Iron Ore";

5. Replace a door on the west elevation with a metal clad Pella window in "Iron Ore";
6. Construct a small segment of 58" high coyote fencing at the northwest corner of the building, between the building and the yard wall;
7. Restucco the west yard wall and patch, and repair stucco as needed on the structure in El Rey "Palomino."

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts - Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(I) Westside Guadalupe Design Standards.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios asked if this is the Ark Bookstore location.

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

Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, was sworn. He explained the stucco is a combination between Bamboo and Palomino. They will match it up. They are raising the wall on the north property line up to six feet. Right now, it is a low fence. They will raise the other existing wall to 5'8 and will put coyote fencing on top to match. There is an alleyway full of weeds and they would like to clean it up and turn into a mediation space.

They also want to put gravel and sculptures in and increase their retail area.

There is a storage room that needs some work, including repair of leaks. The other storage room is being removed.

A short coyote fence with cut off access to the small area. There will be some minor interior work. They will be adding 11 square feet and an open storage area and infill to complete the connection.

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

Member Larson thanked the Applicant for this proposal which will beautify the neighborhood.

#### **Public Comment**

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

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION:** Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, in Case #H-19-0047 at 133 Romero Street, to approve the application with the stucco colors matched.

**VOTE:** The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

**4. Case #H-19-044. 1011 Camino Santander.** Historic Review Historic District. Tiho Dimitrov, agent for Tierra Realty LLC, owner, proposes to demolish a non-statused residential structure. (Lisa Roach)

Ms. Roach presented the Staff Report as follows:

#### BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1011 Camino Santander is a non-statused residence in the Historic Review District. The residence began as two structures, constructed in a vernacular manner by 1960 and combined modified extensively since. The applicant proposes to demolish the masonry and wood frame structure and associated yard walls and paving due to deterioration and non-conformity with district styles. The structure is not known to have any historical importance and has not been found to comprise an essential part of a unique street section or block front.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed demolition and finds that the application complies with Section 14-3.14 Demolition of Historic or Landmark Structure.

#### Questions to Staff

Member Larson asked if they plan to photograph the building before demolition.

Mr. Gemora said there are already some photos of it on file.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Trey Jordan, 227 E. Palace Ave., Suite W, was sworn. He said this house is not in the East Side District. The home has been severely altered.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Roach explained the reason this case is before this Board is because of a conflict in the code. The standards for alterations have to be reviewed by Staff by the demolition standards. The applications have to come before the H Board. There are some concerns that it is before the Board.

Member Katz explained that in his review of the Code, it states that if the structure is not historic, the Board should have no say if it is to be demolished.

Member Biedscheid said it is not historic so there is nothing to be applied.

Mr. Gemora pointed out that especially in the district, there some that are not statused and still maybe historic.

Chair Rios said it would have to be noncontributing or have no status.

Member Biedscheid commented that the age may make it eligible.

Chair Rios said those go directly to Staff.

Member Larson thought it would be beneficial for the research to be done to make sure they keep a record of the photos of the existing structure for future generations and current research.

Ms. Roach they will request photos and scaled drawings.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Peter Schoenfeldt, San Acacio Neighborhood Association, was sworn. He said they are not disputing the demolition of the home but of the demolition of the property. The plat shows there are two gabions that are WPA structures built in in 1933-1942, They serve a purpose - to protect people down from the drainage area. These gabions are there and in the next lot they fit the definitions of the structures.

They are concerned that the new owner came in without a permit and demolished some of them. But the owner stopped when the Association wrote a letter complaining about them. They are there for flood control. They are there to

protect the other 4-5 residents from the flooding. The gabions are part of the same project.

The other entity that could be affected is the City itself, The City owns the street to which this arroyo flows. With the removal of the gabions the owners are exposing a substantial number of neighbors. And they are concerned. The gabions filter sediments and prevent erosion and flooding.

There are photographs on page 7 and 8 where you can see where the drainage is. In 1960, the arroyo ran into San Acacio to the drainage to Don Miguel. They were designed to protect those areas. There are now four houses in danger if the gabions were to be removed.

Ms. Roach understood the removal of the gabions is not being proposed. The owners are aware, and the Architecture Review Committee said if the gabions are 75 years and older they will be handled by that committee.

Chair Rios asked how many gabions were demolished.

Ms. Roach said there were two.

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) liked the idea of documenting these buildings and having a photograph for the applications and at some point they should separate the files since it is only retained for 10 years. That would be a good idea. She hoped that the Board, for any building older than 50 years, that they look at the demolition permit if it is not statused.

Mr. Gemora wanted it to be known that the City keeps the files longer than ten years.

Chair Rios asked how they are kept.

Mr. Gemora explained that the digital copies they have are easier to protect and preserve. They are trying to digitize all of them.

Ms. Roach said the majority are digitized now. They are all in the queue and will be kept with the rest of the records.

Mr. Gemora added that there are no plans to ever delete or phase out those records.

Ms. Annette Groenfeldt, 1021 Camino Santander, was sworn and said she is the neighbor to the top. She has no problem with the demolition of the house. Her concern is if there is a photo showing the height of the new proposed structure. She wants to be assured that it would not affect her view.

Chair Rios explained that if the Applicant wants to build something there, they are required to post a sign and then she is welcome to come to the Board about it.

Mr. Gemora explained generally the projects are designed according to the Code so that Staff will recommend approval. The height should match the street scape. That would be a Staff decision.

Chair Rios asked how the neighbors will be informed.

Ms. Roach said the permit is always posted before it is approved. Staff is working on a better system.

Mr. James Farris, 990 Camino San Acacio, was sworn. He said he lives off the northeast corner and it is steep from the top of the house to the end of the corner. It is at least 75-100 feet. The gabions are there for a reason. He has one on his property and they are functional. There is currently a sign that says there are two parcels. He did not know what that means. He asked if both parcels have to be bought at the same time.

Ms. Marilee Bost, 1007 & 1009 Camino Santander, was sworn. He said she has the property just down from this address. She watched them move a lot of dirt. Hers would be the first property that would be eroded. Her home would not be affected but the property would.

Ms. Roach asked that comments should be restricted to the item on the agenda.

Chair Rios understood but pointed out that when people come here, it is because they do not have another place to discuss these matters. So she allows them to express their views. But it has been stated that the gabions are not at issue.

Ms. Roach explained that there will be an archaeological review at their committee meeting.

Chair Rios explained it is in the Historic Review District, which is why Staff brought it forward. It is written in the Ordinance.

Ms. Roach added that the historic districts are outlined in the code.

Ms. Paez said on the web, it shows the overlays and shows the standards.

Member Katz noted that the height issue is subject to review.

Mr. Eddy asked if the Applicant is required to bring plans that they will be

replacing the building with after the demolition.

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

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, in Case #H-19-044 at 1011 Camino Santander, to approve the application to demolish the structure as submitted and to clarify the yard walls and paving.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by majority (5-1) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and Member Larson voting against.**

**5. Case #H-19-045A. 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, responds to a staff request to designate status and primary elevations, if applicable, for a nonstatused accessory structure. (Carlos Gemora)**

Mr. Gemora presented the Staff Report as follows:

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

917 Acequia Madre consists of a contributing home and an unstatused casita located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The contributing principal structure was likely constructed in the 1930's (according to assessor data) and while staff presume the unstatused accessory structure is historic, there is no presented documentation of its history. An aerial image shows a probable structure in 1971 or 1972, a historic inventory from 1984 mentions an accessory garage, and an inventory from 2003 shows the building with a north-facing pedestrian door.

The accessory structure is approximately 300 sq. ft. with parapets about 8'-5" high and a chimney. Neither the alley-facing façade (west) nor the façade facing the contributing home (south) have fenestrations or notable design features. A pedestrian door opens to the north and a window peers to the east. An approximately 280 sq. ft. portal was constructed in early 2018.

Although the structure may be historic, staff finds no features to convey historic integrity and little-to-no significant features which contribute to the district.

## **RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:**

### **14-5.2(A)(1) General Purpose**

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the city and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and development of the city, it is deemed essential by the governing body that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve property values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and preservation of historical areas and buildings;

(b) The continued construction of buildings in the historic styles; and

(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

### **14-12 Contributing Structure:**

A structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

### **14-12 Primary Façade:**

One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the historic status of the structure be designated non-contributing per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

### **Questions to Staff**

Chair Rios clarified this case is just a historic status designation.

### **Applicant's Presentation**

Mr. Randall Bell, attorney for clients of 917 Acequia Madre, was sworn. He said there was not much to add. He agrees with the conclusions and the accessory should be non-contributing the house should remain.

Chair Rios asked how many square feet there were.

Mr. Gemora said 300 square feet and said it is a simple calculation.

#### Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Application.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Gary Friedman, representing the neighbors to the north, was sworn. The only question he had was if it is non-contributing, he had information from the county assessors as part of their information, that showed a 288 foot extension of the property. The information they had said it was built in 1931.

Mr. Gemora said the records they have shown the house was built in 1931 built, but the assessor's office records are not always accurate. There is very little to say if the accessory was built in 1971. If the structure was built in 1931, Staff still see it as a historic structure.

Mr. Guida asked if the report shows an extension, or if what they are discussing was the detached accessory.

Mr. Friedman said there were no records found.

Member Katz said it was not clear, but the basis is that the recommendation, even if it was built then, is not worthy of contributing status.

Mr. Friedman asked if no one has researched it enough. He is leaving it up to the Board.

Mr. Eddy (previously sworn) asked if they have any information on the property. Chair Rios has lived there and walked near there.

Ms. Roach said it is not reliable for a personal

investigation to rely on.

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

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION:**                    **Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, in Case #H-19-045A at 917 Acequia Madre, to approve the status of the home as non-contributing.**

**VOTE:**                    **The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

**6.                    Case #H-19-045B. 917 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Randall Bell, agent for Lynda Benglis, owner, requests retroactive approval for an approximately 222 sq. ft. portal to a height of 8'7" on a non-statused residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)**

Mr. Gemora presented the Staff Report as follows:

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

917 Acequia Madre consists of a contributing home and an un-statused accessory structure located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The contributing principal structure was likely constructed in the 1930's (according to assessor data) and while staff presume the un-statused accessory structure is historic, there is no presented documentation of its history. The accessory structure, or casita, is approximately 300 sq. ft. with parapets about 8'-5" high.

The applicant requests retroactive approval for an existing wood and stuccoed portal attached to the casita. The existing 280 sq. ft. portal uses unfinished, 8" diameter wood columns with a 12" stuccoed parapet that lacks a color coat and is built to a height of approximately 8'-7" high. Note that parapets are on the north, east, and a portion of the south portal edges and that parapets extend higher than the casita structure.

Due to the required 5' side setback from the property line, the applicant proposes a slightly reduced 222 sq. ft. final size. Design features would remain the same except for parapets which would be finished with an El Rey "Desert Rose" stucco.

Staff have included a packet submitted by the neighbors to the north who are strongly concerned with the visual impact of the portal and specifically request the proposed portal not rebuild a parapet on the north side. Staff encourage neighbors to have reasonable expectations about property rights and expectations for privacy or the visibility of neighboring structures but do note that the proposed parapets are on only three out of four sides, that parapets are not usually a structural requirement or necessarily historically accurate, and that the parapets raise the height of the portal above the attached building.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff encouraged the Board to consider parapet design but recommend approval of the proposed project which application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts - Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Mr. Roybal asked if the 280 square-foot addition was done without a permit.

Mr. Gemora said when it was built, it was not within code. This is not visible from the alley, There are smaller structures, and some have been expanded.

Chair Rios added that the homes are close to one another.

Mr. Guida asked if the portal is visible from the road.

Mr. Gemora said it was not from Acequia Madre. There is a small glimpse, but the closeness of other structures make it hard to see.

Ms. Roach clarified that the visibility in the district standards do not specifically factor when weighing the design. Part of that is because of them being so close together.

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

Mr. Bell appreciated the visibility issue. During the tour, it was not visible because of trees. Also, the only way you can see it if you walk down a few dozen yards on a private drive.

On behalf of the client, he apologized for the addition not being built with a permit. She believed her contractor was going to follow what he needed to do. She will comply with design standards. On one corner of the north side, she has proposed and submitted it to be cut back so as not to impinge on the neighboring property.

Mr. Bell said he and Mr. Friedman have spoken and it is his belief they can agree on a new design. The clients can see from their courtyard a stucco parapet and it is not color-coated.

In discussing with his client, she is willing to remove the parapet on the north side and instead, they propose to have a half round covered gutter along that side.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked if they would bring it in 2-3 feet.

Mr. Bell noted the setback requirement is 5 feet. The impingement is 3 feet.

Member Katz asked which way the water drains.

Mr. Bell said it is to the west.

Member Katz asked why it goes to the north.

Mr. Bell states his client prefers there be a gutter to keep ice and snow from the flagstone.

#### Board Discussion

Member Lotz asked if this could be considered a carport. Clearly it is not a violation to have it lower than a residence. Why would you put a parapet on and call it a portal? That was his opinion on it.

Mr. Gemora wanted it to be clarified that the applicant would remove the north side parapet, and there will still be one on the west and south side

Mr. Bell stated there is nothing on the west side. That is the drain side. By the connecting point and the parapet on the east side, the neighbors do not have an issue with it.

Mr. Gemora asked if there would still be one on the

east at the south where it connects with the structure.

Mr. Guida was not able to attend the field trip. However the retroactive approval is in conflict with the design standards. It would have come to this Board; had it been permitted. Now, there is a series of further designs and not designers. The proposal to remove some and not all are all considerations. To him, what is there now is nothing the Board would approve.

Member Biedscheid was not certain of the elevation drawings. They look more than two inches higher on the roofing than on the casita.

Mr. Gemora said it might be higher. Or it could be an error in the drawings.

Ms. Roach said the south drawing is not showing the mass that protrudes from the top. It is not supported by the beam. There is a floating parapet.

Mr. Gemora said the portal is 8 feet, 7 inches, so there is a two-inch difference from the structure and on site, it appeared that it was much greater than two inches. And the existing drawing does not show the setback.

Mr. Bell said he did not draw these. There are discrepancies. The piece of the parapet that is butting up to the structure should be properly reflected.

Member Biedscheid said the allowable height has a design issue. They prefer the additions be shorter than the existing structure. The difference of a few inches makes a difference.

Mr. Guida said it is confusing on the doors and windows. The lack of information to the property lines is also a problem.

Mr. Bell referred to the new survey in the packet. Member Lotz noted the photograph on the screen shows the vegetation from the street. If the owner takes it down, it could be a carport in the future.

Mr. Bell said there is no coyote fence. If you take it down and they sell it, it is perfect for a carport. But his clients have no intention of selling it.

Mr. Gemora referred to the picture on page 11 of the

packet. It shows the view from the west side.

Member Katz clarified that visibility from a private drive for multiple people is considered public visibility. The City interpretation does not consider trees that lose their leaves in the winter as blocking visibility. This is publicly visible, which although not relevant, really is.

### Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought that all attorneys have been put under oath at the H Board. It is easy to stray into giving facts. She agreed with Mr. Guida that they are coming in after the fact and did not comply with code. To say it is not publicly visible is an excuse. Your neighbor should decide. It is not compatible with anything in the neighborhood. The Board has the right to state what does not go well.

Mr. Friedman explained that his client could not be here this evening. He wanted to emphasize that Mr. Bell has been trying to come to agreement. His clients are frustrated and have been since August 2018. In his letter - they tried to send letters and they did not want to get a permit and they had to contact the City. The City began enforcement actions in May. They would not be backtracking on the illegal structure.

Mr. Friedman appreciated them trying to work it out. He submitted photos and his letter was on page 14 with photos. Photo 1 shows the portal from his client's wall. The mass of the structure exceeds the height. For the record, there is a survey (page 21) it is almost 4 feet right against the common wall. Photo 2 is a summer photo from their yard. The parapet is very visible. Photo 3 is the side road by Acequia Madre, and it shows the parapets. The next photo is the underside of the portal. His concern is he can see to improve the quality of construction. It is shoddy construction. Photo 5 is a close up that shows cracking. When you can see from the living room the portal looms over the property. He confirmed they have a difference of opinion about the light blocking. Photo 6 is a picture of that. His client walked around the neighborhood showing a simple portal that would be a good example for it.

Mr. Friedman said they agreed to pay for the cost to do something simple as opposed to this parapet. It is not reflective matte on the copper.

Mr. Bell respected the after the fact statement and the concerns of the Board that the project does violate the design standards. There is some issue of harmony. He did not think, as a matter of law, that the

neighbors get to determine how to design this property. He said he has been on the property and what they see from the backyard is just trees. It is simple and meets the code.

He understood that they offered the compromise which was to address the parapet on the north side.

Chair Rios pointed out when something is built without a permit there are issues. What she is hearing is they have agreed to remove the parapet on the north side with some drainage and bring in the structure design.

Member Roybal had concerns with the design and the standards.

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

#### Action of the Board

**MOTION:**                      **Member Guida moved, seconded by Member Roybal, in Case #H-19-045B at 917 Acequia Madre, to reject the application and ask the applicant to redevelop, revise and resubmit a new design that has design compatibility and to assure the Board and Staff the drawings are accurate, reflecting the measurements.**

#### **DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION:**

Member Biedscheid suggested that the portal addition be lower, and the parapets be low and the addition as large as the casita also. The proposal of the angle to the facade seems like a very thoughtful way to present it.

Chair Rios suggested a date certain,

Mr. Gemora believed it should be June 25<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Roach thought that might be too soon, July 9<sup>th</sup> may be best.

The maker and seconder of the motion agreed to a date certain of July 9, 2019.

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with**

**Members Biedscheid, Katz, Guida, Larson, Lotz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

#### **H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Member Katz read the DCA on the comments and was shocked when he read that they were not removing it. It is changing the District rules. He looked on Google and found interesting things. Comments were well taken and put together some structures that apply and shows where additions are. There was one structure in Germany that stood out.

Member Katz explained that Santa Fe does not have these big buildings. It makes it harder to figure out how to add a contemporary addition to a historical building.

Chair Rios thanked everyone for their comments. Hers were not included. She stated it seemed like they took a long time. She will re-write hers.

Member Larson said part of her concern was words that are academically accepted but did not align with the building. She thinks, moving forward, there is always going to be enthusiasm about building in the City. It is an important discussion when these come to the Board.

Member Guida thanked them for a thoughtful way to have a conversation.

Mr. Roybal said his concern was that this is on county or state property where the City cannot really change it. They have spent so much money on it already. Can they really change people's minds?

Chair Rios said the DCA should have respected the project they got them to agree to listen. If you look at buildings that have been there a while that are Santa Fe style.

Member Roybal said they need to look at the future.

Member Katz noted under the Ordinance; the discussion would have allowed for time to speak about the rules. That is the distinction. It overwhelms the old building.

Chair Rios wanted to go back to traditional thinking about what makes Santa Fe different and preserve their heritage.

Member Lotz said he has found more and more that it is about fitting in rather than standing out.

Ms. Roach thanked them for the discussion and comments about the building. There are many views about it.

Member Guida commented there are style issues and how do you preserve those? They are independent of a mandated style. The first example is a great one. No history is lost. There are many ways to go about things. It is a worthy conversation.

Member Roybal said that in the future, they need to think way ahead of the game.

Ms. Roach invited the Board members to the Historic Santa Fe Foundation garden party. She did not believe they have to be members to attend. She will a speaker. She will send a link.

Member Biedscheid announced she would not be here for the July meeting.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Approved by:

  
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz for Carl G Boaz, Inc.