



DATE 7/20/11 TIME 2:25p
RECEIVED BY Canille Vigil
JSL

Agenda

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 12, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-051 250 E. Alameda Street
Case #H-11-056 420 Hillside Avenue
Case #H-11-060 124 Delgado Street
Case #H-11-061 315 Sena Street

Case #H-11-062 360 Garcia Street
Case #H-11-063 420 Catron Street
Case #H-11-064 743 Dunlap Street
Case #H-11-065 28 Burro Alley

- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Case #H-11-066. 400 Block – Guadalupe Street. Landmark Outside of Historic Districts. City of Santa Fe, agent for The Santa Fe Railyard Community Corp., owners, proposes to remodel the exterior of the Santa Fe Depot. (David Rasch).

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-043. 325 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Kindgren, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a pedestrian gate in a yardwall on a contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-043. 607 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Presley J. Schmitt, agent, for Lee & Jana Reynolds, proposes to remodel a residential structure by constructing 611.25 sq. ft. of additions on the first floor and a 189 sq. ft. addition on the second floor and to remodel an existing non-historic 380 sq. ft. solarium. An exception is requested to construct additions at less than 10' back from primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-068. 619 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Walton Chapman Builders Co., agent for Jay Michael Coyle, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, construct standing-seam awnings, and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-069. 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Laurie Gottlieb, agent/owner, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 5'4" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-070. 629 E. Palace Ave.,#2. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. P.G. Harris Enterprises, Inc., agent, for Robert & Beverly Pevitts, owners, proposes to construct a coyote fence extension on a stuccoed yardwall to a maximum height of approximately 56" where the maximum allowable height is 74" on a contributing property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-071. 548 E. Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Ann Ash, owner, proposes to construct a 658 sq. ft. portal to a height of 11'6" on a non-contributing residential structure and to restucco all structures on the property. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-072. 641 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Connie Helms, agent, for Elspeth G. Bobbs, owner, proposes to replace three windows and a door on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-073. 1510 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susan Rundstrom, agent/owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-074. 553A Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Marisol A. Navas Sacasa, owner, proposes to construct two metal gates at 13' and 3' wide on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. 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 July 26, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, July 26, 2011.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 7-18-11 TIME 1:25 pm

SERVED BY Emilly Vignos

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 12, 2011

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-051 250 E. Alameda Street

Case #H-11-056 420 Hillside Avenue

Case #H-11-060 124 Delgado Street

Case #H-11-061 315 Sena Street

Case #H-11-062 360 Garcia Street

Case #H-11-063 420 Catron Street

Case #H-11-064 743 Dunlap Street

Case #H-11-065 28 Burro Alley

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Case #H-11-066, 400 Block – Guadalupe Street. Landmark Outside of Historic Districts. City of Santa Fe, agent for The Santa Fe Railyard Community Corp., owners, proposes to remodel the exterior of the Santa Fe Depot. (David Rasch).

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-043, 325 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Kindgren, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a pedestrian gate in a yardwall on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-043, 607 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Presley J. Schmitt, agent, for Lee & Jana Reynolds, proposes to remodel a residential structure by constructing a 329 sq. ft. addition and a 161 sq. ft. ramada at the second story, increase the height of an existing addition, and to construct a 128 sq. ft. ramada at less than 10' back from a primary elevation and an exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-068. 613 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Walton Chapman Builders Co., agent for Jay Michael Coyle, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, construct standing-seam awnings, and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-067. 243 Closson Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Jim Gill, agent for Barbara Brown, owner, proposes to replace three windows on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-069. 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Laurie Gottlieb, agent/owner, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 5'4" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-070. 629 E. Palace Ave.,#2. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. P.G. Harris Enterprises, Inc., agent, for Robert & Beverly Pevitts, owners, proposes to construct a coyote fence extension on a stuccoed yardwall to a maximum height of approximately 56" where the maximum allowable height is 74" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-071. 548 E. Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Ann Ash, owner, proposes to construct a 658 sq. ft. portal to a height of 11'6" on a non-contributing residential structure and to restucco all structures on the property. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-072. 641 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Connie Helms, agent, for Elspeth G. Bobbs, owner, proposes to replace three windows and a door on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-073. 1510 Cerro Cordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susan Rundstrom, agent/owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-074. 553A Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Marisol A. Navas Sacasa, owner, proposes to construct two metal gates at 13' and 3' wide on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. 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 July 26, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, July 26, 2011.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 7-14-11 TIME 1:30 pm

SERVED BY Vanilla Vignette

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, July 26, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 12, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-051 250 E. Alameda Street
Case #H-11-056 420 Hillside Avenue
Case #H-11-060 124 Delgado Street
Case #H-11-061 315 Sena Street

Case #H-11-062 360 Garcia Street
Case #H-11-063 420 Catron Street
Case #H-11-064 743 Dunlap Street
Case #H-11-065 28 Burro Alley

- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
- I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-043. 325 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Kindgren, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a pedestrian gate in a yardwall on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-043. 607 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Presley J. Schmitt, agent, for Lee & Jana Reynolds, proposes to remodel a residential structure by constructing a 329 sq. ft. addition and a 161 sq. ft. ramada at the second story, increase the height of an existing addition, and to construct a 128 sq. ft. ramada at less than 10' back from a primary elevation and an exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-068. 613 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Walton Chapman Builders Co., agent for Jay Michael Coyle, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, construct standing-seam awnings, and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

2. Case #H-11-067. 243 Closson Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Jim Gill, agent for Barbara Brown, owner, proposes to replace three windows on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-069. 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Laurie Gottlieb, agent/owner, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 5'4" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-070. 629 E. Palace Ave.,#2. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. P.G. Harris Enterprises, Inc., agent, for Robert & Beverly Pevitts, owners, proposes to construct a coyote fence extension on a stuccoed yardwall to a maximum height of approximately 56" where the maximum allowable height is 74" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-071. 548 E. Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Ann Ash, owner, proposes to construct a 658 sq. ft. portal to a height of 11'6" on a non-contributing residential structure and to restucco all structures on the property. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-072. 641 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Connie Helms, agent, for Elspeth G. Bobbs, owner, proposes to replace three windows and a door on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-073. 1510 Cerro Cordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susan Rundstrom, agent/owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-074. 553A Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Marisol A. Navas Sacasa, owner, proposes to construct two metal gates at 13' and 3' wide on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. 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 July 26, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, July 26, 2011.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
July 26, 2011

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1
Approval of Minutes July 12, 2011	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2-3
Communications	None	3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Administrative Matters		3
1. <u>Case #H-11-066</u> 400 Block - Guadalupe Street	Approved with conditions	3-6
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H-08-043</u> 325 Delgado Street	Approved with conditions	6-8, 22-24
2. <u>Case #H-11-043</u> 607 E. Palace Avenue	Partially approved with conditions	8-13
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 11-068</u> 619 Webber Street	Approved with conditions	13-15
2. <u>Case #H 11-069</u> 516 Camino Rancheros	Approved with conditions	15-16
3. <u>Case #H 11-070</u> 629 E. Palace Ave. #2	Approved with conditions	16-17
4. <u>Case #H 11-071</u> 548 E. Garcia Street	Approved with conditions	17-19
5. <u>Case #H 11-072</u> 641 Canyon Road	Approved with conditions	19-20
6. <u>Case #H 11-073</u> 1510 Cerro Gordon Road	Approved with conditions	20-21
7. <u>Case #H 11-074</u> 553A Garcia Street	Approved as recommended	21-22
Matters from the Board	None	25
Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:30 p.m.	25

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

July 26, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé 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 Avenue, Santa Fé, 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
Ms. Christine Mather
Dr. John Kantner
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Rad Acton

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelly Brennan, Asst. 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

Ms. Rios moved to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 12, 2011

Ms. Rios requested the following change to the minutes:

Page 9, 4th paragraph should read, "Vice Chair Rios thanked Ms. Cannizzaro and said each person expressing their views on this case made very valid points. She stated she felt uneasy during the review process when the Board was offering many design options to the applicant. She said it was inappropriate for the Board to try to design an entire project during a Board meeting but it was appropriate for the Board to give suggestions on how to improve a project. This applicant, as any other applicant coming before the Board, needed to come with a complete set of plans. Ms. Rios said since the Santa Fé Depot was designated a landmark it should be treated as such. She felt the City applicant should consult with SHPO which could offer positive input. In her opinion, this case should be postponed."

Page 25, 6th and 7th paragraphs should read, "Vice Chair Rios pointed out this was a vernacular style home which had historic integrity and should retain its contributing status. She said vernacular buildings told a very distinct story. They were built by non-professional builders, often the owners of themselves, without the aid of an architect. Vernacular architecture used local materials and displayed the workmanship of the builders. This house was built to meet the needs of the family occupying it. It was improved as the family could afford it. The house had different style windows probably because they were purchased at different times when the family could afford to buy them. She pointed out that if this house retained its historic designation, it didn't mean that the applicant could not remodel the house. As a matter of fact, it's always a good idea to remodel a historic home so that it could continue to exist and be occupied."

Ms. Mather requested the following corrections:

Page 5, first paragraph had a typo that should say "part time resident."

Page 6 - Mr. Lilienthal said the City was asking for approval of four of the items (not five).

Page 19 - last sentence should say, "It gave a lot of discretion to the owner."

Mr. Katz requested the following change to the minutes:

Page 19 - The applicant didn't agree. It would be one course of brick instead of what was on the house and that was what was discussed.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of July 12, 2011 as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-051 250 E. Alameda Street
Case #H-11-056 420 Hillside Avenue
Case #H-11-060 124 Delgado Street
Case #H-11-061 315 Sena Street

Case #H-11-062 360 Garcia Street
Case #H-11-063 420 Catron Street
Case #H-11-064 743 Dunlop Street
Case #H-11-065 28 Burro Alley

Dr. Kantner asked for a change to Case #H 11-061 toward the end of the conclusions to approve the brick with one course and the motion also accepted if the brick cap was removed altogether.

Mr. Katz said two words further had a typo to say "at" rather than "that."

Dr. Kantner moved to approve the finding of facts and conclusions of law for those cases as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Case #H-11-066.** 400 Block of Guadalupe Street. Landmark Outside of Historic districts, City of Santa Fé, agent for the Santa Fé Railyard Corporation, owners, proposes to remodel the exterior of the Santa Fé Depot. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

400 Block of South Guadalupe Street, known as the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fé Railroad Depot, was constructed in 1909 in the Mission Revival style. The building is listed as a landmark outside of historic districts.

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

1. The Convention Center and Visitors Bureau will be occupying the facility and propose to install signage on both the east and west elevations. The signs are designed with three colors, one of which is close to the tan stucco.

2. The Police Department will operate a satellite office in the facility and need to install an emergency call box on the east elevation. The box will be 9" x 15" and has some standard colors on it.

3. Two infrared video cameras will be installed on the east elevation. The exterior appearance will be a 4" diameter dome.

4. Two additional signs will be installed for the Police Substation on the east and west elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the four signs should not overwhelm the historic integrity of the structure.

Mr. Rasch said in the discussion last time they were looking at the call box and it could be free-standing.

Mr. Lilienthal said regarding the signs for the Santa Fé Depot that the police substation would have only one sign and it would be on the east side. There would be two Visitor Center signs, one on the east and one on the west. In the packet was a color rendition of the site and location. The signs would be no wider than the door and hung directly from the eaves less than one inch from the building. On the west side the sign was visible from the window and would be hung above the door.

Regarding the emergency call box - in the packet was a drawing showing the location. The other would be a post seven feet tall and was at the SE corner near the exterior waiting platform and right behind the Tomasita's parking lot and seven feet from the building. Putting the call box on the building would cost \$4,200 dollars and on the post it would cost \$8,000. The box on the building could be painted. The one on post would be red.

Thirdly, the camera would fit inside the dome so only four screws for the dome would be used.

Mr. Katz asked where on the eaves the camera would be placed.

Mr. Lilienthal said the handout showed where it mounted on the east elevation - to the south of the doorway. There would be no penetration of the building but would have an exterior conduit under the eaves that would be visible.

The call box would require mounting with screws on the wall and either have a drill through to the interior or use exterior conduit running down to the box and electrical. The City would prefer not to have any exterior conduit.

Ms. Walker knew it was important to have something but she thought the landmark was more important and didn't see that it would blend in with the stucco on the building.

Mr. Lilienthal explained that the color on the handout was the closest match he could find. Should the Board decide to have the sign background match the building then they could paint the sign to match.

Ms. Walker thought they should do that because the building was more important.

Ms. Mather asked if the size of the visitor sign was 18" x 36". Mr. Lilienthal agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if the police sign was same size. Mr. Lilienthal agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if there was any anecdotal information about possible vandalism to the post of the call box. She was concerned about them finding the box on the wall.

Mr. Lilienthal didn't have any data for an answer.

Ms. Rios asked if the colors were as shown in the packet. Mr. Lilienthal agreed.

Ms. Rios said the City could afford \$4,200 more than \$8,800.

Mr. Lilienthal agreed but the City would follow the Board's determination and would find the money.

Chair Woods asked what his preference was.

Mr. Lilienthal said the wall was his personal and professional preference without the exterior conduit because it would be less intrusive to the building but he was not going to make that call.

Dr. Kantner thought if the purpose of the call box was to see it then having it the same color would sort of defeat the purpose so having the call box separate would seem to serve the public better.

Mr. Lilienthal added that the call boxes were lit.

Ms. Rios asked him to describe that lighting

Mr. Lilienthal said on the upper part would be a lit sign saying emergency in red. It was a down light - not a strobe or blinking and used a blue halogen light.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Pilar Cannizzaro with the State. She said she was asked to come back because the Board felt SHPO was not in sufficient control over the documentation. She reminded the Board that the H Board had the last word on this project as well as the Gross Kelly building. She reminded them that she brought information last time. She felt the best choice for emergency features would be the pole to avoid attaching to the building and not to have it painted the stucco color which would not be as visible. The

SHPO deferred to the Board. She said the colors of red and blue in the signs and their size met the standard. She felt the cameras would not be obtrusive.

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

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 11-066 with the condition that the call box be on a standalone pole. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and asked for a friendly amendment for a condition that the background of the signs be the same color as the stucco. Ms. Mather agreed that the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-08-043.** 325 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Kindgren, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a pedestrian gate in a yardwall on a contributing property. (David Rasch)

Chair Woods made a correction to a typo on the first page where it showed this project was under the City of Santa Fé and should be shown as under the owner.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

325 Delgado Street is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1947 and 1949 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On April 22, 2008, the HDRB conditionally approved a request to remodel the building, including the alteration of a yardwall with a pedestrian gate.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the design of the pedestrian gate. Originally a rectangular board gate with stepped-design appliqué was placed within a stuccoed archway. The new design incorporates an antique Chinese wooden gate with decorative carved and applied elements and a partially arched wooden header beam.

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.

Chair Woods asked for the size of the gate the Board originally approved.

Mr. Rasch said he would have to measure it.

Ms. Rios asked if the existing alterations to the yard wall were previously approved. Mr. Rasch agreed and at this meeting they were only looking at the gate detail.

Present and sworn was Mr. James Kindgren who said the original design was more conceptual and this was what they found after shopping. He felt it was an improvement over the original concept and had less massing. Its appearance would change as the block wall was stuccoed.

Chair Woods asked if he was stuccoing over the wooden header.

Mr. Kindgren said he was going to stucco where the plywood was but it was not part of this project.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the door.

Mr. Kindgren said the panels were only 5' 7" and the top of the header was about 6' 2". The top of the arch was roughly 8' - the same as the original profile. The gates in the original application had a radius head and casing all around. These panels were square and the header had a radius. In the original submission the stucco on the header got so bulky that there was no visibility access on the corner.

Dr. Kantner asked if he was still planning to have the coyote above the existing yard wall. Mr. Kindgren agreed that it was the same.

Ms. Mather noted that she wasn't on the Board for the original approval. It looked like a plain board gate with a modest header in the original drawings but now there was a lot of depth to it. She asked if there was more than one course of concrete behind that gate.

Mr. Kindgren said the gate that was submitted was an ornate multi-panel gate with 56 panels. This was just flat although it was decorative.

Ms. Mather asked if this header had Chinese carving. Mr. Kindgren agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if the curved beam shown above was part of the gate.

Mr. Kindgren disagreed. The header was shown above the transom did not come with the gate.

Ms. Mather explained that this property was in her neighborhood and she found this to be too Chinese in design and mass and with the little feet at the bottom it didn't seem harmonious with the streetscape or with his home.

Mr. Kindgren submitted a petition from neighbors in support of his project [attached as Exhibit A]. He also had several pictures of details from the neighborhood that he said had lots of oriental features. He gave them to Ms. Mather and provided details of them.

Chair Woods showed one that was from Mexico because she did the design.

Ms. Rios asked for the location of one of them which he shared with her.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Rasch read a letter from Amy Hoban at 328 Delgado who felt the gate didn't fit in the neighborhood. [attached as Exhibit B].

Mr. Rasch responded to Chair Wood's first question that on the initial submittal the gate height was 7' 0" and the new drawing to the header was slightly less than 7.5' and to the center above was about 9.75'.

Chair Woods asked about the width of the gate and the pilasters.

Mr. Rasch said the width was about 6.75' on the new gate and on the original the gate was shown at 3.5' wide.

Chair Woods asked about the width of the pilasters.

Mr. Rasch didn't know because they were not drawn here.

Mr. Kindgren shared his drawing with Mr. Rasch.

Chair Woods said the drawings were different from the photographs and suggested if he needed to review his drawings the Board could table the case for now.

Ms. Walker moved to table Case #H 08-043. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-11-043.** 607 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Presley J. Schmidt, agent for Lee & Jana Reynolds, proposes to remodel a residential structure by constructing 611.25 sq. ft. of additions on the first floor and a 189 sq. ft. addition on the second floor and to remodel an existing non-historic 380 sq. ft. solarium. An exception is requested to construct additions at less than 10' back from primary elevations (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

607 East Palace Avenue, known as the Pond House, is a two-story single-family residence that was constructed before 1928 in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and elevations 1, 2, and 5 are designated as primary.

Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following four items.

1. The existing awning over the front door will be removed and replaced with a 128 square foot ramada or portal (application is not clear) at less than 10' back from the primary east elevation. An exception is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required responses are at the end of this report. The ramada/portal is designed in the Territorial Revival style with square posts and a brick coping on the parapet.
2. The non-historic approximately 380 square foot solarium on the east elevation will be remodeled for a master bedroom. As long as the solarium is remodeled rather than removed, then a 50% footprint exception is not needed. If the solarium must be removed, due to structural issues, then an exception would be required to exceed the 50% footprint rule. Mr. Rasch commented that an exception was not required for it.
3. Additions will be constructed on the north elevation at approximately 483.25 square feet. The additions include a ramada or portal on the northwest corner and a laundry and master bathroom with a bay window like the existing bay windows.
4. A 189 square foot second bathroom will be constructed on the north elevation second floor. The addition is located over an existing first floor footprint.
 - (i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape:
 - A. **Front Portal** – removing the blue awning over the front entry and replacing it with a portal, which the house needs for shelter and mass, will meet this criterion. Probably the front porch originally had a portal. As it stands, it is quite the opposite, in that the current state of the porch damages the character of the streetscape. It needs a portal to balance the mass of the house.
 - B. **Existing Master Bedroom** – this current state of the existing structure is very much damaging the character and integrity of the streetscape. As it looks, it is out of sync with the historic nature of this home. By removing the non-complimenting windows and poorly attached structure we will allow this structure to blend with the matching stucco and matching double hung windows. This will greatly enhance the character of the streetscape with quiet balance of character and integrity.

Staff response: The former existence of a front portal is conjecture (not supported by documentation) and does not appear on the aerial images submitted. But, staff is in agreement that the awning and courtyard infill are not harmonious to the structure.

- (ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

- A. **Front Portal** – this portal will insure the public and the applicant's welfare, safety and shelter. The hardship of not having a year round appropriate cover when entering the main entrance is unacceptable.
- B. **Existing Master Bedroom** – The repairs to this structure are not only to bring up to code but also to prevent hardship to the applicant and their family. This structure is not only unsafe but needs new electric, insulation, heating, and new roofing.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

- (iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to

ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts.

- A. **Front Portal** -We feel by adding the front portal the design of the house will be complete. There is a missing mass that needs to be filled so that the design of the house looks complete.
- B. **Existing Master Bedroom** – As it stands the existing master is not compatible with designs of significant integrity as it relates to Santa Fé or any other historical district. We want to bring the design quality of the existing structure up to the standards congruent with other heterogeneous characters of the city.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

The house is special in its conditions and circumstance in that the current state is so far from the original design or aesthetic that we must work with what is existing and try to create a historical 'look' in keeping with the streetscape. The house was originally a brick exterior that has been covered in stucco. There was also a major fire that dramatically altered its original design and character. Our approach has been to renovate and repair this structure as respectfully as possible. This includes filling in the missing mass of the front elevation and repairing the master bedroom so that it conforms with the rest of the structure.

Staff response: Again, no proof of a pre-existing mass was submitted. But, staff is in agreement that the building has peculiar conditions.

- (v) Are due to special circumstances, which are not a result of the applicant.

The applicant has just recently become the owner of the house. There have been many changes to the original appearance to house previous from his ownership. These changes came as a result of stuccoing the brick, a major fire, add-ons, etc. and are not a result of the applicant. The applicant wants to make these changes more in keeping with the historical streetscape by bringing them into an aesthetic, congruent with the rest of the house.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

We don't think either of the requested exceptions provides any degree of negative impact to this property. In fact, the front elevation as it exists is already creating a negative impact on the streetscape and an addition of a portal will balance the elevation and bridge the overall aesthetic. It is therefore providing a positive impact. The repair of the existing master bedroom is improving the safety of the structure, and also bridges the overall design aesthetic so that it looks more in keeping with the original house, rather than looking like a bad add on. Please know that we are adding a very small addition of footprint, way below the allowed amount, so to best stay in relation to the size of original footprint.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to place an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). Staff also recommends that the new coping detail not match the historic coping detail. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of

Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Woods referred to the second floor in the back and asked if the facade would go up straight there. Mr. Rasch didn't think so.

Ms. Mather asked for clarification on the portal or ramada.

Mr. Rasch said the application said it was a ramada but apparently had a solid roof.

He also got the design of the front door to share with the Board.

Present and sworn was Mr. Carson See, 617 E. Palace. He clarified that it was a portal with a covered roof. He asked if the Board would like him to go over any of the elevations.

Chair Woods asked if the back was a sheer second floor.

Mr. See said it was stepped back on all sides.

Ms. Mather asked how deep the portal was and if it covered the three windows.

Mr. See said it covered the porch above those windows.

Ms. Mather asked how long it was.

Mr. See said it was exactly 12' by 10'.

Dr. Kantner said in looking at the south elevation that it appeared the window under the portal was a lot taller. Mr. See agreed.

Chair Woods asked if that was a primary elevation. Mr. Rasch said it was not primary.

Ms. Rios asked for the color of the door.

Mr. See said it came in mahogany or pine and he could paint it or stain it.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if the depth of the portal would negatively impact the primary elevation.

Mr. Rasch said there was a large landing there but he didn't think it would negatively impact it.

Mr. See said that house was naked and it needed something there.

Chair Woods disagreed with him. She thought if it had a portal it should be much smaller. And she didn't think introducing a transom over the window or the door should be done. Also she said the door was a pueblo style door on a territorial building.

Mr. See asked if would be okay without a transom.

Chair Woods said it would and he should change the door design.

Dr. Kantner was concerned with the height of the portal at 105". The top would add another 31".

Mr. See said the transom was way under the portal. The parapet of bricks would still be about six inches below the existing parapet on the original building. It would not interrupt the original brick on it.

Dr. Kantner understood but still thought it was very high.

Chair Woods thought it was quite massive and felt the portal could be much smaller and leave the window alone. This Board would try to work with him on it.

Mr. See asked if the Board would prefer that it be without stucco and no brick

Chair Woods agreed. And it maybe should be 3-4' deep just in front of the front door.

Mr. Rasch said the height of the portal to the bottom of the header beam was slightly less than 8.5' and to the top of the coping was around 11.5'.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was the owner, Mr. Lee Reynolds who said the blue awning now on the building was not Santa Fé style. So they wanted to do something that would respect the community and the design and also offer some protection. That was such an eyesore. He had grandchildren that were small and wanted to do something that would provide some protection for them. They took out the tree that was blocking the home but now it looked like the entrance to an IHOP or something. He knew this was a city of portals and wanted to honor that and offer as much shelter as possible so they could sit down there and look across Palace Avenue. If it went a little further it would block the windows so they wanted it to go just past the windows and have enough height to bring light into the home and complement the landscape.

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

Mr. See thought the approximately 30" suggestion of the portal not interfering with the window would look too small for the size of the house. He wanted to stop it as quickly as he could but not to have it just past the windows. The top and the stucco was something he could deal with. There was just a mass of empty space there.

Ms. Mather respectfully disagreed with him. This plain facade was typical of the nature of Santa Fé. It was not a typical style of Santa Fé home. It was more Midwestern. The Board wanted to protect the integrity of this home as long as possible. To add a big portal would negatively affect the integrity of this home.

This was a huge issue the board was dealing with here and they were trying to keep it as normal as possible and still keep it on the non-contributing side.

Chair Woods noted they were within ten feet of the primary facade so it required an exception. She appreciated what they were trying to do here but it was their responsibility to retain the historic designation and by changing this face it would impact the status.

Mr. See asked if he came back ten feet and didn't have a post against the window it that would be allowed.

Chair Woods said there was no way to put it ten feet back from the front.

Dr. Kantner appreciated how awkward it would look to put a small three foot portal attached to the door. He wondered if having a promenade just around the door similar to the portal in back and not attached to the south facing portal might be more in keeping with the building. He could see the difficulty to not interfere with the windows.

Chair Woods suggested the Board might approve the rest of this project and have the applicant come back with this part.

Mr. See agreed that would be fine.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-043 as recommended by staff with the exception of the portal and ask that the application come back for later approval of the portal and granting the exception for the back portal be accepted. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and asked for a friendly amendment that the front door be more Territorial style and have no transom on it. Dr. Kantner accepted the amendment and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-11-068.** 619 Webber Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Walton Chapman Builders Co., agent for Jay Michael Coyle, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, construct standing-seam awnings and restucco a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

619 Webber Street is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1912 and 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style and the building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. A secondary residence was constructed at the rear of the residence at an unknown non-historic

date in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style.

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

1. Existing windows will be removed and replaced with Andersen Series 100 windows with 2-over-2 lite pattern grilles. Simulated or true divided lite are not required on this structure or in this district.
2. Brown-finished metal standing-seam shed-roof awnings will be installed over existing doors. There are two awning depths proposed: 1.5' on the east elevation and 4' on the south and west elevations.
3. The building will be restuccoed with Sonowall elastomeric material that will match the cement stucco "Buckskin" in color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Chapman, 1842 Forest Circle, who said there were no changes to the window openings. There were two awnings that would be matched on the doors being added. Colors and lights would match existing.

Ms. Rios asked if the muntins going to be proud.

Mr. Chapman said they would use architectural series.

Ms. Mather noted the east elevation seemed to change the window pattern on the second story. On the existing there was space between the windows.

Mr. Chapman said they were still individual windows but the sizing made them closer together.

Ms. Mather said the awning over the doorway appeared to stop before it got to the walls on either side.

Chapman agreed there were six inches on either side of the door and it didn't look like it was drawn right. It should be like the one on the west.

Chair Woods asked if he could take it all the way to the walls.

Mr. Chapman explained that this was what the owner asked for but he didn't think the owner would care. It was deeply recessed and on an existing patio.

Chair Woods said it would be easier.

Mr. Chapman agreed that would be fine.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-068 per staff recommendations and the condition that on the south elevation the awning be wall to wall. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-11-069.** 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Laurie Gottlieb, agent/owner, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 5' 4" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

516 Camino Rancheros is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style at an unknown date. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

A previous owner received approval to construct vehicle and pedestrian gates and a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 5' 4". The current owner/applicant removed the coyote fence and constructed a stuccoed yardwall in the same location to a height of 6' without approval or a building permit.

The applicant requests that the Board grant a 20% height increase over the maximum allowable height as per the Wall and Fence Guidelines. There are no changes to the gates or light fixtures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District and 1999 Wall and Fence Guidelines.

Ms. Mather asked about the color. Mr. Rasch said it was to match.

Ms. Rios asked if this was compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Rasch said a decade ago the neighborhood had few walls but there were many more now.

Ms. Walker didn't see a building permit for the application. Mr. Rasch explained that the building permit was issued after approval by the Board.

Present and sworn was Ms. Laurie Gottlieb, 516 Camino Rancheros who said she just moved here last December and didn't know what requirements she had to meet. She read a statement in which she said she regretted that she didn't know what was required and was researching the whole permit process. A

neighbor saw what was being built and the neighbor's dog bit her and it required medical attention so a coyote fence didn't seem adequate. She didn't want to go through that again. She understood the rules. Perhaps a neighbor called and objected so she went to as many neighbors as she could and they agreed to the new wall.

If there was any landscaping she could add to soften it, she would be glad to comply. She would like to finish the project.

Dr. Kantner said the letter indicated the stucco would match existing. Ms. Gottlieb agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-069 with stucco to match existing stucco. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-11-070.** 629 E. Palace Avenue, #2. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. P. G. Harris Enterprises, Inc., agent for Robert & Beverly Pevitts, owners, proposes to construct a coyote fence extension on a stuccoed yardwall to a maximum height of approximately 56" where the maximum allowable height is 74" on a contributing property. David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

629 East Palace Avenue Unit 2 is a multi-family residential compound that was originally constructed before 1928 in the Hipped Cottage style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the stuccoed yardwall along Rodriguez Street with the following two items.

1. The existing wall height will be increased up to 56" where the maximum allowable height for this location is 74". The extension will be constructed of coyote latilla fencing. The latillas are shown on the drawing with flat-cut level tops.
2. The existing arched-top wooden pedestrian gate will be removed and replaced with a matching gate that is taller, so that it is more in harmony with the taller wall/fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which is in compliance with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District. He was unaware of the date of the yardwall construction.

Ms. Mather noticed this was Unit 2 and asked if this was separate from the front part of that home.

Mr. Rasch said it was a condominium there now.

Present and sworn was Mr. Bob Pevitts, 629 East Palace Avenue, who thought it was a simple project. The wall was very low and they wanted a little more privacy along Rodriguez. The gate would match the other gate in color and style and the wood being used for it. On Rodriguez and along Palace Avenue there was similar type construction around that area.

Dr. Kantner asked Mr. Rasch what happens to the wall on the east side when it reached the property line.

Mr. Pevitts said it turned the corner.

Dr. Kantner said the drawing showed the tops level and the Board usually wanted uneven tops.

Mr. Pevitts said they were trying to keep the line of the wall but they could stagger the coyote tops.

Ms. Rios asked if he would consider no latillas but increase the height of the stucco.

Mr. Pevitts explained that they had latillas in the garden on the inside.

Chair Woods noted the house was contributing and didn't know if the Board had approved it with latillas before. Putting latillas on top of a stuccoed wall was unusual. It was not a Pueblo Revival building.

Mr. Pevitts said they had not thought of that. They found many of this design throughout the neighborhood.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H 11-070 with the tops being irregular in height. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and asked that the tallest latillas not exceed the maximum height.

Dr. Kantner asked if the Board could approve an option of constructing stucco to the top as a friendly amendment. Mr. Katz agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-11-071.** 548 E. Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Ann Ash, owner, proposes to construct a 658 sq. ft. portal to a height of 11' 6" on a non-contributing residential structure and to restucco all structures on the property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

548 Garcia Street is a single-family residence that was constructed after 1945 in the Territorial Revival style. The building has been significantly remodeled at non-historic dates and it is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. A 568 square foot portal will be constructed on the rear of the building to a height of 11' 6". The portal will feature square wooden posts and cornice. A low stuccoed wall with brick coping will enclose the brick finished portal. A door will be installed on the west elevation of the residence and the wall under the portal will be finished in white along with the exposed wooden elements. Also featured are a BBQ hood and an outdoor fireplace at either end of the portal.
2. Deteriorated brick coping will be removed and replaced with matching brick.
3. The main residence, associated yardwalls, and the rear free-standing casita will be restuccoed with cementitious "Coral".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Rasch passed around the stucco color chart.

Chair Woods said stucco had to be earth tone and asked if staff was saying this complied.

Mr. Rasch said it was up to the Board.

Ms. Rios thought it had a lot of pink in it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Andy Lyons who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Mather commented that she had personal experience with coral stucco and it was very pink. It was pleasant but personally she would not feel it was an earth tone.

Mr. Lyons said the coral was his client's choice. There was pink granite up there. He thought it was a taste issue although it wouldn't be his first choice. It was not yellow, blue or green.

Ms. Walker explained that the Board had to look at the whole streetscape and this color choice was not in harmony with the streetscape.

Ms. Rios asked what the existing color was.

Mr. Lyons said it was slightly darker than Buckskin. Mr. Rasch agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Joseph Feyas, 875 Camino Franciscas, who said he understood the Board's comments about the streetscape. They went around and looked and found about 20% of downtown buildings were a pink color. They tried to match them. Most were painted and few were stuccoed. They were being forced to use stucco and not allowed to paint. They had a lot of photos that showed them including the Post Office, the New Mexico Bank building and others. He understood the color might not come out the same. They just had to get a paint color sample because they only had three hours' notice. They didn't want to photograph private residences.

Present and sworn was Ms. Carol Feyas who appealed to "feminine side" for consideration of the color, noting the owner was strongly feminine.

Chair Woods thanked them.

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

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H 11-071 with the exception of the final color of the stucco and have the applicant come back with a final color of the stucco. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods explained the decision to the applicant and Ms. Mather invited them to view the coral in her house.

5. **Case #H-11-072.** 641 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Connie Helms, agent, for Elspeth G. Bobbs, owner, proposes to replace three windows and a door on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

641 Canyon Road Unit H is a single-family residence in a multi-family residential compound that was constructed after 1945 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the building by removing doors and windows on the south and east elevations and replace them with 30"-compliant lite windows and doors. The east elevation opening dimensions will be reconfigured in a more traditional pattern and the wood siding will be replaced with stucco finish in El Rey "Buckskin."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ms. Mather asked about colors of the windows.

Present and sworn was Ms. Connie Helms, 630 Alameda, who said the color was called Cloud Tan.

Dr. Kantner asked if that was the color of all the windows.

Ms. Helms agreed and said there were a lot of the same colors in that area.

Ms. Rios referred to the proposed east elevation and also the south and wondered if she would be willing to replicate the existing window pattern and size rather than what she was proposing.

Ms. Helms agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-072 per staff recommendations with the condition to replicate the window pattern on the south elevation replicate existing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-11-073.** 1510 Cerro Gordon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susan Rundstrom, agent/owner, proposes to replace non-historic windows on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1510 Cerro Gordo Road is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style before 1937. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the south elevation is designated as primary.

The applicant proposes to remove non-historic windows on the primary elevation and replace them with matching thermal-pane windows which will have 30"-compliant lights. The existing windows appear to be historic, but the applicant states that they were installed in 1981 or 1982.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown &

Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked if the project was just the two windows. Mr. Rasch agreed and they were matching the existing style and opening dimensions.

Ms. Rios asked if he had the history of the existing windows.

Mr. Rasch said they appeared to be historic single light windows but the applicant stated they were replaced in 1981.

Present and sworn was Ms. Susan Rundstrom, 1510 Cerro Gordo Road who said the current owners did extensive remodeling in 1981 and the windows were replaced along with a new addition.

She asked for clarification regarding them. When she first started and had wanted to upgrade to double pane windows for energy efficiency and also for maintenance. She wondered if the other windows needed help if she could go ahead and do them later.

Ms. Brennan explained that she would have to submit a new application.

Chair Woods explained that she would have to come back for that since notice was not given for that.

Ms. Rios asked if the lite pattern would be like the existing pattern. Ms. Rundstrom agreed.

Chair Woods asked if they would be architectural series and not snap ins. Ms. Rundstrom agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if the color would match existing.

Ms. Rundstrom said it was brick red, matching the other windows.

She clarified that the windows she would put in would be clad. She already had some on the newer portion of the house.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz asked if she was allowed to replace those that were not clad. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-073 as recommended by staff with the condition that the color of new window trim match existing and be true divided lite or architectural series. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-11-074.** 553A Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Marisol A. Navas Sacasa, owner, proposes to construct two metal gates at 13' and 3' wide on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

553A Garcia Street is a single-family residence that was constructed at an unknown, presumably non-historic date in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to install two metal gates in an existing stuccoed yardwall at the street frontage. The gates will be 13' wide for vehicles and 3' wide for pedestrians. The gates are designed with full visual accessibility into the lot with a rusted finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Tim Curry, 608 Ridgepoint Lane, who had nothing to add except that the owner requested the gates for privacy purposes.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the gate.

Mr. Curry said it was four feet above existing grade.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 11-074 per staff recommendations and as presented. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

1. **Case #H-08-043.** 325 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Kindgren, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a pedestrian gate in a yardwall on a contributing property. (David Rasch)

Ms. Rios moved to remove Case #H 08-043 from the table. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Kindgren apologized for the confusion. The confusion was that he was going off the approved working drawings and Mr. Rasch was using the ones he had submitted before getting a building permit. The working drawings showed to the top of the arch was 8' 10".

Chair Woods said the Board could only go from what the Board approved, not the working drawings.

Mr. Rasch said for some reason the drawings he was talking about were not in his packet so he didn't see what Mr. Kindgren was showing them.

Chair Woods said it was a problem when people submitted one set of drawings to the HDRB to get approved and then changed things to another set to submit for a building permit.

Mr. Kindgren thought that was a possibility but he understood these plans surpassed those plans.

Ms. Brennan said the building permit was approved subject to what the HDRB had approved. What should have been constructed was only what the Board had approved.

Chair Woods recalled they were trying to figure out the size of the gate the Board had approved.

Mr. Kindgren said from bottom to top, the gate in the working drawings was 8' 10".

Chair Woods said that was not what the Board had approved previously. So they had the construction drawings; they had what the HDRB had approved; and then they had what was actually built.

Chair Woods understood the construction drawings showed 8' 10" to the top of the arch and asked Mr. Rasch what the height was that the Board had approved.

Mr. Rasch said what was approved by the Board showed 7' 0" to the top of the arch.

Chair Woods asked what the measurement was for what was built.

Mr. Kindgren said it was 9' 4".

Chair Woods went next to the width dimensions and asked what the width was on the construction drawings.

Mr. Kindgren said on the working drawing the gate without any casing was 4' 3".

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch what was shown on what the Board approved.

Mr. Rasch said it showed as a very narrow gate on those drawings.

Chair Woods asked how wide the gate was being proposed now.

Mr. Kindgren said it was 4' 3".

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch if he had a photograph that did not cut off the pilasters.

Mr. Rasch said there was one on page 15.

Chair Woods asked the applicant how wide the pilasters were.

Mr. Kindgren said from the side jambs of the gate it was 8" to the pilaster.

Chair Woods explained that she was talking about the whole thing - what the whole width was of the double pilaster.

Mr. Kindgren said the thickened portion started about 8" on either side of the gate and ran all the way to the corners.

Mr. Rasch said the width of the pilaster was approximately 2.5'.

Chair Woods asked if that had changed from Board approval to construction drawings.

Mr. Rasch was certain the angle had remained the same.

Present and sworn was Ms. Val Kindgren, 225½ Delgado, who had one more photo to share. It was a sample of an Asian style gate in the neighborhood. She said they were not married to that top carved portion of the gate. What they really loved were the doors themselves. So if they could just have the doors showing without the ornate carving she would be happy and the supports at the bottom could come out as well.

Dr. Kantner was not enthusiastic about the gate itself. He could imagine getting rid of the entire arch because it would reduce the size and getting rid of the element at the bottom which was clearly Asian.

Ms. Mather agreed. The overall impact of the arch really drew attention to the Asian style. Then the gate would seem more harmonious.

Ms. Rios would eliminate the arch and the header.

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

Mr. Kindgren said regarding the arch making it look more Asian that arches were found all over town. Their lot was on a corner and their street frontage was 180'. Most of the rest of their neighbors had a back yard but they didn't. The rest of their wall was 4' 6" to 4' 1". They had to look at all the pieces. There was a mature vine whose tendrils would go over the top of the gate. There was a big tree there. That would all minimize the impact.

Mr. Rasch believed that the arch looked more Asian because it was on stilts.

Chair Woods concluded that whatever happened along the way, the 7' gate was now two feet higher and that was a big concern. She heard what he was saying. But almost consistently, the Board has taken off those big heavy arches to reduce the impact. At 7' this gate didn't have so much impact but with 2' 4" more, it did.

Mr. Kindgren said they could lower the top. It was just placed up there now as if with stilts.

Dr. Kantner thought that to keep the header but remove the stucco part of it would work.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 08-043 with the header beam and stucco arch removed. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.

Chair Woods added a condition that the feet also be removed. Ms. Mather accepted the amendment as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

A man in back had come to the meeting regarding 243 Closson.

Mr. Rasch explained that staff was considering that administratively.

A woman in the back objected to the gate as a neighbor.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer