



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 12-31-08 TIME 11:45

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2009 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2009 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 5, 2008

December 2, 2008

December 9, 2008

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Case #H-08-141. 500 & 700 blocks of W. Alameda Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agents for Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority, proposes to demolish 107 non-contributing residential units and construct 130 residential units at heights ranging from 16.5' to 21.5' where the maximum allowable heights are between 13' and 15' for street-frontage structures and at 24' for non-street-frontage structures. Two exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable height for street-frontage structures (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(b+c)) and to construct pitched roofs where pitches are not allowed (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)(d)). (David Rasch)

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-06-001. 142 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agents for Storic Development, proposes to amend a previous approval by increasing the height of portals by 1.5' and deleting second-story balustrades on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-07-050. 1260 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Elisabeth Wagner, agent for Roy Trice, proposes to amend a previous approval to change a 6' high stuccoed yardwall to a 6' high coyote fence and to construct an in-ground spa with a 6 ft. high stone retaining wall on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-08-128. 538 1/2 Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Arminda Diaz, owner/agent, proposes to construct an approximately 1,316 sq. ft. addition to the maximum allowable height of 13'9" (17'9" at highest point to due grade change). Construct yardwalls to not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6' to a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

3. Case #H-08-129. 523 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Mountain Investments NM, proposes to amend a previous approval, which has expired, to construct two residential structures at 2,308 sq. ft. and 1,853 sq. ft. at 13'6" high where the maximum allowable height is 15'2". (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-08-130. 121 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Max Aragon, owner/agent, proposes to replace a non-historic door and window on a contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-08-131. 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Camino Don Miguel, LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 2,213 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 13' here the maximum allowable height is 14'4" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
6. Case #H-08-133A. 412 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agents for Pearl Tom, proposes an historic status review of a contributing residence. (David Rasch)
Case #H-08-133B. 412 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agents for Pearl Tom, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by adding 155 sq. ft. of additions, spray foam insulation, replacing non-historic windows, and constructing a patio with pergola on the rear. (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-134. 517 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Flying X Construction, agent for Sallie Bingham, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by installing a door and a window on a non-primary elevation. (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-135. 723 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area. Gudrun Hoerig, owner/agent, proposes to replace windows, change trim color, and restucco on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-08-140. 1472 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter Maccorquodale, agent for Belle M. Carpenter, proposes to construct an approximately 47" high fence and vehicular gate where the maximum allowable height is 6'8" on a vacant lot. (Marissa Barrett)
10. Case #H-08-143A. 947 ½ Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Paul Walter, proposes an historic status review of a non-contributing residence. (David Rasch)
Case #H-08-143B. 947 ½ Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Paul Walter, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by infilling an existing courtyard with a 326 sq. ft. portal to 10'8" where the maximum allowable height is 16' and replacing a vehicular gate. (David Rasch)

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

K. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the January 13, 2009 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, January 13, 2008.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 13, 2009

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes		
November 5, 2008	Approved as submitted	2
December 2, 2008	Approved as amended	2
December 9, 2008	Approved as amended	2
Communications	Discussion	3
Business from the Floor	Beninato about 610 Galisteo	3
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>Case #H 08-141</u>	Approved	4-12
500/700 West Alameda		
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 06-001</u>	Postponed	12
142 Lincoln Avenue		
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 07-050</u>	Approved with conditions	12-14
1260 Canyon Road		
2. <u>Case #H 08-128</u>	Postponed for redesign	14-17
538½ Hillside Avenue		
3. <u>Case #H 08-129</u>	Approved with Conditions	17-20
523 Canyon Road		
4. <u>Case #H 08-130</u>	Postponed	20, 29
121 Quintana Street		
5. <u>Case #H 08-131</u>	Approved with conditions	20-22
444 Camino Don Miguel		
6. <u>Case #H 08-133A</u>	Status Retained	22
412 Palace Avenue		
<u>Case #H 08-133B</u>	Approved as Recommended	22-23
412 Palace Avenue		
7. <u>Case #H 08-134</u>	Approved as Recommended	23-24
517 Camino del Monte Sol		
8. <u>Case #H 08-135.</u>	Approved as Recommended	24-25
723 Gomez Road		
9. <u>Case #H 08-140</u>	Approved with Conditions	25-26
1472 Canyon Road		
10. <u>Case #H 08-143A</u>	Non-contributing status retained	26-27
947½ Acequia Madre		
<u>Case #H 08-143B</u>	Approved with Conditions	27-29
947½ Acequia Madre		
Matters from the Board	None	29
Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:21 p.m.	29

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 13, 2009

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Chair Woods asked for a moment of silence in memory of Kami Martínez.

Chair Woods introduced the two newly appointed board members, Dr. John Kantner and Ms. Christine Mather and welcomed them to the Board.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Dr. John Kantner
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner
Ms. Kelley Brennan, City Associate Attorney
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch noted that under Administrative Matters, the case would require two 2 motions: one on the demolition request and the other one on the construction proposal. Under Old Business, the case has been postponed.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. November 5, 2008

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of November 5, 2008 as submitted. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. December 2, 2008

Ms. Walker requested a change on page six, half way down the page to say "... has been part ..."
instead of "...had not been"

Ms. Rios requested a change on page 3, 3rd paragraph from the bottom to read "even if on a primary elevation they should ask for an exception." On page 6, it should say, "Santa Fe only has a handful of big buildings like this."

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of December 2, 2008 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. December 9, 2008

Ms. Walker requested a change on page 4 that instead of "pansies" she "didn't see that any landscaping on the north side."

Ms. Shapiro requested that on page 14 it say, "new construction would have rounded edges."

On page 19, 5th paragraph from bottom it should say, "She asked if there were 2 nichos, one on each side..."

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of December 9, 2008 as amended. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Woods announced that the City of Santa Fe received an award from the National Historic Preservation Trust as one of 12 Distinctive Destinations. It was a huge award and exciting to get. On the down side, the state would be introducing legislation that would exempt them from the historic ordinance. .

Mr. Rasch said the Commission approved it unanimously.

Ms. Walker clarified that it was a state statute they were trying to amend.

Chair Woods said they needed to get organized to oppose this effort.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that Santa Fe was one of 8 CLGs in the state and it would affect all of them. So the others would be contacted and they would get the National Trust involved.

Mr. Featheringill said he had worked with Paula Tackett. It had been a battle because they didn't want to spend the money to do what was right.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Stefanie Beninato was sworn. She said it was synchronistic that the Board would bring up the award by Historic Trust and the State having to comply with the ordinance. But at 610 Galisteo, the developers were not complying.

She said she noticed Chair Woods and Ms. Walker meeting with the City Attorney, Frank Katz and asked what the meeting was about.

Chair Woods said they did not have a meeting with him.

Ms. Beninato said the Board visited 610 Galisteo a year and a half ago and at that time said they would do a form but hadn't yet done it.

She said that under sworn testimony the developers swore the windows would not be moved but they have. They told Ms. Beninato that they were equivalently placed. That term doesn't occur in the ordinance.

She began to address the demolition and Chair Woods reminded her that this was not for testimony regarding any case on the agenda.

Ms. Beninato claimed that Mr. Rasch was speaking over the Board's authority.

Ms. Rios stated that she had staff tell her regarding the work at 610 Galisteo that they were in compliance in their project. It appeared that the developers were in compliance at 610 Galisteo.

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Case #H-08-141.** 500 & 700 blocks of W. Alameda Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agents for Santa Fe Civic Housing Authority, propose to demolish 107 non-contributing residential units and construct 130 residential units at heights ranging from 16.5' to 21.5' where the maximum allowable heights are between 13' and 15' for street-frontage structures and at 24' for non-street frontage structures. Two exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable height for street-frontage structures (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(b+c)) and to construct pitched roofs where pitches are not allowed (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)(d)). (David Rasch)

Chair Woods asked staff to address the demolition first.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The affordable housing projects on three tracts at the 500 and 700 blocks of West Alameda Street were constructed as multiple family residential units in the early 1960s in a vernacular manner. There is additional street-frontage on San Francisco Street, Camino del Campo, and Las Crucitas Street. The western tract (A & B) consists entirely of pitched roof structures. The eastern tract (C) has a mixture of flat and pitched roof structures. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The existing buildings will be demolished and the criterion for HDRB approval to grant demolition has been met. 1. The Building Inspector has submitted a report that cites structural stability, but numerous and serious code deficiencies. 2. The buildings are all of a non-historic date and do not represent an important streetscape feature. 3. The applicant is proposing to reestablish the streetscape with similar structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request for demolition as it complies with Section 14-3.14 Demolition in Historic Districts.

There were no speakers from the public regarding the demolition in this case.

Present and sworn was Mr. O. Michael Duty who said he had nothing to add to the demolition request.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Alyssia Abbott who introduced herself as a qualified archaeologist who had worked in Santa Fe for the past 10 years on historic and related projects. Her issue stems from having been involved in the potential archaeological work on this project. Mr. Duty in advance of the analysis did a lot of the background that needed to be done. It was in the most restrictive archaeological district in Santa Fe. The project would undergo the 2% sampling work there.

She asked about the demolition which was a very destructive process, in relation to yet unknown archeology that might be found in the 2% testing. She asked if those doing the work had the qualifications and if they had made it known to the ARC and the potential involvement of State since it abutted the River Park.

She thought there might be other important issues. It was also in the National Historic Register district. It could potentially damage archaeological resources. She asked what was being done to insure no damage would be done to those resources.

Ms. Barrett replied that the ARC was aware and she had talked today with the archeologist hired to do the work there. She knew the potential was in this area.

Ms. Abbott shared pictures of the area.

Ms. Barrett added that it had been surveyed.

Present and sworn was Ms. Lois Pena, 124 Duran Street, who was present representing the Westside Guadalupe Neighborhood Association. They had been working with the applicants and they have been accommodating. She knew that the housing authority was soon going to break ground. Their only concern was what would happen if they did not get their HUD grant. She said the Association was in support of their effort.

Present and sworn was Ms. Elizabeth Oster who was present on her own behalf and worked as an archeologist and a private consultant in historic preservation. So she was very aware of all the state, federal and local restrictions and ordinances. As a Santa Fe resident she appreciated the heritage here. She requested that as the project moved forward that due consideration be given to follow all the procedures involved. She thought that while machinery was operating, it should have a trained monitor present. She feared that without careful evaluation, historic deposits might be affected. She urged careful monitoring in all phases of demolition and that care be given to state and federal implications. Federal funding might be invoked so federal regulations needed to be followed as well as State regulations also for structures over 50 years old. Certain documentation was required before demolition and HCPI forms. Recent changes to the state regulation included the procedures to be used for HCPI. None of that meant the project could not be done. It just gave a process to follow.

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

Chair Woods asked Ms. Barrett to address the Board's lack of authority over archaeology.

Ms. Barrett explained that the ARC regulated 75 years or older structures. It did not require the HCPI. Those who were concerned could refer all archaeological issues to the ARC and get feedback.

Ms. Walker asked if someone from the ARC could be there.

Ms. Barrett explained that it would be by someone hired for the project. Mr. Ron Winter was hired as the archaeologist.

Mr. Rasch referred the Board to the documentation on page 5. The inventory was not substantial. On page 6 it gave the date of construction. The next page was the aerial and corresponded to the demolition plan on 59 and 60. Then pages 8-36 included the 1963 documents.

Mr. Duty confirmed that the archeologist was Mr. Ron Winters. His report was submitted today and would be considered by the ARC at its next meeting.

Chair Woods thought it would be good to have the referral to ARC in the motion.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the demolition for Case 08-141 with the condition that due and careful consideration be given to archaeological issues and that they be referred to the ARC. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for what was to be developed there as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Due to an underlying conflict with the height code and the overlay historic height code the HDRB entertained a compromise that allows the underlay of 24' for structure heights that do not have street frontage. The street-frontage structures as applicable to the historic height ordinance averaging. The maximum allowable height was determined to be between 13' and 15' for proposed structures with street frontage. Height exceptions are requested for the street-frontage structures (14-5.2, D, 9, b and c) and the required exception responses were submitted. (He pointed out the structures on the screen.)

In addition, pitched roofs are proposed where pitched roofs are not allowed (14-5.2, D, 9, d) and the required exception responses were submitted.

The following designs are proposed:

1. Single-story Seniors Type A
2. Single-story Seniors Type B
3. Single-story Seniors Type C
4. Single-story Duplex 2 Bedroom
5. Single-story Duplex 2 and 3 Bedroom
6. Single-story Duplex 1 and 2 Bedroom
7. Two-story Townhouse Fourplex
8. Two-story Townhouse Sixplex

The seniors' designs are Northern New Mexico pitched roof structures with simplified Territorial Revival flat roofed massing and portals.

The Duplex designs are Northern New Mexico pitched roof structures with varied roof massing.

The Fourplex designs are simplified Territorial Revival with some stepped massing.

The Sixplex designs are larger examples of the Fourplex designs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends denial of the exception requests to exceed the *maximum* allowable heights along street frontages (14-5.2, D, 9, b and c) and to construct pitched roofs where pitched roofs are not allowed (14-5.2, D, 9, d) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the necessary exceptions. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (l) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Mr. Rasch showed the floor plans for each type listed above.

Mr. Duty said the project already had a couple of years of study and articles in the newspapers. In the overall procedure, the Santa Fe Civic Housing had to get beneficial control of the property in order to be able to submit a proposal for funding. So some time was dedicated to secure a long term lease. After that there has been work on funding. There was a section of this project that was senior housing that could be built under the 202 program. It was 51 units on the easternmost side.

They had a problem because the federal funders did not find the land ownership (99 year lease) satisfactory. There was also an issue of having a sublease. Since then they prepared funding proposals for the western part of the site with family units with a submission date in late January. They might have to modify the lease with the City. They came first to the HDRB late last year to discuss the potential conflict between height calculations and specificity of 24 feet and gave three options. The Board didn't vote on anything but they left with an understanding of a reasonable compromise and they stuck to that.

The Next step was the preliminary development plan that went to the Planning Commission and was approved so they had zoning approval on the two sites and the development could be legally constructed. A small part would have to go through rezoning and would be presented after the rezoning was completed.

They also worked closely with the neighbors and they have had substantial impact on the project. It was a very successful relationship. Their requests were all very sane and sensible. Their ideas were compelling even though some conflicted with the plans. They had a road and the Planning Commission agreed it was good to have it in there. But the neighbors got them to change the roadway into a walkway.

He went to the handout on one-story and two-story structures. On the west it was about the same as shown to the board before. They kept the high buildings in the center and the low buildings around the streets.

On the small site to the east they originally showed two-story along San Francisco and one-story on W. Alameda. But the neighbors prevailed and asked them to flip flop it. So now they were showing 2-story on Alameda next to the Salvation Army. The scale seemed to work better that way. There might be some debate on it. It was about density ultimately and they were trying to maximize it for Santa Fe Civic Housing.

He urged the Board to approve the height along Alameda. There was sufficient setback and he felt they responded to the neighborhood's concerns.

Regarding the pitched roofs, he acknowledged this was unique in Santa Fe. All the existing pitched roofs there didn't count. He believed they were in substantial conformance with that and thought they followed the original compromise agreement, working closely with the neighborhood and with the City. He felt this would help Affordable Housing greatly.

He held up a site plan and showed the items on it. He pointed out how they moved the units around in an undulating manner. Family units on West San Francisco, Senior on West San Francisco.

He showed the palette of four colors and how they would use them. The roofs would be propanel. Window frames would be off white, windows would be vinyl windows and trim to match.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Ray Herrera, 279 Hillside, who said he was opposed to it at the beginning. He thought the compromise for the two exceptions was a mistake and would set a precedent for future development to allow the height and pitched roof. He also felt they were asking a little too much.

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

Ms. Rios asked how many units were being demolished and how many to be built.

Mr. Duty said 104 were being demolished and 139 were proposed.

Ms. Rios asked how many of the 139 units would be with a pitched roof.

Mr. Duty said 74 of the units would have some pitch. Some of those would be a combination of flat and pitched. He explained that their pitched roofs were gable and some of them out there were hipped. The pitched roof was a strong heavy statement. It had broad eaves to cover the duplex and they were greatly reducing it with some flat roofs. It was much smaller than what they had out in the field. The material was propanel but not standing seam. It was an overlapping panel.

Ms. Rios asked if they were going to be in the same locations as existing.

Mr. Duty said they were on the street front along Alameda in about the same location as existing. But they left an open space to get some relief from the steady marching of the buildings. Secondly, they had a request from the neighborhood that they have small commercial or related retail located in the development. He said they told the neighbors that it would require specific rezoning and would hold up the project. So it was set aside. If it does not get support from City, it would remain open space. The elevation on West San Francisco was different. The access to the units was off the street so they had little sidewalks going to them with gates and entrances. So even though the parking was in back, the frontage would read

less like a project and more like a collection of homes.

On the main part of San Francisco currently was a big block wall that would be substantially improved.

Ms. Rios asked if this project had dedicated open space.

Mr. Duty said they exceeded the requirement and dedicated it. He pointed out the primary open space with garden areas and play areas. It would invite neighborhood people to come there.

Ms. Walker asked how much space was between the buildings.

Mr. Duty said in most cases they had 20-30 feet between buildings. He pointed it out on the site plan.

Ms. Walker recalled their agreement that the interior buildings would be high and exterior building would be at historic heights. She asked if that was what they did.

Mr. Duty said the top of pitches were slightly greater than 15'. There were no specific heights mentioned at that meeting. He was a little surprised by Mr. Rasch's calculation. The difference between what they were proposing was rather lost on the observer.

Ms. Walker asked if multi-family pitches would be included.

Mr. Rasch said multi-family dwellings were exempt from both height and pitch averaging.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the coping on the seniors' buildings with the combination roofs would be stuccoed. Mr. Duty agreed.

Ms. Shapiro said she had not seen that in Santa Fe.

Mr. Duty mentioned a few locations. He explained how it was done. It was very easy to do with two colors of stucco and was inexpensive.

Ms. Shapiro asked about rooftop equipment.

Mr. Duty said they were trying to get a very high energy rating and use air to air heat pumps. In the pitched roofs they could have those pumps. There was some advantage in a rooftop unit but they would avoid using them. On the two buildings without pitched roofs they would locate them inside.

Ms. Shapiro asked on the pitched roofs what the diamond shapes were.

Mr. Duty said it was drawn as a window but would likely be a grilled opening.

Ms. Shapiro asked about exterior lighting.

Mr. Duty said they had not developed that yet. The detailed development plan would go back to the Planning Commission. They would have low level low bollard lighting.

Ms. Shapiro said they could bring it back to the Board.

Ms. Shapiro noted that the two-story on Alameda had a lot of space between street and the buildings. She asked if it was the back of the buildings.

Mr. Duty agreed. That area was owned by the State and they were now in negotiation to own that land but it would continue to be used as a buffer strip. All the parking would be screened by the buildings. With parking in the middle, they had to put some two-story on the street. The setback would be retained. They wanted to foster the idea of Alameda as a green avenue.

Ms. Shapiro asked how high the wall would be.

Mr. Duty said it was four feet. They were worried about security, being a housing project, and had a history. The walls were a mixed bag. They could provide places for people to hide. In Santa Fe walls had a positive context in general but they were all penetrated and disjointed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they extended back to the units.

Mr. Duty agreed. The two-story units had small individual walls to give them privacy but not too high. Some were three feet and some were up to five feet.

Mr. Featheringill asked what was shown on page 48.

Mr. Rasch explained it was the maximum allowable heights. The frontages all exceeded the maximum allowable height.

Mr. Featheringill asked why they were putting these 4 two-story buildings on the street when there were many that could be two-story in the center.

Mr. Duty said it was because the senior area was in the center. So they sacrificed some valuable high height real estate to develop the senior area. The seniors needed their identity and control of pedestrian space.

Ms. Walker asked about height there.

Mr. Duty said the senior buildings were 16'. This was a very flat site.

Chair Woods asked if they could say 16-18'. Mr. Duty agreed.

Ms. Rios appreciated the designs on this project but was concerned that it had a lot of green roof domination on the street.

Mr. Duty said the easiest way to deal with that was to turn the second row. They tried to put front doors on San Francisco but they could rotate some of them.

Chair Woods said although they had some that were combination pitched and flat but there on Alameda they were all pitched roofs.

Mr. Duty agreed they could place a substantial percentage of flat roofs there.

Chair Woods summarized the concerns.

Mr. Duty clarified that there were 34 pitched roofs.

Chair Woods said the Board definitely needed to have him come back with a lighting plan. The windows were not traditional and she asked what kind of muntins would be used.

Mr. Duty said he had never used snap-ins and they would be a disaster in this project.

Chair Woods asked that the application come back to show the coping detail.

Mr. Duty said they might need to show a plan incorporating solar voltaics. They would bring it when they got it worked out. It would cost money and give them a higher ranking on sustainability. Every point counts. This was a very competitive issue.

Chair Woods clarified that they would have to put them on flat roofs but not big panels on pitched roofs.

Mr. Featheringill asked that they bring elevations that showed what was pitched and what was flat and what had solar panels.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch if the Board could do preliminary approval now and cite the sections.

Mr. Rasch agreed but cautioned that if the Board approved the exceptions, they were binding.

Chair Woods said the motion could refer to page 44 if it was to approve the exceptions. If not, it would be denying the application.

Mr. Duty said if the Board could not grant the exception, they would have to go a different direction.

Chair Woods was not sure how to approve it since some of the pitches would change.

Mr. Duty said he knew what to do.

Ms. Shapiro said the PV systems could change the streetscape.

Mr. Duty said they would not do them if they couldn't do it without changing the streetscape.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-141 with approval of the exceptions for height and the pitched roofs following the applicant's responses to the exception criteria on page 4 and the following conditions:

- 1. The combinations of flat and pitched be brought back to the Board**
- 2 - All rooftop appurtenances to be hidden within the building**
- 3 - The exterior lighting plan to be brought back to the Board**
- 4 - Reconsider windows on the gables**
- 5 - The coping detail to be brought back to the Board.**
- 6 - All windows to be true or simulated divided lights.**
- 7 - All pitched roofs to be redesigned.**

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

H. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H 06-001. 142 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lom Tryk Architects, agents for Storic Development, propose to amend a previous approval by increasing the height of portals by 1.5' and deleting second-story balustrades on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)**

This case was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

I. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H 07-050. 1260 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Elisabeth Wagner, agent for Roy Trice, proposes to amend a previous approval to change a 6' high stuccoed yardwall to a 6' high coyote fence and to construct an in-ground spa with a 6 ft. high stone retaining wall on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1260 Canyon Road is a single-family, two-story residence that was constructed before 1951 in a vernacular style. Major remodeling occurred in 1968 with non-compliant elements. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District as supported by 1983 and 2007 historic cultural properties inventories.

On April 24, 2007 and June 12, 2007, the HDRB approved remodeling of the existing residence,

construction of a free-standing guest house and a free-standing garage, and construction of yardwalls.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the previous approvals with the following two items:

1. An in-ground spa would be constructed on the southwest side of the residence where there is sloping ground. The flagstone surfaced terrace will be extended and the lower 5' high mechanical room walls will be surfaced with rock. The access door will be wood.

2. The previously approved yardwall along the east lotline will be changed back to the 6' high coyote fence of the initial proposal. The Board changed the fence to wall after hearing testimony from the neighbor about car headlights which potentially will be directed toward the neighbors' house from the parking area.

The applicant proposes to mitigate the conflict by retaining a 20' to 28' section of yardwall at the parking area. The neighbor has submitted a request to extend the yardwall 38' so that it connects to the existing wall and blocks more of potential headlight spillage.

The neighbors' submittal also requests clarification of the stucco color for the wall. The previous approval is for "Buckskin" which differs from the neighbors' darker color. Therefore, the Board may wish to discuss the transition from one color to another color. In addition, it appears from submitted photographs that the existing yardwall is being partially stone surfaced. No previous approval was granted for this exterior alteration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ms. Rios asked if the project was publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch said it was not.

Present and sworn was Ms. Elisabeth Wagner, 1402 C Cerro Gordo Road, who said that to bring this along, they would drop the spa from the proposal. There was a change on the front of the property. Everything except what the neighbor requested would be coyote. She pointed out the 38' wall to block the headlights.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Wagner said they had reached an agreement with the neighbors.

Chair Woods asked about the posts.

Ms. Wagner said the four posts on the second floor would continue down on the first floor.

Ms. Rios asked what color the wall would be.

Ms. Wagner said their side would be Buckskin and the neighbor's side would be whatever they wanted. She said it stepped down and met in the middle.

Chair Woods summarized the changes.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 07-050 with the changes specified, deleting the spa, the masonry plastered in buckskin and the coyote fence with staggered heights. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H 08-128.** 538½ Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Arminda Diaz, owner/agent, proposes to construct an approximately 1,316 sq. ft. addition to the maximum allowable height of 13' 9" (17' 9" at highest point due to grade change), construct yardwalls to not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6' to a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The approximately 427 square foot Simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style casita located at 538 ½ Hillside was constructed in the 1980s and is part of the Plaza Walk Condominiums. The structure is built below grade and is constructed from stone retaining walls. The south elevation, which is exposed from within the courtyard, is stuccoed and includes the two windows and the entry door. The Official Map does not list a status for the building and the structure is not publicly visible. (Building is not eligible for contributing status due to age.)

The applicant proposes remodeling the building with the following:

Construct approximately 1,316 square feet of additions to the maximum allowable height of 13'9" measured midpoint on the west elevation, which carries the primary entrance. The south elevation, which faces the courtyard, will be to a height of 17' 9" due to the slope change. Since the footprint of the building has a slope change of 2' or more the ordinance, with the Board's approval, may grant the height to increase 2 additional feet, not to exceed 4' on the down slope. Therefore the proposed heights meet the Historic Ordinance.

498 square feet of the additions is located over the existing building and the remaining 818 square feet of additions are located to the east, rear elevation and will be built on grade.

The building will include exposed viga beams on the north and west elevations and will be finished in a Driftwood color. Windows and doors will be aluminum clad in the color turquoise (existing color). Two

windows on the west elevation do not meet the 30" window rule. Window patterns lack a consistency ranging from no divides, horizontal muntins, and 3 over one windows.

The existing door on the south elevation will be replaced and one window will be eliminated. A second story balcony will extend over the south elevation and will have viga supports.

The additions will have a stone base and will be stuccoed in the color Driftwood which is similar to the existing color. The building corners and parapet appear sharp which is not a characteristic of Spanish Pueblo Revival style. Three skylights are indicated on the floor plan. Exterior light fixtures were not submitted.

A new approximately 200 square foot court yard will be constructed on the west elevation. The court yard will be enclosed by the construction of a new stone wall to a height of 7' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 6'.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that all windows meet the 30' window rule, that window patterns are consistent throughout the building, that the building corners and parapet are rounded, that there are no publicly visible skylights, that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a building permit application is submitted and that all walls not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Ms. Rios asked if the Driftwood color in the packet was the earth tone color. Mr. Rasch showed it.

Ms. Barrett said the Board has never disapproved that color.

Chair Woods asked if this balcony as cantilevered would violate the rule.

Ms. Barrett clarified that anything under four feet deep did not need supports.

Present and sworn was Ms. Arminda Diaz, 538½ Hillside Avenue.

Chair Woods asked for the depth of the balcony.

Ms. Diaz said it would be 9-10 inches. She said right now her building was 400 sq. ff and she bought it with intent to add on to make it a comfortable home. She wanted to keep it in harmony with the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Alice Fisher 538½ Hillside Avenue who said she was not part of this condominium complex. She was concerned with the designs. She wanted to be a good neighbor and didn't

seek to impose on the area. The neighborhood had a rich history of homes and they had been welcomed graciously. She hoped Ms. Diaz would become aware of the unique history and, working with this Board would consider changes to her home to integrate with the traditional nature of the neighborhood. As she was an architect, Ms. Fisher felt Ms. Diaz could put her own artful touch into her home and still honor the designs of the homes there now. This area had for a long time welcomed families there. The current plans seemed so sharp and angular to her that they were at odds with the rounded nature of the homes there. She respectfully urged the applicant to reconsider her design. She thanked the Board for working with her in achieving a design that truly complemented the area.

Present and previous sworn, Mr. Ray Herrera said he could not understand how the City would allow a building of that size on that lot. It was in the flood plain. With all due respect to her, this area of Hillside was one of the most unique in Santa Fe that was left. To place this modernistic design there would not fit with the other properties. He urged her to change her design to comply with the neighborhood.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ed Hobler. He said he served on the Board of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. He appreciated that Ms. Diaz needed to add on but the square design was not fitting here. The press release this morning addressed the award for adobe architecture. It also signaled the end of federal funding in New Mexico.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dave Garrity, co owner at 538½ Hillside, and part of this condominium. He said they only saw it last week and had not seen any of the changes and none of them have approved these drawings. He didn't understand how this proposal got here before being approved by the Association. He said he tried to explain it to Ms. Diaz. She only bought 478 sq. ft. She didn't buy any of the other area. She was completely changing the nature of the percentages. He said the Declarant (for the Condominium Association) was out of town.

Chair Woods explained that the Board could not enforce covenants.

Mr. Garrity said his second point was that the sunken building now was in an old arroyo. Opening an area down next to it was asking for trouble. He wanted to see a drainage plan, noting that they have had mud slides in this section of Hillside because they had such a great flow of water there.

He said they would just like to see something that would retain the character of the neighborhood.

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

Ms. Diaz said her home was not visible from a public way. She said she met with all her next door neighbors. These who spoke here lived down Hillside. There were only two families that could possibly see her house: Benavides and Roybals, who supported the addition where it was located. She added that she had submitted her drawings to the person representing the association and had a letter approving the design. The renderings showed scale and mass but not finishes and other details. She said that was why she submitted pictures. She said she would match the stone wall there and would commit to a 2" radius on all corners. She believed this addition would improve the value of the property.

Chair Woods explained that the Board could not accept hearsay. If neighbors had approved it, the Board needed their written statements. She added that anyone was allowed to speak at a public hearing.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the Board was going to have construction drawings. Ms. Diaz agreed. Mr. Featheringill asked about the discrepancy in the colors submitted.

Ms. Diaz said she would be happy to work with the Board on the colors.

Ms. Rios asked how she would characterize the style.

Ms. Diaz said it was Southwestern. It was modern in that it was square but it complied with a lot of the features.

Ms. Rios commented that the windows were a very modernistic element. They were not like the windows in that neighborhood. They needed to be in harmony and the Board needed it to comply with harmony.

She commented about her sister who lived at 503 Hillside. To introduce a very modernistic element was diametrically opposed to the historic element. The proper thing to do was to ask the applicant to go back to the drawing board with something more in keeping with traditional styles.

Ms. Diaz asked to whom she should speak about that.

Ms. Rios suggested she follow what she saw around.

Ms. Diaz said the homes around her were not very traditional.

Mr. Featheringill said the major issue was that everything here was horizontal.

Ms. Diaz asked if she could explain why they were horizontal.

Chair Woods explained that the Board could not approve a project without drawings.

Mr. Featheringill explained it further.

Ms. Diaz said she read the staff report and made the changes staff recommended.

Ms. Barrett agreed she addressed some of the concerns but the pattern of the windows did not fit.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to postpone Case #H 08-128 to give the architect an opportunity for redesign. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 08-129.** 523 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Mountain Investments N M, proposes to amend a previous approval that has expired to construct two residential structures at 2,308 sq. ft. and 1,853 sq. ft. at 13' 6" high where the maximum allowable height is 15' 2". (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

523 Canyon Road is a 910 square foot adobe single-family residence that was constructed in 1961 with a blend of Spanish-Pueblo Revival and Territorial Revival styles. The HDRB approved the construction of a 163 square foot addition on April 8, 2008. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Two free-standing residences were approved by the Board on September 12, 2006 to be located on the vacant area at the north side of the property. That approval has expired and the applicant is requesting to make alterations to the approved proposals.

Unit A was approved previously at 2,125 square feet and 13' 3" high. Unit B was approved previously at 1,727 square feet and 13' 3" high. The maximum allowable height for both structures is 15' 2" as determined by a radial calculation.

Now, the applicant proposes to construct the two units with Unit A designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style and Unit B designed in the Territorial Revival style. Changes to the original designs were indicated in the application letter and with bubble outlines on the floor plans and elevations.

Unit A would be 2,308 square feet at 13' 6" high and features wall-dominated stepped massing, rounded and battered edges, exposed headers, and portals and trellis-covered arbors with wooden viga posts and carved corbels.

Unit B will be 1,853 square feet at 13' 6" high and features wall-dominated stepped massing, brick coping on the parapets, wooden door and window surrounds with triangular pediments and shutters, and portals and trellis-covered arbors with square wooden posts or simplified viga posts.

Finish colors and exterior light fixtures will remain as approved. Unit A will have cementitious "Buckskin" stucco and turquoise trim. Unit B will have cementitious "Fawn" stucco and sage green trim.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Rasch pointed to page 7-10 as the previously approved plans that had expired. Pages 10-21 were the new plans.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas, 421 St. Michael's Drive, who said they were comfortable with the staff recommendations and would answer questions.

Ms. Shapiro asked for the details about the relationship of the wall with the house.

Mr. Horcasitas said in the original approval, the Board wanted to make a 15' setback of the wall instead of 5'. Actually the Board asked for 10' and they agreed to 15' but should not have done that. Now they were asking for a 13' 4" setback from each of the houses. He asked to move the units to give a ten foot separation and a 13' 4" setback on the sides. He said the space between existing and proposed was about twelve feet.

Mr. Rasch asked if the mechanical room was left out.

Mr. Horcasitas agreed. On the floor plan on Unit A he pointed out where the mechanical room would be. They also straightened up the wall there.

Ms. Walker felt this design was really cramping the space.

Mr. Horcasitas said the lot coverage was 30.4% compared to 27.7% before. On Canyon Road there were very close houses up and down. So this was a thoughtful plan for infill and it had no streetscape.

Ms. Shapiro asked about the height of new buildings compared with those on the drive.

Mr. Horcasitas said the existing height was 11' 6" and the new was 13' 6".

Mr. Rasch noted that heights of other buildings were on page 6. He pointed out 15, 11 and 13, 12, 14.

Chair Woods said the one shutter design on Alameda was a bizarre treatment.

Mr. Horcasitas said the designer was not married to it.

Ms. Rios asked about roof top appurtenances.

Mr. Horcasitas said there would be none.

Ms. Rios asked about exterior lighting.

Mr. Horcasitas said it was presented on page 11 and was as previously approved.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-129 with the following conditions:

1. That all shutters be eliminated from both houses,
2. That there be no rooftop equipment and
3. That exterior lighting be as previously approved.

Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Chair Woods explained that on this project he had symmetrical shutters so they were okay. Ms. Rios agreed to eliminate the condition regarding shutters. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H 08-130.** 121 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Max Aragon, owner/agent, proposes to replace a non-historic door and window on a contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

Ms. Barrett said the applicant was not present.

Ms. Rios moved to table Case #H 08-130 to the end of the agenda. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H 08-131.** 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Camino Don Miguel, LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 2,213 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival style, approximately 909 square foot single family residence located at 444 Camino Don Miguel was constructed around 1932 and was approved by the Board in 2008 for a complete remodel which includes a 153 square foot heated addition, a 195 square foot portal, and a 204 square foot carport. The remodel also included all window and door replacement and increasing the roof to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 2,213 square foot single family residence that includes 1,753 square feet of heated space, a 247 square foot attached garage, and 213 square feet of portals. The new single family residence will be located west (rear of lot) of the existing building which will become the guesthouse.

The building will be to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4" and will include divided light windows and wood plank doors. The windows and doors will have exposed wood headers, window trim will be "Marvin Tan", and all exposed wood will be stained and sealed with a grey opaque

stain. The garage door will be a cedar plank door. Canales will be wood lined with galvanized metal.

The building will be stuccoed using El Rey "Buckskin. Two skylights are indicated on the floor plan. No exterior light fixtures were submitted.

Also proposed is a yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 6' at the southeast corner of the new building and at the northeast corner of the building. The wall at the northeast corner will include a wood pedestrian gate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that no skylights are publicly visible and that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a building permit is submitted. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said they met with neighbors and rectified their previous oversight. The neighbor to the south requested that they raise the wall to six feet as it was her garden wall and she wanted more privacy. The neighbors on the other side didn't show up. When they did demolition, they must have released varmints so they put out traps and put up a privacy screen.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro said it appeared that on the west elevation the top of the windows were not at the same height.

Mr. Enfield said they matched the portal there at 8'.

Ms. Shapiro said the parapet was quite high and asked if it could be lowered a little.

Mr. Enfield said it stepped down to the garage and it was requested to keep it at the same height as the garage but he would be happy to step it down to 12'.

Ms. Rios asked if there was no rooftop equipment and if he would take exterior lighting to staff. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Chair Woods noted he previously agreed to divided light windows on the doors under the portal of the guest house. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Chair Woods asked if he would be willing to put in a larger window and eliminate the other one.

Mr. Enfield said no and pointed out that the 3' rule was for publicly visible elevations so he wanted to keep it. Chair Woods said okay.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-131 according to staff recommendations and with the following conditions:

- 1. That any exterior lighting be reviewed and approved by staff,**
- 2. That the parapet over the bedroom be stepped down one foot and**
- 3. That the windows under the portal be divided lights.**

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

- 6. Case #H-08-133A. 412 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agents for Pearl Tom, proposes an historic status review of a contributing residence. (David Rasch)**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

412 Palace Avenue is an adobe casita that was originally constructed, probably as a garage, between 1921 and 1930 in a New Mexico Vernacular manner. An addition was constructed on the west elevation between 1930 and 1948. Non-historic remodeling occurred in the 1970s and 1980s with an enclosed porch on the north elevation. The east, street-facing elevation does not retain a garage door opening and has been infilled with non-historic fixed windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends maintaining the historic status of contributing for this residential structure due to historic dates of original construction and major additions as well as retaining some historic windows. The south elevation may be considered as primary, with the least amount of non-historic alterations.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ran Allen for Lloyd and Associates who had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-133A as recommended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H-08-133B. 412 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agents for Pearl Tom, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by adding 155 sq. ft. of additions, spray foam insulation, replacing non-historic windows, and constructing a patio with pergola on the rear. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

412 Palace Ave is a contributing casita with non-historic alterations on the north elevation. The south elevation may be considered as primary.

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

1. Additions totaling 155 square feet will be constructed on the north elevation after removal of the non-historic porch at the middle of the north elevation and partial removal of the yardwall at the northwest. The additions will be constructed with adobe to match existing adjacent height. Windows and doors will be divided-light and mimic light patterns that are existing. Exterior spray foam insulation will mimic the rounded edges of the existing walls and parapets. The additions will be finished with cementitious "Buckskin" stucco to match.

2. A corner fireplace will be constructed at the southeast corner with the chimney penetration through the roof. The non-historic fixed light windows on the east elevation will be removed and replaced with a 6-light door. A 4' high spur wall will be constructed parallel with the street at the northeast corner.

3. A pergola covered patio will be constructed on the rear, west elevation. The pergola will be constructed of wooden elements at 10 feet high. The patio will be surfaced with brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Allen had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios if the project would have any rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Allen said it would not.

Ms. Walker thought the existing east elevation showed the door as larger than the proposed door.

Mr. Allen agreed that it was smaller He explained that it had been the garage door.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-133B per staff recommendations Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-08-134.** 517 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Flying X Construction, agent for Sallie Bingham, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by installing

a door and a window on a non-primary elevation. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

517 Camino del Monte Sol is a single-family residence that was constructed by 1933 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The west and south elevations may be considered as primary.

The applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following two items.

1. A pair of 4-light casement windows will be installed in the north elevation with an exposed header and a 4" bull-nosed reveal that mimics the existing window opening on the same elevation. The window frame and trim color will be brown to match the existing window.

2. French doors with operational transoms will be installed in the north elevation with a 4" bull-nosed reveal. The bottom wood panels will mimic the front door at 515 with an applied molding in cruciform shape. The door, frame, and trim color will be brown to match the existing window.

The landing and steps will be finished with river rock to match the foundation finish with flagstone-covered top surfaces. A simple design iron handrail will be installed on the east side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Jasper Vassay, 211 Lorenzo Lane, who said the intent of the addition was to open this building to the garden. Before the compound was organized, it was a zero lot line building. It was adjacent to this very beautiful building.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather asked if there was any lighting by the door.

Mr. Vassay said there was not.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to describe the handrail.

Mr. Vassay said it was an elegant hand forged rail and was anchored to the end of the flagstone landing and closed off with curly cue against the wall. It matched the one on the other side.

Ms. Walker moved for approval as recommended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-08-135.** 723 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area. Gudrun Hoerig, owner/agent, proposes to replace windows, change trim color, and restucco on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

723 Gomez Road is a pen-tile single-family residence that was constructed by 1947 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. A 1980s wood-frame two-story addition was constructed on the south east corner. An additional room was constructed on the east elevation in 2002. A free-standing shed was constructed on the south side of the lot in 2002. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. The west, south, and north windows will be removed and replaced with clad 2-over-2 thermal-pane double-hung windows in the same opening dimensions. Exterior screens will also be installed. Frame color will be a dark brown.

2. The building will be finished in cementitious "Adobe" stucco along with the front yardwall and planter. The storage shed will be painted to match.

3. The portal and door paint color of light blue will be changed to a green turquoise color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Gudrun Hoerig, who said she had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios said the trim color appeared to be black.

Ms. Hoerig clarified that it was a dark bronze.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 08-135 as recommended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

9. **Case #H-08-140.** 1472 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Peter

Maccorquodale, agent for Belle M. Carpenter, proposes to construct an approximately 47" high fence and vehicular gate where the maximum allowable height is 6'8" on a vacant lot. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

1472 Canyon Road is an approximately 1.392 acre vacant lot located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 120' long wire mesh fence to a height of 4' where the maximum allowable height is 6' 8". The new fence will replace the partial dilapidated non-historic barbed wire fence along the street. The wire fence will include cedar posts at each of the ends, intermediate green steel stakes and a 16' wide vehicular gate. The gate will be to 4' and will include steel tubing painted brown and wire mesh.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Ms. Rios noted a discrepancy on the address

Ms. Barrett clarified that it was 1472.

Present and sworn was Mr. Peter Maccorquodale who had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if he would be willing to do all cedar posts rather than the steel posts. Mr. Maccorquodale agreed.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 08-140 with the condition that all posts be cedar. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

10. Case #H-08-143A. 947 ½ Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Paul Walter, proposes an historic status review of a non-contributing residence. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

947½ Acequia Madre is a single-family residence that was originally constructed in a vernacular manner before 1951 as a residence and a separate garage. In the 1970s, the two structures were combined through additions into one structure. After 1982, further additions and removal of historic windows substantially eliminated the historic integrity of the older portions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends maintaining the historic status of non-contributing for this residential structure due to the major non-historic remodeling that enveloped two historic structures, altered the massing, and replaced historic materials.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail who commented that the applicant was upset with the review process.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 08-0143A as recommended, retaining its status. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H-08-143B. 947 ½ Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Paul Walter, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by infilling an existing courtyard with a 326 sq. ft. portal to 10'8" where the maximum allowable height is 16' and replacing a vehicular gate. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

947 ½ Acequia Madre was a non-contributing single-family residence that was set back from the street frontage on a long driveway.

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

1. The front entry courtyard at the southeast corner will be infilled with a portal. The approximately 10' 8" high portal is designed with a stuccoed parapet above the exposed wooden header beam and carved corbels. Four 2' x 2' skylights are proposed.

The primary entry door with sidelights on the east elevation will be removed and replaced with another door. The sidelight areas will be infilled.

An existing pedestrian gate in the existing yardwall will be removed and the wall infilled and finished with stucco to match.

A wooden arched pedestrian gate will be installed in the alley behind the yardwall.

2. The existing bileaf wooden manual vehicle gates will be removed and replaced with reverse-arched wooden vehicle gates that feature solid panels below and visual-access grilles above painted blue to match existing colors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, who said this gate design was not the final design but was the design he was asked to present to the Board and would work with Mr. Rasch on it.

Chair Woods said it was hard to figure out where the portal was going, what wall was there and what wall was not there.

Mr. Enfield showed a wall to be removed and how it would engage the other wall.

Chair Woods asked how high the parapet was there.

Mr. Enfield said it was not visible from the street.

Ms. Walker asked how high the fenestration would occur.

Mr. Enfield said it was in the 1.5' to 3' range. They had like kick plates at the bottom.

Chair Woods asked how high the gate was.

Mr. Enfield said it matched the existing wall at 6½ to 7 feet.

Chair Woods asked that it be lowered.

Ms. Shapiro said it should be 5 feet high.

Mr. Enfield clarified that there was no lighting at the gate. There were existing lights by the door and a sconce on the exterior. He said they showed the existing wall at six feet high. He agreed to have it lower and chop off the high pieces.

Chair Woods summarized the concerns including low profile skylights that were not visible, the gate not exceed 6' with the upper half be fenestrated and lighting to staff.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-143B with the following conditions:

- 1. That the skylights be low profile, not visible,**
- 2. That the gate be 5½ feet tall and the design taken to staff for final approval,**
- 3. That any exterior lighting be reviewed and approved by staff.**

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

- 4. Case #H 08-130. 121 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Max Aragon, owner/agent, proposes to replace a non-historic door and window on a contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

Ms. Rios moved to postpone Case #H 08-130. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Rios moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Walker seconded and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer