



Agenda

DATE 4/1/10 TIME 1:50 PM
PREPARED BY [Signature]
REVIEWED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2010 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2010 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
March 9, 2010

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Case #H-09-043B. 108 Candelario Street
Case #H-10-017. 642 Camino de la Luz

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-053. 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Bob Parker, SIVAD LLC, proposes to amend a previous approval by altering the approved one car garage and one car carport to an approximately 500 sq. ft. two car garage to a height of 11'4" where the existing height is 13'8" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-09-057. 518 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Torres, agent for Beth Strutzel, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing residence, to construct a 130 sq. ft. covered storage and seating area to a height of 10'7", and to construct a 484 sq. ft. teahouse to a height of 12'1" where the maximum allowable height is 18'1". (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-10-011. 557 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Luis Olivas, agent for William and Amiee La Calle, proposes to amend a previous approval by constructing an approximately 96 sq. ft. portal to a height of 10' where the existing height is 15'6" and an approximately 123 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 8'6" where the existing height is 12'6" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-10-023. 855 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. RM Sandrian, owner/agent, proposes to remodel two non-contributing residences including increasing height from approximately 10' to approximately 13'8" where the maximum allowable height is 15'11", to change shed roofs to flat with parapet, to replace doors and windows and to change locations and dimensions. (David Rasch)

2. Case #H-10-024. 852 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Fabu-Wall-Ous Solutions, LLC, agent for Faye Shilkey, proposes to remodel a contributing property including the construction of an 83 sq. ft. addition with a 280 sq. ft. portal on a non-primary elevation, replace brick parapet where necessary, repair and restucco yardwalls and replace a pedestrian gate. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-10-026. 612 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Doug McDowell, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 3,280 sq. ft. residence on a vacant lot to a height of approximately 15'6" where the maximum allowable height is 16'8" with yardwalls not to exceed 6' in height. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-10-027. 614 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Doug McDowell, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 3,905 sq. ft. residence on a vacant lot to a height of approximately 15'9" where the maximum allowable height is 16'6" with yardwalls not to exceed 6' in height. (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-10-028A. 275 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. ORR Architects, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fe, proposes a historic status review of this non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

Case #H-10-028B. 275 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. ORR Architects, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fe, proposes to construct ADA-compliant ramps with handrails. (David Rasch)
6. Case #H-10-029. 707 Dunlap Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Duran Enterprises de Santa Fe Inc., agent for Allison Hill, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence to include replacement of all windows and doors, replacement of shingle roof with pro panel, and restuccoing. (David Rasch)
7. Case H-10-031. 517 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning, agent for Kevon Zehner, proposes to install brick paving and construct 8" to 12" high planter boxes on a non-statused property. (Marissa Barrett)
8. Case #H-10-025A. 101 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale A. Lopez, owner/agent, proposes a historic status review of this non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

Case #H-10-025B. 101 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale A. Lopez, owner/agent, proposes to remodel the residence by replacing windows. An exception is requested to removed historic material from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D, 5, a, i)). (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-10-030. 542 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Paul Kinderdine, agent for Frank Clifford & Barbara Anderson, proposes to construct an approximately 420 sq. ft. addition to 6" below the existing height of the significant building. An exception is requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 D, 2, c) and to construct an addition less than 10' from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D, 2, d)). (Marissa Barrett)

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

K. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the April 13, 2010 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, April 13, 2010.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
April 13, 2010

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes March 9, 2010	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law Case #H 09-043B, 108 Candelario Street Case #H 10-017, 642 Camino de la Luz	Postponed	2
Communications	Discussion	2
Business from the Floor	Discussion	2-3
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-053</u> 444 Camino Don Miguel	Approved with Conditions	3-4
2. <u>Case #H 09-057</u> 518 Palace Avenue	Approved with Conditions	4-8
3. <u>Case #H 10-011</u> 557 Agua Fria	Postponed by applicant	8
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 10-023</u> 855 E. Palace Avenue	Approved with Conditions	8-12
2. <u>Case #H 10-024</u> 852 Old Santa Fe Trail	Approved with conditions	12-15
3. <u>Case #H 10-026</u> 612 Garcia Street	Approved with conditions	15-18
4. <u>Case #H 10-027</u> 614 Garcia Street	Approved with conditions	18-21
5. <u>Case #H 10-028A</u> 275 E. Alameda	Upgraded to Contributing	21
<u>Case #H 10-028B</u> 275 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions	22
6. <u>Case #H 10-029</u> 707 Dunlap Street	Approved with conditions	22-24
7. <u>Case #H 10-031</u> 517 Acequia Madre	Approved as recommended	24-25
8. <u>Case #H 10-025A</u>	Upgraded to Contributing	25-27

101 Rim Road <u>Case #H 10-025B</u> 101 Rim Road	Approved as recommended	27-29
9. <u>Case #H 10-030</u> 542 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved with conditions	29-34
Matters from the Board	Reconsidered 09-058	34-35
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:05 p.m.	35

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 13, 2010

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.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch said that E, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law was not in the packet and requested it be postponed. The third Old Business Case (on Agua Fria) was not included in the packet and asked that it

be postponed as well. He clarified that the fifth new business case had the B section in the packet first but they needed to consider the A part first.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 9, 2010

Ms. Rios requested a change to these minutes as follows:

On page 10, 3rd paragraph from the bottom to change the word "objected" to "stated."

Ms. Walker requested that on page 10, 3rd paragraph down regarding the precedential effect - they should have pointed out that the building was built before the height ordinance.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of March 9, 2010 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDING OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H 09-043B, 108 Candelario Street

Case #H 10-017, 642 Camino de la Luz

This matter was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch reminded the Board that the Heritage Preservation awards would be awarded on May 13th in the National Park Service Building on Old Santa Fe Trail at 6:00 p.m. He was taking nominations for awards and the Board would take action on them after the conclusion of this meeting.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Mr. John Dressman, 5 Cerro Gordo Road, was sworn in. He said he wanted to speak about the electric boxes on the Plaza. At the Public Works meeting the Committee voted to change the configuration of the electric switching box that was added last year. The Finance Committee to finance it even though they did not know where the money was coming from.

He went to the first meeting but could not speak. But he realized that the HDRB had not yet taken any action on. He thought that project had to come before this Board before it could be done and it appeared the City Council was making an end run around the Board. He provided a copy of the letter he wrote to the Council and asked if they could find out what it really would cost. Documentation of the plan needed to happen.

Ms. Rios asked if their interim solution was to make the box smaller.

Mr. Dressman agreed. He said the equipment took up 60 square feet now so it was a big footprint on the Plaza.

Chair Woods asked if Mr. Rasch could let the Board know when it was going to Council. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Woods thanked him for coming to the Board meeting to present his concern.

Ms. Brennan arrived at this time.

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 08-053.** 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc. Agent for Bob Parker, SIVAD LLC., proposes to amend a previous approval by altering the approved one-car garage and one-car carport to an approximately 500 sq. ft. two-car garage to a height of 11' 4" where the existing height is 13' 8" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

444 Camino don Miguel is a Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence (now considered the guest house) that was constructed around 1932. The building received alterations through the years and was approved for total remodeling including additions and construction of a new 2,213 freestanding single family residence with attached garage in 2008 and early 2009. The Official Map listed the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes amending a 2008-2009 Historic Design Review Board approvals by altering the 204 square foot carport and 247 square foot one car garage to an approximately 500 square foot attached two car garage. The garage will be to a height of 11' 4" where the existing height is 13' 8" and the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". Garage doors will be cedar plank wood doors finished in a natural stain or the opaque grey stain to match the existing wood work. The garage will be stuccoed using El Rey "Buckskin" to match the single family residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application as it is in compliance 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 this project was visible from a public way.

Mr. Rasch said it was only partially visible. Parts of the east elevation could be seen when looking down the driveway.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said he really had nothing to add to the staff report. What happened was the old shed was allowed to stay but the CMU wall was now gone. So his client proposed to incorporate the carport and garage as one garage. The carport was never built under the guest house permit and he didn't think it was closed yet.

He met with Ms. Barrett who felt he needed to come to the Board with it. The pergola between would remain. So the only difference was the closing of the previously approved carport.

Ms. Mather asked if he proposed any lighting on this structure.

Mr. Enfield thought the electrical plan would show a sconce on each side.

Ms. Mather said he could take them to staff for approval.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-053 per staff recommendations and the condition that any exterior lighting would be taken to staff for review and approval. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone who wished to appeal a decision of the Board to City Council had 30 days in which to file it

2. **Case #H 09-057.** 518 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Torres, agent for Beth Strutzel, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing residence to construct a 130 sq. ft. covered storage and seating area to a height of 10' 7", and to construct a 484 sq. ft. teahouse to a height of 12' 1" where the maximum allowable height was 18' 1". (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

518 East Palace Avenue is a single-family residence that was constructed by John Gaw Meem in 1926 for Dr. J.R. Rolls in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. This building is characteristic of Meem's style from 1925 to 1928 with picturesque silhouettes of parapets that are "slightly wavy and irregular," with "corners and edges more rounded," and with "wood casement windows that are deep-set with no frame showing on the face of the wall and only the wood lintel exposed;" paraphrased quotes from Bainbridge Bunting, John Gaw Meem: Southwestern Architect, SAR/UNM Press, 1983. Aerial photographs from 1958 and 1969 reveal that the guest bedroom at the front NE corner of the residence (elevations 8 and 9) was probably constructed after 1960. A two story addition was constructed between the SW rear corner of the residence and the free-standing garage to the west sometime after 1985. Also, there appear to be other non-historic alterations on the rear, south elevations of the building including window replacement and construction of a porch. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On September 22, 2009, the H-Board designated four of the nineteen elevations as primary (elevations 3, 4, 6, and 7 as shown on the floor plan) and approved remodeling that included the construction of a garage addition.

On October 6, 2009, the H-Board approved additional remodeling of the residence that included the construction of a second floor addition to an existing second floor, installation of bay windows on the south, enclosure of a non-historic portal on the south, and the construction of a portal on the south side.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the remodel of the residence and perform other improvements with the following three items.

1. The previous residential remodel has been refined and changes are proposed to the second floor addition at the west, south, and east elevations. The alterations include window and door modifications, angling of the wall at the southeast, and the construction of a 58 square foot portal at the roof deck.

2. A 576 square foot free-standing tea house will be constructed in the back yard to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 18' as determined by a radial calculation. The tea house is designed in a manner that intends to harmonize with Santa Fe style while also incorporating Asian design features. The tea house will feature divided light windows, an 18" overhanging roof, and a recessed entry portal.

3. A 130 square foot free-standing storage and sitting area will be constructed in the back yard to a height of 10' 7". The seating area features a floor plan on one side and unfenestrated doors on the storage room.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Chair Woods asked for the location of the portal.

Mr. Rasch said it was on the rear elevation and there was one on the second floor also on the rear was the master bedroom.

Chair Woods asked if the portal at the rear on the second floor was angled as well.

Mr. Rasch thought it look like it was angled but deferred to the applicant.

Present and sworn was Mr. Tom Torres, who said the portal on second floor was not angled. It was perpendicular on the site plan. He said the elevation change was approximately 14'. The front elevation had no change. They called it a tea house and explained there were no bathroom facilities but did have water.

Dr. Kantner asked about the visibility of the tea house.

Mr. Rasch said it was not visible from Palace or Alameda but was from neighboring yards.

Ms. Mather regarding the 2nd floor portal asked if it was the dark wall that was at an angle.

Mr. Torres agreed the wall was at an angle but the portal was perpendicular. They did have a portal in the original application but did not have it covered. This had a slight covering there.

Chair Woods noted in the original approval, if it was covered, it would have been a portal. But if it was not covered it would be a deck. Mr. Torres agreed it was not covered so it was not a portal.

Ms. Shapiro asked about the storage area and sitting area. The shape of it was a little different than she expected. She asked what way it faced and why it was in the middle of the yard. She asked how it would interact with the rest of the yard.

Mr. Torres said his client was heavily influenced by ancient design and had a background in Japanese architecture and spatial relationships generated by gardens. The location was not arbitrary. It had to do with facing west. There was very little storage on lower level so he put in some storage. He agreed that it was a little peculiar but it was driven by her wishes.

Ms. Shapiro said he had not provided a landscape plan. Mr. Torres said he did.

Mr. Rasch said it was shown on page 16.

Ms. Rios asked if it would have any rooftop appurtenances. Mr. Torres said it would not.

Ms. Rios asked if it would have any exterior lighting.

Mr. Torres said they would have very low lighting as was granted before.

Dr. Kantner was concerned about the angle of the wall under the 2nd story portal. He asked if they were wedded to that idea.

Mr. Torres said it had to do mostly with opening up the space. He was trying to honor what had previously been approved and reduced the windows on the back side. The flow of the space relative to the trees was considered. There was a very fine pine tree there. He tried to orient the exit so they wouldn't be staring out at the tree. The tree would be a counterpoint to the experience.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather asked about the storage shed doors design.

Mr. Torres said they were basically very simple.

Ms. Mather asked if there would be lights on it.

Mr. Torres said they would have no lighting at all on the shed.

Ms. Rios asked if on the Tea House he was proposing sliding doors.

Mr. Torres said they were more like Tatani doors like a barn door.

Ms. Rios asked if he would consider French doors.

Mr. Torres said they could but preferred to have a sliding door if they could. They did consider it.

Chair Woods thought the Board had really tried to work with Mr. Torres on expanding the second story on this contributing building. They worked hard to meet his needs and keep the historic status of the building. She thought to introduce an angle on a John Gaw Meem building was inappropriate. And to expand the 2nd story by having a second story portal with a parapet also expanded that second story and footprint. She recommended a small eyebrow. She understood enjoying Japanese architecture. But they did buy a contributing building in the historic east side of Santa Fe - in the heart of the historic east side. She recommended either he choose a parapet or an overhang but not both. Although an interesting concept, it was not necessarily appropriate for the east side. She also would ask them not to have sliding glass doors. She couldn't remember one other project on the east side where they had approved sliding glass doors. She was just concerned with where it was located and with the historic building the Board was trying to work with.

Ms. Rios asked if on the Tea House he was proposing rounded corners or straight edge.

Mr. Torres said they would be soft but not as pronounced as on most John Gaw Meem buildings.

Ms. Rios asked if the colors would emulate what was existing. Mr. Torres agreed.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 09-057 as recommended by staff with the following conditions:

- 1. That the door design and colors on the storage building be brought to staff for review and approval;**
- 2. That the lighting be brought to staff for review and approval;**
- 3. That there be no angle on the doors leading to the portal (the doorway area) on the 2nd floor;**
- 4. That they use French doors on the tea house**
- 5. That the tea house not have an overhang;**
- 6. That the colors emulate the original colors**

Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion.

Chair Woods proposed the condition be either a parapet or an overhang but not both. She also suggested that on the second story portal to not have a parapet so there was some semblance of stepping down.

Ms. Mather and Mr. Featheringill agreed the amendments were friendly. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H 10-011. 557 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Luis Olivas, agent for William and Amiee La Calle, proposes to amend a previous approval by constructing an approximately 96 sq. ft. portal to a height of 10' where the existing height was 15' 6" and an approximately 123 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 8' 6" where the existing height was 12' 6" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

This case was postponed under Approval of the Agenda:

I. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H 10-023. 855 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. RM Sandrian, owner/agent, proposes to remodel two non-contributing residences including increasing height from approximately 10' to approximately 13' 8" where the maximum allowable height was 15' 11, to change shed roofs to flat with parapet, to replace doors and windows and to change locations and dimensions. (David Rasch)**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

855 East Palace Avenue is a single family residence with a free-standing casita that was constructed in a vernacular manner in the early 1930s through the 1970s. Alterations have occurred over time including additions with a mixture of older wood windows and replacement steel and aluminum windows. The

buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The property is also identified as within the Escarpment Overlay and regulations for sloping ground, height, and screening must also be addressed.

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

1. The building heights will be increased from approximately 10' to approximately 14' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 11" as determined by a radial calculation. The lower rear section of the casita will be increased in height. Shed roofs will be changed to flat with parapets and canales.

2. All windows, both historic and non-historic, will be removed and replaced with true-divided light windows in a 2-over-2 muntin pattern. Some opening dimensions and locations are changing. Some existing window openings are nearer than 3' to a corner, but new window openings are proposed at nearer than 3' to a corner and an exception has not been requested to Section 14-5.2 (E)(2)(b).

3. The carport will be removed.

4. The roofs and walls will be insulated and the structures will be restuccoed in El Rey "Madera" or "La Morena." Staff is unfamiliar with these colors which may be from an elastomeric chart.

5. Stuccoed yardwalls are proposed at 42" high to separate the roadway and parking area from yards. Pedestrian gates are shown on the site plan with the yardwalls but no descriptions or elevations were provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the conditions that windows which are proposed to be in new opening locations nearer than 3' to a corner shall be moved to meet the 3' corner rule or an exception shall be posted for a later hearing, that the pedestrian gates and exterior light fixture designs shall be approved by staff before applying for a building permit, and that Escarpment Overlay regulations be examined for compliance. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Mr. Rasch explained there were windows proposed closer than 3' to a corner and no exception was requested.

He said the color of stucco was from a new color chart and might be too close to chocolate.

Chair Woods asked if he was saying the existing openings were within three feet of the corner. Mr. Rasch agreed. They were existing window openings that were less than three feet from a publicly visible corner so they were non-conforming.

Chair Woods asked if no exception was required for that.

Mr. Rasch agreed but said new openings were being proposed closer than 3' as well.

Chair Woods concluded that he would have to change those new windows that were.

Present and sworn was Mr. Robert M Sandrian, 539 Hillside Avenue, who- had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker noted that the lower rear section of the casita would be increased in height. She asked how much it would be increased.

Mr. Sandrian said it would be 10' high in front. The ground sloped so it would be about 6.5' on the back so it would gain about five feet.

Ms. Walker asked if he had designed the pedestrian gates.

Mr. Sandrian said it would be a simple wooden gate with no cover or posts on the sides.

Ms. Rios asked what material he would use for the canales to be made from and what lining they would have.

Mr. Sandrian said the outside would be wood and the inside would be copper. They would- extend out about 30".

Ms. Rios asked about appurtenances on the roof.

Mr. Sandrian said they would have skylights that were not visible because of the height of the parapet and was why they had asked for the parapet to be increased.

Ms. Rios asked if the building was of adobe.

Mr. Sandrian said it was as well as wood and block and pentile on the inside.

Ms. Shapiro noticed on the elevations that all the doors looked a little different.

Mr. Sandrian said the existing doors were all very different. He said he would build them to have the old time feel to them. Old Santa Fe houses didn't all have the same style doors.

Ms. Shapiro noted on east elevation were two overhangs over the doors. She asked for a description of them and if they had corbels or would be simpler than that.

Mr. Sandrian said the one on the back had an eyebrow now that was about 3' by 4'. They wanted to extend that to make it an actual portal. There would be a six by six post on each corner supporting it.

Where the carport was now was a little eyebrow over the double entry doors. That would probably stick

out about 18". It would be the same with the double doors that led into the little patio. They would be wooden with a corbel bracket.

Ms. Shapiro appreciated the nice drawings. She asked if he would maintain the character of the walls.

Mr. Sandrian said he definitely would. They wanted it to be energy efficient by adding insulation but would keep the same character. They did not plan to spray foam but would keep a deep reveal.

Ms. Shapiro asked how many new windows were to close to the corner.

Mr. Sandrian thought the only one was on the east elevation - 2 over 2 - 7' off the floor that might be 2' to the corner. They could probably move it but he thought he could just go to a smaller window.

Ms. Shapiro said it would be either that or come back with a request for an exception.

Mr. Sandrian said he would move it over. The other window might be on south on Unit B at the kitchen and he could easily move that one. That was where the notice was posted. On the south side of Unit B kitchen.

Ms. Rios asked for the proposed color of the windows.

Mr. Sandrian said they would be white - very white.

Chair Woods felt that pure white with dark stucco would be too stark.

Mr. Sandrian said the house across the street had brown stucco with white trim. He agreed he could make the color less stark.

Chair Woods suggested the bathroom window could be between the stool and the shower.

Mr. Sandrian said he was thinking more of venting.

Ms. Walker asked if he had considered other stucco colors.

Mr. Sandrian said he was open to that. It was just that he was taken to the one across the street.

Mr. Rasch and Mr. Sandrian clarified which windows were new and which were existing.

Chair Woods was concerned with his statement about an eyebrow that would become a portal with six by six posts because it was not shown on the drawings.

Mr. Sandrian said it was shown on plans and he pointed it out.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods summarized the issues discussed.

Dr. Kantner asked for clarification on the windows now close to the corner.

Mr. Rasch clarified that existing windows didn't have to be moved.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 10-023 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

1. That no new windows would be closer than 3" to a corner,
2. That the trim would be a little creamier than white,
3. That no rooftop appurtenances could be publicly visible,
4. That the window at the master bath be moved as discussed.

Ms. Rios seconded the motion and asked for the following conditions:

5. That the stucco should be cementitious and a little lighter color,
6. That canales be would be wooden with copper lining,
6. That any lighting would be submitted to staff for review and approval,
7. That the gate design be taken to staff for review and approval.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 10-024.** 852 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Fabu-Wall-Ous Solutions, LLC., agent for Faye Shilkey, proposes to remodel a contributing property including the construction of an 83 sq. ft. addition with a 280 sq. ft. portal on a non-primary elevation, replace rick parapet where necessary, repair and restucco yardwalls and replace a pedestrian gate. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

852 Old Santa Fe Trail is a single family residence and free-standing garage that was constructed in the Territorial Revival style in the 1930s. The buildings are listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The elevations that include the north and east faces of the residence are considered to embody the character defining elements. These elevations are identified as 1 through 7 on the floor plan of 12 elevations.

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

1. An 83 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear at elevation 10 with an angled wall which is not visible from a public way. The addition will match the architectural style and characteristic features with a brick parapet. The windows will be simulated divided light with exterior wood surrounds painted white. The addition will be 11' 7" high and lower than the adjacent parapet heights.

2. A280 square foot portal will be constructed at the rear at elevations 9 and 10. The portal will match the architectural style with a simplified exposed wooden beam and posts and at a lower height than adjacent parapets with a brick parapet.

3. The rear patio in the new portal area will be surfaced with brick and a fireplace will be constructed on elevation 9 with a brick cornice at the top.

4. Where necessary, deteriorated brick at the parapets will be removed and replaced with matching brick.

5. The Old Santa Fe Trail yardwall will be remodeled for the installation of a pedestrian gate flanked with stuccoed pilasters.

6. The yardwalls will be restuccoed to match the existing material, color, and texture.

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. Rasch added that the primary elevations were on the east and north. He also corrected the staff report to say that the angled wall was visible from a public way.

Ms. Walker thought items 5 and 6 seemed similar.

Mr. Rasch said in #5 the applicant was adding pilasters and a gate and #6 was that the entire wall would be restuccoed.

Present and sworn was Mr. Bill Bushall, 501 East Coronado Road who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Dr. Kantner said the portal looked angled and the parapet appeared to extend behind the portal. He was concerned with the funny looking angle.

Mr. Bushall said the parapet for the new entry took in the stairs just inside the entry. The parapet was taller than the portal parapet and was angled.

Dr. Kantner explained that this building was a Territorial building. That style had all right angle so he was concerned with the angle.

Mr. Bushall said it allowed access to the stairway to the basement that was presently illegal. But by changing the stairs configuration it would be legal. They looked at various ways to do this. In doing so, it became evident that if they squared it off there would not be room from the east side or the southwest side.

He added that the owner's mother might soon need wheelchair access and this design would allow for a ramp.

Chair Woods asked why he wouldn't just make it bigger. It would be very visible. She thought they had to come up with a way to square it out.

Mr. Bushall agreed that would be possible but it would create a right angle going into the kitchen.

Chair Woods said if he brought it out and put the door in the center, then it wouldn't have a right angle into the kitchen. That seemed to her to be an easy solution.

Mr. Bushall said the only portion you could see was just the parapet.

Chair Woods disagreed if a person turned down the side street.

Mr. Rasch asked how the parapet would maintain the traditional appearance.

Mr. Bushall said the portal going to the east would screen that entry.

Mr. Featheringill said they needed to square up that corner. He didn't understand why they had to be angled.

Mr. Bushall asked if that meant if he squared up the entry and extended it a bit then staff and Board would have no objection.

Chair Woods said it depended on the motion.

Ms. Rios asked what exterior lighting there would be. Mr. Bushall said the only lights would be at the entrance under the portal.

Ms. Rios asked if any rooftop equipment would be visible.

Mr. Bushall said it would just be the extension of the chimney two feet above roofline.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the wood trim would be painted white and coping and stucco would match existing.

Mr. Bushall agreed. All would match the existing. They planned to use interior existing brick for the outside.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked which style of simulated divided lights would be used.

Mr. Bushall said it would be architectural series.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 10-024 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

- 1. That the entry portal be square with the new plan submitted to staff for review and approval;**
- 2. That all new windows will be architectural series;**
- 3. That the finishes on the addition match existing.**

Ms. Rios seconded the motion with the request for conditions:

- 4. That there be no visible roof top appurtenances; and,**
- 5. That any exterior lighting be submitted to staff for review and approval.**

Dr. Kantner accepted the amendment as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H 10-026.** 612 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Doug McDowell, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 3,280 sq. ft. residence on a vacant lot to a height of approximately 15' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 16' 8" with yardwalls not to exceed 6' in height. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch clarified that this was for Lot 4.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

612 Garcia Street, or Lot 4, is a 9,686 square foot vacant lot in a 6 lot subdivision in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The HDRB has already approved grading of the lot and a maximum allowable building height of 16' 8".

The applicant proposes to construct a 3,280 square foot residence in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style to a maximum height of 15' 6" at mid point on the front elevation and a maximum height of 15' 11". The building will feature wall-dominated stepped massing with battered walls and rounded edges.

The true divided-light Marvin windows will be clad in "Evergreen", exposed woodwork will be stained, and the stucco will be a special mix of "Pecos." Color samples will be presented at the hearing.

Skylights and roof-mounted solar panels are proposed that do not appear to extend above the parapets.

Stuccoed yardwalls will be approximately 3' to 4' high from highest grade and slightly over 6' high from lowest grade with retainage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the conditions that the skylights and solar panels shall not be publicly visible and that exterior light fixture designs shall be approved by staff before applying for a building permit. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Doug McDowell, 1317 B Cerro Gordo. He said they were proud of this subdivision they were doing in the historic district. He wanted to assure the Board that they had worked very hard to make sure the parapets would cover the solar collectors effectively. There were many complications but they found a solution and were excited about doing the first LEED Platinum project in Santa Fe. They were trying to be true to the core nature.

Ms. Rios asked if the skylights were low profile and not visible. Mr. McDowell agreed.

Mr. McDowell said some of the solar panels were hydronic panels. There were ten panels that were long and thin and about 2' high. The PV panels were larger and there were 8 of them. They were in an area with higher parapets. They didn't have a grid so they were just flat black.

Ms. Rios thought perhaps the Board could use this as example for future solar cases. Mr. McDowell agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if he would have outdoor lighting.

Mr. McDowell said they would but didn't bring the design. It would be a metal cylinder or square with down lighting made locally. He agreed to seek staff approval.

Ms. Rios asked about the canales.

Mr. McDowell said they would have wood canales with patinated copper linings.

Ms. Rios complimented them on the careful approach.

Ms. Shapiro had trouble reading the west elevation courtyard entry.

Mr. McDowell said the drawing was a cross section and- to the right was a gate to the south into the courtyard. The wood grill was just made of wood that you look through into the courtyard. The drawing before just showed the entry door.

Ms. Mather asked to view the samples.

He explained that he put out several because they would be doing different designs on different houses. They didn't want to do a compound that would look like a condo. If they used dados under the portal this was what they would use.

He showed stain colors on wood. On this unit they would use light blue for windows.

He showed the evergreen color at Ms. Mather's request.

Chair Woods said the confusion of the Board was because the application said Evergreen.

Ms. Mather said the blue was Cascade Blue.

Ms. Walker asked if they considered a lighter stain.

Mr. McDowell said they did. It was a four-coat process and on other buildings they would use some lighter stain but wanted to avoid having it look yellow which could happen. This was the darkest stain they would have.

Ms. Walker noted on the floor plan, sheet A-2, that- the portal was in living room area. Mr. McDowell agreed.

Ms. Walker asked what kind of doors he would use.

Mr. McDowell said they were Marvin divided light sliding doors to mimic French Doors.

Ms. Walker asked if he could use French Doors.

Mr. McDowell said they could but wanted to avoid losing the space inside. The sliders were the Universal Design Series (highest level).

Chair Woods - most sliders

Present and sworn was Mr. Jim Satsinger, 1801 Camino Cruz Blanca, who said the sliding doors were not publicly visible and the styles and rails were not as large as French Doors. The numbers shown included portals and garage space. The buildings were 2,300 and 2,800 heated area.

Ms. Rios asked if they were proposing to inset the windows.

Mr. Satsinger agreed. These were the new replacement casements which were less than 3" so they would have 4-5" on inside and outside recess.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. McDowell added regarding the sliding doors that they were 5-6' below grade so from the road one would see a wall or the top of the portal.

Chair Woods thought the houses were great with solar and everything but that the sliding doors would set a precedent on Garcia Street. It was the first one.

Mr. McDowell asked if the concern was for its visible appearance or when it was open.

Chair Woods said for it was the look from the exterior and that it was precedent setting.

Mr. McDowell said they were true divided lights. He asked if they could use something like a nano wall or folding door so they wouldn't have to come back to the Board.

Chair Woods favored the bi-fold doors.

Mr. McDowell said it was a small unit and open to the courtyard.

Mr. Featheringill noted that on those elevations on the other units had the same look but they showed a different rail system.

Mr. McDowell said the others were regular French doors.

Mr. Featheringill thought there were sliders that used the same doors.

Mr. McDowell said he didn't want to set a precedent if the Board could give him a chance to work with staff for an acceptable system.

Ms. Walker asked if there was a problem opening them out.

Mr. McDowell said it would mean the same problem with outdoor living.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 10-026 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

- 1. That the lighting be taken to staff for review and approval;**
- 2. That the canales be copper lined with patina;**
- 3. That the stucco colors be as presented to the Board;**
- 4. That the windows be clad in a Cascade Blue;**
- 5. That the French style doors use either sliding or bi-fold design to mimic French doors with staff review and approval.**

Ms. Rios seconded the motion with two other conditions:

- 6. That the windows have a reveal of 4-5 inches; and**
- 7. That there be no visible rooftop appurtenances.**

Ms. Mather accepted the amendments as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H 10-027.** 614 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Doug McDowell, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 3,905 sq. ft. residence on a vacant lot to a height of approximately 15' 9" where the maximum allowable height was 16' 6" with hard walls not to exceed 6' in height. (David Rasch) Lot 3

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

614 Garcia Street, or Lot 3, is a 9,083 square foot vacant lot in a 6 lot subdivision in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The HDRB has already approved grading of the lot and a maximum allowable building height of 16' 6".

The applicant proposes to construct a 3,905 square foot residence in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style to a maximum height of 15' 9" at mid point on the front elevation and a maximum height of 16' 4". The building will feature wall-dominated stepped massing with battered walls and rounded edges.

Cantilevered overhangs will be supported with corbel-like beams.

The true divided-light Marvin windows will be clad in "Dark Bronze", exposed woodwork will be stained, and the stucco will be a special mix of "Pecos." Color samples will be presented at the hearing.

Skylights and roof-mounted solar panels are proposed that do not appear to extend above the parapets.

Stuccoed yardwalls will be approximately 3' to 4' high from highest grade and slightly over 6' high from lowest grade with retainage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the conditions that the skylights and solar panels shall not be publicly visible and that exterior light fixture designs shall be approved by staff before applying for a building permit. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Rasch if the staff report had the correct square footage area.

Mr. Rasch said that was total roof coverage, not just heated.

Ms. Mather asked in looking at the south elevation about the cantilever.

Mr. Rasch briefly reviewed the overhang code requirements. This one met the code.

Mr. McDowell (already sworn) felt good with the house. A local couple was moving into it.

Chair Woods referred to the west elevation and said she didn't understand how it was drawn. It had a viga overhang with no parapet on it and posts or buttresses and it looked like the roof came over that with a viga sticking out in the middle elevation and it went past the garage.

Mr. Satsinger said on the roof plan there was a two-foot thick wall underneath the entry overhang like a zaguan entrance. He pointed it out on the floor plan. The grill connects inside with outside to take your attention away from the garage. It continued to the garage to break up the massing. And 20' behind was the entry portal.

Chair Woods suggested if that overhang didn't come over the buttress or post and came in slightly from the far right-hand side of the garage, it might read as stronger where now it appeared thin.

Mr. Satsinger said he looked at that but it was important that the roof pass by the mass there. The roof was floating across this buttress. It would be easier if they didn't look at the entry portal behind.

Chair Woods asked how it would work if it didn't come as far to the garage.

Mr. Satsinger said he could see the point but they didn't have a lot of bulk right there. It would change the modulation of the vigas. Sometimes they got too hung up on geometry.

Chair Woods said she was just concerned with how it appeared.

Mr. Satsinger didn't think it was that important.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios said on this project the reveals were the same and asked what the colors were.

Mr. McDowell agreed the reveals were the same and the color of the windows was bronze. The setbacks and bullnoses were the same. The stain might be a little lighter. The rooftop skylights and solar panels would not be visible. Sliding doors would be used as on the other lot.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the panes of glass were too large in the French doors.

Mr. Satsinger said they were less than 30".

Ms. Walker asked if these French doors were sliders.

Mr. McDowell said they were not sliding doors on this unit.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 10-027 per the application with the following conditions:

- 1. That the Marvin windows be a dark bronze;**
- 2. That the stucco be a special mix of Pecos as presented;**

3. That the windows be recessed 4-5";
4. That no rooftop panels or appurtenances be visible.

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

5. **Case #H 028A.** 275 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. ORR Architects, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fe, proposes a historic status review of this non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

275 East Alameda Street, known as the St. Francis Cathedral School, was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style by John Gaw Meem in April 1948 as building inventory number 549. Historic wooden doors and steel casement windows remain along with a mural painted by Harry Miller in the 1950s at the entry portal. In the 1960's an addition was constructed on the west, rear elevation which does not distract from the street-facing elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends upgrading the historic status from non-contributing to contributing for this structure which displays good historic integrity and the south and east elevations may be considered as primary.

Mr. Rasch showed a series of illustrations of the south elevation which had character defining tower as well as distinctive massing. He also showed illustrations of the east elevation which was a primary elevation in his estimation. It had a long façade with steel casement windows. He recommended south and east elevations as primary. He also showed the west and north elevations as well as the non-historic addition from the 1960's.

Ms. Rios noted that the footprint had not changed

Present and sworn was Mr. Jake Rodriguez, 1418 Luisa, Suite 6 who said the Archdiocese of Santa Fe had leased the school building to the New Mexico School for the Arts and wanted to start classes in the fall of 2010. The City required them to do some accessibility improvements. They were focusing more on the inside with rails and lifts. Only three items affected the outside and that led them to ask for this historic status review. They agreed with the staff recommendation.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved in Case #H 10-028A to upgrade the historic status to contributing and designate the south and east elevations as primary elevations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H 028B. 275 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. ORR Architects, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fe, proposes to construct ADA compliant ramps with handrails. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

275 East Alameda Street is a contributing property within the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the east and south elevations are considered to be primary.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with three ADA-compliant ramps. The ramps at the main entrance on the southeast corner and the north entrance will have a minimal rise. The west entrance ramp at the kitchen will have a taller rise that requires a handrail. The handrail will be 1 ½" steel pipe with a minimal design. Paint color was not submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that all concrete be earth-toned. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked about colors.

Mr. Rodriguez (already sworn) said they would match existing colors. They were doing the hand rail for life safety to meet city requirements. Only the one on the west would have hand rails. That was an area to load/unload for kitchen.

Ms. Walker asked what the minimal design on hand rail would be.

Mr. Rodriguez said it was a simple pipe design.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro moved for approve Case #H 10-028B per staff recommendations with the concrete to be earth toned and the hand rail color the same as the existing stucco color. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H 10-029.** 707 Dunlap Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Duran Enterprises de Santa Fe, Inc., agent for Allison Hill, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence to include replacement of all windows and doors, replacement of shingle roof with pro panel, and restuccoing. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

707 Dunlap Street is a single family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner before 1928. The building has been altered including the replacement of historic windows with steel casements and aluminum sliders. It is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

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

1. Windows and doors will be removed and replaced. Some opening locations and dimensions will be altered. On the west, driveway elevation a large picture window will be infilled with wall and four smaller and higher windows will be installed. Also, on the west elevation two window openings will be change to one opening of the same style. On the east elevation two window openings will be infilled with wall. The windows will be in the color "Bronze."

2. The asphalt shingle surface on the hipped roof will be removed and replaced with a metal Propanel roof in "Hartford Green." Repair and or replacement of fascia and soffit may also be needed, but it will be repaired in-kind.

3. The building will be restuccoed with El Rey "Buckskin."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Robert Guerin, 1713 Paseo de Peralta, who said the hip roof was structurally sound but the shingles were not waterproof anymore. They were just trying to do this for a single mom with a young daughter. That was also the reason for the windows being blocked for her privacy.

Chair Woods asked what the roof color was.

Mr. Guerin showed the color sample which was green.

Ms. Mather asked about the soffit and fascia and agreed they looked deteriorated.

Mr. Guerin said they were not repairable so they would be removed and replaced. For her budget they were going to a propanel roof and would just stucco the soffit.

Chair Woods asked how much they wanted this color.

Mr. Guerin said they would consider another color and had chosen this for her budget. He showed the

color choices.

Chair Woods suggested a color.

Ms. Shapiro thought a lighter color would be more efficient.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Mr. Guerin showed the two colors available for the windows. He added that the windows were 300 Series.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 10-029 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

1. That the propanel be either light grey or sage;
2. That the windows be in the darker of the two color choices;
3. That the stucco be Buckskin color;
4. That it have wood fascia;
5. That there be no roof top appurtenances;
6. That any exterior lighting be taken to staff for review and approval.

Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and requested a condition:

7. That the soffit be wood (not stuccoed).

Ms. Rios accepted the amendment as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H 10-031.** 517 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning, agent for Kevon Zehner, proposes to install brick paving and construct 8" to 12" high planter boxes on a non-stated property. (Marisa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

517 Acequia Madre is a Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence that was constructed in 2007-2008. The Official Map does not list this building since it was recently constructed.

The applicant proposes to install brick in the driveway area to match the existing brick walkway in brick color and pattern. Also proposed is the construction of 8" to 12" high stuccoed planter boxes on the publicly visible south and west elevation. The stucco will be El Rey Adobe to match the existing residence.

No other work is proposed for this property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval as the application is in compliance 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 Ms. Dolores Vigil, 501 Rio Grande, who said the applicant was also present.

Dr. Kantner asked if the decorative planter pot was part of the new application; part of the new planters.

Ms. Vigil said it would be set on top of the planter like an accessory.

Dr. Kantner asked if it would be on top of the plaster.

Ms. Vigil said it would be stuccoed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Charles Newman, 429 Delgado Lane, who said he supported this project. He lived around the corner. The owners had gone through great hardship from acequias flooding. The brick would be great improvement over the sandbags.

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

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 10-031 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H 10-025A.** 101 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale A. López, owner/agent, proposes a historic status review of this non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

101 Rim Road is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1958 and 1960 in the Hipped Box style with a standing-seam metal roof, steel casement windows, and concrete sills. The residence retains its original historic integrity and it has been well-maintained. It is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District, but the residence is eligible for a historic status upgrade.

No Historic Cultural Property Inventory was found in the data files, but the applicant has provided copies of original permits and inspections. The construction permit was issued for the residence on April 30, 1958 and the electrical inspection was issued on August 19, 1960. The building permit for the free-standing garage was issued on September 22, 1970 and the yardwall permit was issued on February 21, 1964.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends an upgrade in historic status for this residential structure from non-contributing to contributing due to high historic integrity with the south elevation considered as primary. The free-standing garage should remain non-contributing due to non-historic date of construction.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch to read the definition of contributing and he did.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dale López who said it was an honor to be in front of the Board. He said he wanted to improve the house his dad built and keep the same look while keeping the energy efficient at this time.

Ms. Rios asked him if he agreed with staff recommendation to have it contributing.

Mr. López said he felt it was borderline - He took out the permit but it took him until 1965 to finish it. He said he would accept what the Board recommended.

Ms. Mather noticed in part B that he wanted to remove the windows.

Mr. López said he wanted the window replacements to be as close to the original as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. McDowell (already sworn) said it had been his pleasure to know Mr. López for 20 years. He was a fine home builder. He watched Mr. López take care of his parents until they passed away in this home. Santa Fe needed to honor its local natives and help them upgrade for energy efficiency instead of forcing them to move away.

Present and sworn was Mr. Raymond Herrera who said he was here in favor of Mr. López' request to redo his residence. It was an honor to have a person wanting to keep the house his father built and to see it remaining. It was right next to the López chapel that Mr. Herrera's father built in the 1920's.

He said the reason the Board hadn't seen him in the last six months was because he had colon cancer and Ms. Rios asked him to urge board members to avoid getting it themselves and to have a colonoscopy.

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

Ms. Rios noted this was a vernacular style house, built by the people who lived in the house. They added on to the house. They built it with the economic means they had and met the need. It also denoted the particular time that it was built. Some people would say it was not of character style but it was important. The family maintained it though it was not a pedigreed house. For her it was important to upgrade it.

Chair Woods said that for all the reasons Ms. Rios just said, she felt they should not inflict a historic

designation on this property.

Mr. Rios said it wasn't a limitation. He could come to the Board and present his ideas and make a case with an exception as the Board considered any other case.

Ms. Walker thought it was an honor to have a contributing house.

Ms. Walker moved in Case #H 10-025A to approve upgrading the status of 101 Rim Road to Contributing and the south elevation be designated primary. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with one member against.

Case #H 10-025B. 101 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale A. López, owner/agent, proposes to remodel the residence by replacing windows. An exception was requested to remove historic material from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D, 5, a, I)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The applicant proposes to remove all original steel casement windows and replace them with simulated divided-light metal clad black windows. The drawings appear to represent that the windows will match the originals in muntin pattern and dimensions with slight alteration in frame dimensions while retaining the overall opening dimensions. Bedroom windows will meet the ingress/egress dimensional requirements. There is mention of a request to not provide divided lights on the living room window on the east elevation, but this is not shown on drawings. An exception is requested to remove historic windows on the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and the required exception responses are as follows. The stucco will be patched around the new windows to match the existing material, color, and texture.

EXCEPTION TO REMOVE HISTORIC WINDOWS ON A PRIMARY ELEVATION

i. The proposed removal of historic windows in this area does not damage the character of the streetscape.

The house sits up hill from Cerro Gordo and set back close to 75' and up 40' from the street in height. On the Rim Road side the closest part of the house is about 15' and about 14' in height from street to bottom of the house. In addition there are many mature trees all around the house so there is not a clear view from the street. The windows sizes will stay the same because I did not want to create more costs that were needed and with saying that there will be very little change at those distance.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response, as the windows on the south elevation are only slightly visible from a public way.

ii. The proposed removal of historic windows shall prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

The current condition of the house windows create a immense hardship on me. The existing original steel divided light windows need a lot of work as they will need to be re-glazed, and in some cases some windows will have to be replaced because the steel dividers have rotted and disintegrated—leaving gaps for the penetrating weather to cause loss of energy. Maintenance on the windows has only been a temporary fix, and I fear that if I cannot replace the windows now that I am in my 50s, I will not

physically or financially be able to maintain, fix, or replace the windows as I progress in years.

At this time in my life, I am in a position financially and physical to replace the windows in the house my parents built. I don't want to sell it to someone who fix and sell the house and risk the authenticity of my ancestor's contribution to our historical neighborhood.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

iii. The proposed removal of historic windows shall strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts.

I have been part of this house all of my life. It started as a young two year old boy who helped my father Fidel G. López, brothers and neighbors make help my father build our house. I only ask to upgrade by replacing the windows to more energy efficient units. In doing so, I will order and install windows to fit into the original window openings as possible with the exception to current egress requirements in the bedrooms. I support and agree with the installation of window in bedrooms which follow all egress guidelines.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

iv. The proposed removal of historic windows is due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are applicable to the other lands or structures in the related streetscape.

At this time the cost is barely affordable. I need to make this house as efficient as possible because of rising cost and we all need to focus on energy efficiency. The times have change and we need to adjust to those times. In addition, many homes built on Cerro Gordo are not historically contributing, so I would like to set a precedence by replacing my old windows with new units which will capture as close of an original look as possible. This pays homage to my ancestors with energy and aesthetics in mind.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

v. The proposed removal of historic windows is due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant.

This house was originally built by my father from 1957 until he finished sometime in the late 60s. I lived with my parents as they grew old because I was the youngest of all my siblings. As it was time for me to enter the world on my own, my parents came ill (my father first and my mother later) and I stayed to care for them. As a result, I have inherited this house that I love. My father originally installed windows which were "state of the art" in 1960. However, the combination of the steel single pane windows are not what I or the city's energy standards consider to be a wise composite or use of installed material.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

vi. The proposed removal of historic windows shall provide the least negative impact.

I am proposing the removal and replacement of all of my original steel, single pane, divided light windows to a comparable match of windows that will be a black exterior clad window with a similar grid pattern. There will be minimal plaster patching, but I am committed to apply the same material, texture, and color (El Rey Cameo 102) as the original plaster application in a brogue texture. I have reviewed and made as little of an impact as possible. This would avoid any drastic changes to the over all look of my parent's original house.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to replace historic windows on the primary elevation. The Board should discuss the potential effect of the non-divided light living room window to determine if it meets the 30" rule, otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Mr. Rasch said the east window was very minimally visible.

Mr. López clarified that he had once wanted a picture window but since had agreed to a simulated divided light window there.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. McDowell (already sworn) felt Ms. Rios hit it on the nose. His father did a great job with what they had. Now the son was doing the same time and keeping in the neighborhood.

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

Ms. Shapiro asked how he was going to maintain the reveals.

Mr. López said the walls were 12" so he would inset the window to keep the same reveal.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 10-025B per staff recommendations and finding the responses to exception criteria were met. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

9. **Case #H 10-030.** 542 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Paul Kinderdine, agent for Frank Clifford & Barbara Anderson, proposes to construct an approximately 420 sq. ft. addition to 6" below the existing height of the significant building. An exception was requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 D, 2, c) and to construct an addition less than 10' from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D, 2, d)). (Marissa Barrett)

Ms. Mather recused herself from consideration of this case.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence was constructed by 1928 and has received minor alterations which include a 1980s small addition on the non-publicly visible rear elevation and a 32 square foot mud room addition also on the non-publicly visible west elevation. The sculpted fireplace on the street facing northwest elevation is a distinct architectural element that defines the character of the building. The Official Map list the building as Significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

This application proposes construction of an approximately 420 square foot addition to a height of 12' 4" where the existing height is 12' 10" on the non-publicly visible, west elevation. The addition is set back approximately 1' 6" from the south elevation. Since the building is listed as significant, all elevations are primary. Therefore applicant is asking for an exception to Section 14-5.2(D,2,c) to allow the addition to the building as well as Section 14-5.2 (D,2,d) to construct an addition less than 10' from a primary elevation. As required by code the applicant has answered the exception questions in Section 14-5.2 (C, 5,c,i-vi).

The following answers are in regards to the construction of an addition to a primary elevation:

1. Does not damage the character of the Streetscape:

This proposed 420 square foot addition will abut the rear of the existing structure near its southwest corner and extend just over 23 feet westward into the backyard. The addition will not exceed 50% of the square footage of the existing dimension of the primary façade. At its highest point, the parapet height of the addition will be at least 6" lower than the existing parapet. Also, there will be multiple steps down in the roof height lessening the impact to existing elevations. The addition will not be publicly visible from the street from most vantage points. However, the south facing wall will be partially visible from the street at the far southeast corner of the property. The view of it will be limited by a neighboring structure, by an existing perimeter wall and by foliage. In the interest of privacy, the owners intend to add more planting which will further camouflage the new construction. The external walls of the addition will match the existing façade in all aspects, including building materials, texture, color, and window design.

Staff concurs that the addition is under the 50% footprint, that the step downs help to mitigate the impact of height to the significant structure, and that the location of the addition will not damage the character of the streetscape.

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

The existing structure is a 1,300 square foot house that contains one bedroom and one bathroom that must be shared by both occupants and visitors. There are only three small closets in the house. The addition will contain a master bedroom, bath, and laundry room. Extra closets will allow the owners to move clothing and other personal belongings into the house from storage in an unattached garage. Most important, the addition will create more adequate private living space in a home that is the year-round home and sole residence of the owners.

Staff concurs that the existing building contains a limited amount of living space.

3. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts.

This addition will complement the pueblo style of the residence and reflect the historic character of the neighborhood. Its "adobe" stucco will help restore the home's brown hue which core sampling indicates was the original color, predating the current rose coloration. By enlarging this small house in a manner

wholly consistent with its traditional design, the addition will enhance the livability and thus the longevity of this significant home.

Staff concurs that the design strengthens the heterogeneous character of the city as well as complements the significant building design.

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

This is one of the smallest houses along Camino del Monte Sol. At the same time it sits on a spacious lot, about one-third of an acre, with virtually all of the property at the rear of the house. The lot slopes down away from the street and the existing structure. The proposed addition, by stepping back and down from the rear of the house, is designated to take advantage of the topography in the most unintrusive fashion.

Staff concurs that the design of the addition stepping back and down from the rear of the house is the best location for an addition based on the land and visibility of the significant structure.

- 5 & 6. *Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and provide the least negative impact with the respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Section 14- 5.2(A)(1).*

Except for the addition of the 32 square foot mud room at the rear of the structure, the house has not been altered since its purchase by the applicant in 2005. With the proposed addition, the residence will be enlarged without detracting from its historic character. The front facing profile of the house with its uniquely sculptured chimney will remain unchanged. The house, viewed from the front gate, will look exactly as it does today.

Staff concurs that the proposed location for the addition will have the least negative impact on the streetscape and historic district since the elevation which carries the most distinct character defining element will not be altered.

The following answers are in regards to the construction of an addition less than 10' from a primary elevation:

1. *Does not damage the character of the Streetscape:*

The new south facing wall of the proposed addition will be partially visible from the street at one corner of the lot. Someone standing at the southeast corner of the property, looking over an existing five-foot adobe wall and through foliage will be able to see a segment of the wall. That wall will match the existing façade of the house in material, texture, and coloration. In keeping with the rest of the house, recesses and step backs will break up the plane of the wall.

Staff concurs that the location of the addition will not damage the character of the streetscape as it is set back from the south elevation to break up the massing and is only slightly publicly visible.

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

A 10 foot setback at the southwest corner of the existing structure would make the addition unfeasible by reducing its width from about 16 feet to six feet. A setback less than 10 feet but greater than 18 inches would sacrifice interior space that could be recaptured only by extending the addition deeper into the backyard, requiring the removal of a mature fruit tree-one of two on the property. Such an extension could also jeopardize a grove of Arizona cypress trees, the tallest shade trees on the property. The proposed sitting of the addition was done with the help of tree specialists who made two trips to the property at the applicant's request to ensure that valuable trees would not be lost.

Staff concurs that the landscape, which includes the existing mature trees, would be jeopardized by moving the addition 10 feet from the south elevation.

3. *Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts.*

The south facing wall will compliment the Pueblo style of the existing structure and be fully in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood architecture. The wall is an integral part of the addition that will upgrade the property and enhance its appeal by making a small house larger without detracting from historic character of the district.

Staff concurs that the design of the addition, less than 10' from the primary elevation, would compliment the structure.

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

Given the small size of the house and its proximity to the street, it would be very difficult to design an addition that was totally hidden from view and at the same time did not jeopardize prized features of the landscape.

Staff concurs that the landscape, which includes the existing mature trees, would be jeopardized by moving the addition 10 feet from the south elevation.

5 & 6. *Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and provide the least negative impact with the respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Section 14-5.2(A)(1).*

The owners have made no external changes to the house they bought in 2005 except for the construction of a 32 square foot mud room attached to the rear of the entrance of the house. A small guest house in the northwest corner of the property does not affect the sitting of the proposed addition which is on the south side of the lot. Rather, the design of the addition with its proposed setback is determined by the lay of the land, its rearward sloping topography and its stands of towering cypress and mature fruit trees that enhance the property's historic appeal. Its modified setback notwithstanding, the proposed addition will be

largely hidden from view; its partially exposed southern elevation will present a pleasing façade totally in keeping with the historic character of the house and neighborhood.

Staff concurs that due to the location of the existing healthy trees, the topography of the land, and the character defining elements on the east elevation, that the proposed location of the addition, which includes the 1' 6" step back is the best possible location for the least negative impact on the streetscape and the historic district.

The proposed addition does not exceed half of the historic footprint, therefore no exception is required for the size of the addition.

The addition will include "Eagle" true divided light wood windows and doors which will be painted to match the existing trim color. The existing window on the west elevation, which is being removed for the addition, could not be reused due to damage from alterations made to accommodate an air condition unit. The new windows will match the style and pattern of that window. The building will be stuccoed using El Rey "Adobe" which core sampling indicates was used before the existing rose color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application, including the exception to construct an addition on a primary elevation and to construct an addition less than 10' from a primary elevation citing the exception criteria has been met, on the condition that there be no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances and that exterior light fixtures be approved by staff before a building permit application is submitted.

Ms. Rios asked if the proposed project was publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch said it was not.

Ms. Rios asked for the square footage.

Mr. Rasch said currently the proposal was 420 sq ft.

Present and sworn was Mr. Paul Kinderdine, 7 Bosque Road, Bosque Farms New Mexico, who said they did the calculations to make sure it didn't exceed 50% of the historic footprint.

Ms. Rios asked what would be on the roof. Mr. Kinderdine said there would be nothing on the roof.

Ms. Rios asked if any lighting was proposed.

Mr. Kinderdine said code required a light fixture at the rear exit. He thought they would select and install two wall sconces with down lighting.

Mr. Rasch said the previous floor area was 1006. It was within the 50% rule.

Ms. Rios asked if they would use cementitious stucco. Mr. Kinderdine agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if they would have the same color stucco.

Mr. Kinderdine said the existing house was Desert Rose. They believed the original was Adobe or Buckskin. The owner would like to return to the original color if they could find that out what it was, with staff approval. He explained they had done some coring at the rear of the house where the addition would be added. If they could not find the original color, they would ask for Buckskin.

He said the windows would match existing in color.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 10-030 as recommended by staff and finding that the response for the exception request were accepted with the following conditions:

- 1. That any color change be brought to staff for review and approval,**
- 2. That the trim match existing,**
- 3. That there be no rooftop appurtenances;**
- 4. That exterior lighting details be brought to staff for review and approval.**

Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Chair Woods asked for a condition:

- 5. That the windows be true divided light and not clad as submitted.**

Dr. Kantner accepted the amendment as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Walker asked staff to share the information about the awards with Marilyn Bane because the OSFA newsletter was going to the printers right away.

Ms. Rios noted in reference to #H 08-058, 518 East Palace Avenue that there was item the Board did not address that should have been included in the motion.

After a brief discussion about the correct parliamentary procedure -

Ms. Rios moved to reconsider Case #H 09-058. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios explained that the "skinny little windows on the tea house were odd and needed to be discussed and addressed. She wanted to postpone final approval until the Board had an opportunity to

discuss possible changes with the applicant.

Chair Woods said it was possible he might agree with the Board's suggestion. She said she felt they did not need to adhere to the three feet from the corner rule on this structure. They were very non-traditional windows for the historic district. That was the concern.

Mr. Rasch clarified that they did not need to conform to the three foot rule because these windows were not publicly visible. But they did need to conform to the 30" window pane rule even though not publicly visible. The original submittal showed single pane windows and they divided them into four panes but still needed to meet the 30" rule. So they needed a more traditional window style for it.

Ms. Mather apologized for not catching that in her motion. She thought the applicant was attempting to make it look more like an oriental building and therefore included those long narrow windows.

Chair Woods suggested they could just say the Board wanted more traditional proportions to be reviewed by staff. If the applicant wanted to come back and argue that point, it would be fine.

Ms. Rios moved to keep the original approval as approved and add the condition that the narrow windows on the Tea House have more traditional proportions, that the staff notify the applicant of this condition, that the applicant submit the drawings for the more traditional design to staff for review and approval or return to the Board if that was not acceptable. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer