



# Agenda

DATE 10/2/11 TIME 4:20pm  
SERVED BY *Carroll Vign*  
RECEIVED BY *[Signature]*

## "NEW LOCATION"

### HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, October 11, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

### HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, October 11, 2011 – 5:30 PM

SANTA FE COMMUNITY CONVENTION CENTER  
201 WEST MARCY STREET  
LAMY ROOM (1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR)

## A M E N D E D

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 27, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-085 100 Sandoval Street  
Case #H-11-100 102 Montoya Circle  
Case #H-11-104 1170 San Acacio

Case #H-11-105A 237 & 239 E. De Vargas St.  
Case #H-11-106 214 Johnson Lane

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

1. Case #H-10-012. Santa Fe River Parkway. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kenneth Francis, agent for City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to redesign the Skate Park including pathways, furniture, and lighting. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-10-117. 62 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associate Architects, agent for Jennifer Lind, owner, proposes to amend a previous approval for finish colors on a contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nurit Walsky, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-105B. 237 & 239 E. De Vargas Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences, owner, proposes to demolish a free-standing garage and to construct additions on a contributing structure with two exceptions to exceed the maximum allowable height for a yardwall (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)) and to exceed the 50% footprint rule and with an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-11-094A. 1228 Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney & Ken Payson, agents/owners, requests an historic status review of a contributing residential building. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-107. 312 Lomita. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Caryn Spain, agent/owner, proposes to construct a storage addition on an existing yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-108. 100 N. St. Francis Drive. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Pat Joseph, agent for Tom McCollan, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-109. 509 Plaza Balentine. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Caverly, agent for Grace Hopwood, owner, proposes to construct a free-standing 276 sq. ft. studio to 11' high where the maximum allowable height is 13'11" on a contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-110. 441Cerrillos Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony & Dianne Medina agents/owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-11-111A. 940 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kenneth Francis, agent for Nancy Mammel owner, requests an historic status review of a contributing residential/commercial building. (David Rasch).
11. Case #H-11-112A. 215 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gayla Bechtol, agent for Barry Ellsworth, owner, requests an historic status review of a non-contributing commercial building. (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 October 11, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, October 11, 2011.



# Agenda

MARK'S OFFICE  
8/22/11 TIME 11:00am  
Camille Vigil  
[Signature]

## "NEW LOCATION"

### HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, October 11, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

### HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, October 11, 2011 – 5:30 PM

SANTA FE COMMUNITY CONVENTION CENTER  
201 WEST MARCY STREET  
DE VARGAS ROOM (1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR)

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 27, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-033 St. Catherine's Industrial Ind. Sch.  
Case #H-11-085 100 Sandoval Street  
Case #H-11-100 102 Montoya Circle

Case #H-11-104 1170 San Acacio  
Case #H-11-105A 237 & 239 E. De Vargas St.  
Case #H-11-106 514 Johnson Lane

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

1. Case #H-10-012. Santa Fe River Parkway. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kenneth Francis, agent for City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to redesign the Skate Park including pathways, furniture, and lighting. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-10-117. 62 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associate Architects, agent for Jennifer Lind, owner, proposes to amend a previous approval for finish colors on a contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nurit Walsky, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-105B. 237 & 239 E. De Vargas Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences, owner, proposes to demolish a free-standing garage and to construct additions on a contributing structure with two exceptions to place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(c)) and to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-11-094. 1228 Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney & Ken Payson, agents/owners, requests an historic status review of a contributing residential building. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-107. 312 Lomita. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Caryn Spain, agent/owner, proposes to construct a storage addition on an existing yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-108. 100 N. St. Francis Drive. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Pat Joseph, agent for Tom McCollan, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-109. 509 Plaza Balentine. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Caverly, agent for Grace Hopwood, owner, proposes to construct a free-standing 276 sq. ft. studio to 11' high where the maximum allowable height is 13'11" on a contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-110. 441 Cerrillos Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony & Dianne Medina agents/owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-11-111. 940 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kenneth Francis, agent for Nancy Mammel owner, requests an historic status review of a contributing residential/commercial building. (David Rasch).
11. Case #H-11-112. 215 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gayla Bechtol, agent for Barry Ellsworth, owner, requests an historic status review of a non-contributing commercial building. (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 October 11, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, October 11, 2011.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
October 11, 2011

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes September 27, 2011	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2
Communications	Discussion	3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H 10-012</u> Santa Fé River Parkway	Approved with conditions	3-5
2. <u>Case #H 10-117</u> 62 Lincoln Avenue	Approved with conditions	5-6
3. <u>Case #H 11-014</u> 208A Gonzales Road	Approved as recommended	6-8
4. <u>Case #H 11-105B</u> 237 & 239 E. De Vargas Street	Partially Approved	9-17
5. <u>Case #H 11-094A</u> 1228 Cerro Gordo	Downgraded status	17-19
6. <u>Case #H 11-107</u> 312 Lomita	Approved as submitted	17-18
7. <u>Case #H 11-108</u> 100 N. St. Francis Drive	Approved as recommended	18-20
8. <u>Case #H 11-109</u> 509 Plaza Balentine	Postponed	20-22
9. <u>Case #H 11-110</u> 441 Cerrillos Road	Approved with conditions	22-24
10. <u>Case #H 11-111A</u> 940 E. Palace Avenue	Contributing retained	24-25
11. <u>Case #H 11-112A</u> 940 E. Palace Avenue	Non-contributing retained	25-26
Matters from the Board	Discussion	26
Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:35 p.m.	26

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FÉ**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**October 11, 2011**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Vice Chair Cecilia Rios on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the Lamy Room, Santa Fé Community Convention Center, 201 West Marcy, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair  
Mr. Rad Acton  
Dr. John Kantner  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. John Murphey, Historic Planner  
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 five cases were listed for Finding of Facts and Conclusions of law but only the first was for approval at this meeting. Secondly, Case #H-11-109 was postponed by staff for underlying zoning

changes.

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

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 27, 2011**

Vice Chair Rios requested a change on page 16, second to last sentence to read “Ms. Rios didn’t think he should put resident rooms ~~where the main room was~~ in the patio.” [stenographer’s note: The exact words she used were “main house” not “patio.”]

On page 17 in the first sentence, she request it to read “Ms. Rios asked how close the proposed first room was to the street.”

Mr. Katz said the applicant’s representative was Mr. Polk, not Mr. Park.

Ms. Mather requested a change on page 6 to read, “She felt the reading was all being tortured by this ~~like they were torturing by inches and the Board was looking at mass change.~~”

Mr. Acton requested a change on page 19 to read, “Mr. Acton asked if they had to have six parking spaces not along the street.” -

**Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of September 27, 2011 as amended. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **E. FINDING OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**Case #H-10-085    100 Sandoval Street**

**Ms. Mather moved to approve the Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law for Case #H-10-085 as presented. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **F. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch introduced Mr. John Murphey as Senior Historic Planner who comes with excellent credentials in historic preservation.

The Board welcomed Mr. Murphey.

Vice Chair Rios announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board had 15

days from the time of the approval of Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law for the case.

## **G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

There was no business from the floor.

## **H. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Case #H-10-012.** Santa Fé River Parkway. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kenneth Francis, agent for City of Santa Fé, owner, proposes to redesign the Skate Park including pathways, furniture and lighting. (David Rasch)

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

The City of Santa Fé, Public Works Department, Parks Division has contracted with Surroundings to remodel the Santa Fé River Park from St. Francis Drive to Patrick Smith Park in the Westside-Guadalupe and Downtown & Eastside Historic Districts. The project consists of redesign of pathways, furniture such as benches, tables, rails, trash receptacles, water fountains, and doggies bag receptacles, signage, hardscaping, and landscaping.

The applicant proposes to remodel the Skate Park along West de Vargas Street. The Skate Park is in a state of disrepair and needs to be updated. Besides the previously approved furnishings and proposed various colored concrete items and railings, there will also be light poles installed.

Three options for light poles are submitted where the maximum allowable structure height is 17' 8".

A. 6 poles with multiple lamps each at approximately 30' high.

B. 10 poles with one lamp each at 16' high, previously approved in this historic district.

C. Approximately 11 lamps mounted on cables at an unspecified height.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application with the lighting option B of previously approved light poles and lamps which complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ken Francis who said they were essentially taking a 25 year old skate park in disrepair that was neither safe nor working properly and not a safe lighting at night. We have to make it



bright for safety. The National Skate Park Association recommended 30foot/candles over the entire park. They could put in more lights with less power or less bulbs with more power. Option B would take 10 lights. This design was plaza oriented - not large concrete with big bowls. So people skate down steps and rails. This design was designed by the skateboarders and came up with a plaza design. And it was only 8,000 sq ft., only slightly larger than existing. A lot of surface runoff would benefit the trees and plants in the area.

He would like approval of color on concrete, the lights, and removal of the old trellis that was there.

Vice Chair Rios was happy that it was going forward. She asked if they were going to plant more trees.

Mr. Francis agreed. He pointed them out on the display. The large one would stay in place. They wanted to keep all mature trees intact. He pointed out the new tree locations and they would pick up the runoff. To have a canopy of trees would also help shade from the western sun. They had a larger Master Plan and in the future it might become the large amphitheater down to river and the trees would fit with that Master Plan. All along De Vargas the trees would shade there as well.

Vice Chair Rios asked about the grass.

Mr. Francis said there would be some and they would keep what was there.

Vice Chair Rios asked about the color of the light poles.

Mr. Francis said they would copy the colors next door.

Vice Chair Rios asked if he agreed with the staff recommendation for option B. Mr. Francis agreed.

Ms. Walker said the original plan had included a pergola that was more territorial in design and the Board had also requested permanent bathrooms.

Mr. Francis said the pergola the Board approved looked over the large green lawn and the small one was an old structure and they requested to tear down. The large pergola they proposed had benches and waste cans. There were no permanent bathrooms included in what the City requested. That would be up to the City. They would have coyote fence around the portable bathrooms there.

He shared the color samples with the Board members. Yosemite Brown was the dominant concrete surface. The accent color on the ledges was called "graphite" which was a dark grey color. Terra Cotta was an accent on the concrete.

Vice Chair Rios asked if they were using any other colors.

Mr. Francis said that was it. The Zia symbol probably wouldn't look like it was in the rendering. They showed it as a decorative element but it might be solid. They could come back once they decided to do it.

Ms. Mather asked if he was indicating they might need more lights.

Mr. Francis said it was the photometrics. It was the minimum amount of lights they could put in to meet the standard. It was lower than 1,500 watts maximum at 1000. They wanted to use LED but would have had to use more lights. The lights would be down facing.

Ms. Mather asked what hours they would be lit.

Mr. Francis said typically parks allowed lights to be on until 11 pm.

Mr. Brian Drypolcher thought it was 10 p.m. when park lighting was turned off.

Mr. Francis said they would be hidden more by the trees.

Ms. Mather appreciated that because other people used it also. She was also concerned about no permanent restrooms.

Mr. Acton pointed out that there was a grey color of concrete there too. He asked if these were the samples of tinted concrete.

Mr. Francis agreed they had a standard grey also. They wanted definition instead of the same all across.

Mr. Acton suggested perhaps the grey could be adjusted to more of a creamy color to fit with the earth tones.

Vice Chair Rios asked the color of the railings.

Mr. Francis said they would be dark brown as previously approved. These were very simple clean railings - nothing ornate. There were low to the ground and parallel to it.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-10-012 per staff's recommendation using lighting option B and that the grey color be more of a cream base. Mr. Acton seconded and asked for a friendly amendment that if the skate park needed more light poles at the apex of that triangle the Board could approve that. Ms. Mather agreed with the amendment and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

2. **Case #H-10-117.** 62 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associate Architects, agent for Jennifer Lind, owner, propose to amend a previous approval for finish colors on a contributing commercial building. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

62 Lincoln Avenue, previously known as El Oñate Theater (the Cassell Building) and now known as the First National Bank, was originally constructed in 1920 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with a remodel in 1954. The building was listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the east and north elevations are designated as primary.

The applicant proposes to amend an approval to choose finish colors for the building. The previously approved color scheme to be a mix of "Kokanee" and "Suede" for the painted surface of the walls will be changed to a color that will be a redder-brown color called "Cinnamon Stick" and the window trim color will match the required retention of the gray-green for the exposed woodwork in the paint color "Smokey Slate". These colors are available for viewing as samples on the Lincoln Avenue façade where the white wall was located. These are tests only; the white under the portals will be retained.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Ms. Mather asked if the green gray was what they saw there. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Dr. Kantner asked if that color was not too dark for the approved historic district palette. Mr. Rasch agreed that it was acceptable.

Present and sworn was Mr. Allan Baer, 501 Halona who showed the actual colors there. They painted more on the Palace Avenue side. He shared the samples with the Board. He hoped that combination was pleasing to the Board.

Ms. Walker asked if the color under portals was white. Mr. Baer agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if it would be painted with texture in it.

Mr. Baer agreed and added that it was over a stucco base.

Mr. Acton thought the colors would relate nicely to the museum but asked how the applicant would compare them.

Mr. Baer said these colors were darker so more in contrast with the history museum.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-10-117 per staff recommendations. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

3. **Case #H-11-014.** 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nait Walsky, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

208A Gonzales Road was a single-family residence and a casita that was constructed at an unknown date in a vernacular manner with non-historic alterations. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On June 8, 2011, the HDRB approved a remodel of the property with 490 square feet of additions, no increase in the building height, massing changes, replacement of windows, restucco in "Buckskin", repaint in a medium brown color, and install gates in the existing fence. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the project with the following five items.

1. A 130 square foot plant room will be added to the west elevation.
2. The east elevation will be lengthened and paired French doors added.
3. The north elevation portal will be reduced in floor plan and raised 18".
4. The west elevation portal will be reduced in depth with window alterations.
5. A window was added to the south elevation.

**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.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, who said the window on the south was not visible because it was inside the courtyard.

Vice Chair Rios asked what the visibility was and if there was open space beyond the house.

Mr. Purvis said there was a lot because it was a large lot. The house was increased to the south and

the west but mostly to the south.

Dr. Kantner asked if they were making changes to the surrounding fencing or if that would be as it was approved.

Mr. Purvis said it would be as was approved.

Vice Chair Rios asked if there would be anything on the roof that would be visible.

Mr. Purvis said no. He pointed out that there was a set of tiered parapets behind and part of it was a place where they could put solar collectors.

Ms. Walker said this was only about 10% lot coverage.

### **Public Comment**

Present and sworn was Ms. Rosalyn Stone, 214 Lorenzo Lane, who said she lived next door on the west side. She wanted to know more about the plant room, exactly where it was and if it would be at the same height as the other addition. She was wondering where it would be and how close it would be to her property next door.

She also wanted to make sure whether their equipment would be using the easement with the gate. She explained that Lorenzo Lane on the north was a private lane.

Mr. Purvis said the plant room was on the west side. The portal was a little deeper. It would change the shape of the shop but it was no higher. There was a gate there that they might use in the process. There were no gates planned on the back wall.

Ms. Stone concluded that the master addition was going on the west side and the plant room would be next to it.

Mr. Purvis pointed out the locations and said the portal would be about 18" closer to her house.

Ms. Stone said it appeared they would use the easement for construction purposes. She asked if that was allowed. Ms. Walker said it was allowed.

Mr. Acton said in the proposed elevation on the west he was seeing a parapet on a portal with rounded edges that might mean stucco. The depth of the beams above the corbels seemed to be about six inches and then the parapet seemed to be about ten inches. He asked if that- was a stucco detail.

Mr. Purvis said it was not a stucco detail. He agreed the corners should be shown more square. It was a metal edge which was on the portal now. It would be painted like a shed portal.

Mr. Acton asked if the top of the roof wouldn't be visible - just the flashing. He asked what color that would be.

Mr. Purvis said it would be stained to match the wood - a brown stain.

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

**Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-11-014 per staff recommendations. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

4. **Case #H-11-105B.** 237 & 239 E. De Vargas Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences, owner, propose to demolish a free-standing garage and to construct additions on a contributing structure with two exceptions to exceed the maximum allowable height for a yardwall (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)) and to exceed the 50% footprint rule and with an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

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

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

237 & 239 East de Vargas Street was a contributing structure in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the primary elevations designated as 1-9.

The owner proposes to remodel the property with the following four items.

1. The free-standing garage will be demolished for required parking. Historic Preservation staff finds that the building has lost historic integrity and the City building official finds that the building has no foundation, although it was stable, and there were several code violations. Demolition standards have been met according to Section 14-3.14(C) and (G) for code citations see below.
2. An eleven-room addition will be constructed on the rear and sides of 237 with the addition not set back more than 10' from primary elevation #1. The addition will match or be lower than existing adjacent height and finishes will match existing character. Two exceptions are requested to add more than 50% of the historic footprint (Section 1-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.
3. A 258 square foot free-standing ramada will be constructed in the front courtyard. No elevations were submitted for the design and the height, where the maximum allowable height was 13' 11" and a roof pitch was not allowed.

4. Yardwalls will be constructed to 7' high along the front of the property where the maximum allowable height was 5' 6". The wall will feature three windows with grilles and shutters and steps and jogs to conform to the Wall and Fence Guidelines. A height exception was required (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.

If the Memory Center was deemed to be a residential use by zoning standards, then the maximum allowable zoning height was 6' and a Board of Adjustment variance was required to exceed 6'. If the Center was deemed to be a commercial use, then the maximum allowable zoning height was 8' and an underlying zoning variance was not required. An exception was requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) and the required exception criteria are at the end of this report.

#### **14-3.14 DEMOLITION OF HISTORIC OR LANDMARK STRUCTURE**

##### **(C) Staff Review and Report**

Before granting approval or denial to a demolition request, City staff shall provide the following information on the structure under consideration.

- (1) A report on the historic or architectural significance of the structure;
- (2) A report from the City Building Inspector on the state of repair and structural stability of the structure;
- (3) If the structure was more than 75 years old, and the entire project of which demolition was a part requires an archaeological clearance permit, a report from City staff for the Archaeological Review Committee on whether the demolition would damage possible archaeological artifacts; and
- (4) Other information as requested by the Board or Governing Body.

##### **(G) Standards**

- (1) In determining whether a request for demolition in an historic district should be approved or denied, the Board shall consider the following:
  - (a) Whether the structure was of historical importance;
  - (b) Whether the structure for which demolition was requested was an essential part of a unique street section or block front and whether this street section or block front will be reestablished by a proposed structure; and
  - (c) The state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration.

#### **EXCEPTION**

**TO EXCEED THE 50% FOOTPRINT RULE AND**

**TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT LESS THAN 10' FROM A PRIMARY ELEVATION**

##### ***i. Do not damage the character of the streetscape;***

The proposed reconstruction will not damage the character of the streetscape. It will, in fact, improve the streetscape by adding more building mass to what has become a reduced amount of building frontage. A new garden wall will

replace an open accessible parking space.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement as an infill for adaptive reuse.

***ii. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;***

The hardship to the applicant in not granting the exception was a reduction in El Castillo's ability to serve its constituents with a full range of required services. The memory center was needed to complete a full range of services to the residents of El Castillo. It will serve persons with impaired memory and cognitive functions. Currently El Castillo lacks proper facilities to provide memory services. El Castillo has studied two adjacent properties for this expansion. Both properties are occupied and unsuitable for this expansion. This property was the only property abutting El Castillo which offers the possibility of renovation and addition into a memory center. Without this new facility, El Castillo will not be able to offer the residents the services they require.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

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

The new units will be replacing a commercial use with a unique but sorely needed housing type and thereby the overall amount of residential use in this Historic District. It should be noted that El Castillo was the largest residential center in downtown Santa Fé and the impact of its presence on the city was significant both on the economy and on the lifestyle of Santa Fé.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

***iv. 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 site was the only site abutting El Castillo with suitable buildable area for the memory center without wholesale removal of existing structures. A renovation and addition as proposed was the only way to make this unique lot serve as the new memory center and not require extensive demolition. The majority of the open space on the lot was behind and to the west of the existing main contributing building. This allows much of the new construction to be located to the rear, but some portion of the new residential rooms will have to be located in front of a portion of the existing building.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

***v. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant;***

The existing condition of the property was the result of all former owners and to a large degree of the 1960s era Urban Renewal which decimated the south side of this historic street. The applicant has played no role in the condition of this property and the exceptions required are strictly a result of the application of the ordinances on this property. In fact the actions of the applicant by submitting this design are extremely sensitive to the intent of the historical ordinances.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

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

This addition and remodel will help with the continued existence and preservation of these historical buildings and will



be built in general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between of the surround historic buildings. This design provides the least negative impact for this expansion by the careful placing of the new masses and how connections are made to the existing building.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

## EXCEPTION TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE WALL HEIGHT

### **i. Do not damage the character of the streetscape.**

The proposed wall construction was in keeping with other solid walls along the street. The only reason the calculated height allowed was lower than what we propose was that a 2-3' wood picket fence has to be included in the height calculations. The other solid walls are in keeping with what we propose.

Staff response: Staff was not in agreement with this statement. Only three of the 32 measurements are above 7' high and only two other measurements are at or above 80" high.

### **ii. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.**

The wall height requested was precisely to prevent the clientele from escaping or injuring themselves. Without a wall of sufficient height, the courtyard would be unusable to the memory center and in that regard would impose a serious hardship by not allowing the construction of the project.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement, although staff was unaware of the necessary height required to avoid climbing over the wall.

### **iii. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts:**

The provision of the proposed wall was what allows this property to be used for the residents of the memory center. The character of the City was improved by allowing this design option and by allowing the improvement of the long standing mission of the El Castillo Retirement Center.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

### **iv. 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:**

The adaptive reuse of this property as a memory center was a very unique use, with unique requirements such as this wall height. The adaptive reuse of the building requires that the courtyard area be preserved, thereby dictating that the courtyard was the only space suitable for the outdoor function required, and therefore the necessity of the wall height.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

### **v. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant.**

The special conditions and circumstances in this case are a necessary part of achieving the adaptive reuse of this property. The owner has done nothing to cause this condition; it was simply a result of the needs of the residents of the center.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement.

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

This wall exception will allow the adaptive reuse of this property in a manner which was positive to the surrounding historic area, and the wall proposed was in character with other solid walls along the streetscape. It can be argued that this proposal was not merely the "least negative", but in fact quite positive relative to the impact to streetscape by providing walls which are common along the street and by allowing the continuous, improved use of the courtyard.

Staff response: Staff was in agreement with this statement, with the addition of the windows to allow viewing of the courtyard.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the two exception requests to construct more than 50% of the historic footprint and to place an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation and defers to the Board whether the height exception request has been met which appears to be lacking in the first response. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-3.14, Demolition of Historic Structures, 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District, as long as the ramada does not exceed the allowable height with a flat roof.

Mr. Rasch explained that a variance was not needed for the 7' wall height but only an exception from the HDRB. Staff could administratively approve the ramada.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the modifications would be likely to impede the status. Mr. Rasch said no.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Duty, 404 Kiva Court who said this was an excellent example of where the Board made substantial improvements in the project. They managed to squeeze in all the construction in the rear and keep all of the facade in front free from it. What the Board saw represented reasonable protection of the building and it was functional and economic.

They could set the wall back about 20' and not require an exception but they didn't want to do that.

The walls along De Vargas included a little picket fence. It was built 15 years ago. Ms. Sigstedt had said originally it was a barbed wire fence and she built the picket fence. He wanted to tear it down. It was not historical. But it was included in the height calculation. The others were rather tall. He had photos of them. The first one to the west was about 7' tall. At El Castillo all were over 7'. There were walls almost all the way to the Hunter property that were tall so this wall height wasn't out of character.

They wanted about a 10' setback for landscaping. The wall would be 7' to 7' 6" and would have some holes in the upper parts of the wall. There was some concern about people escaping through them but 7' allowed plenty of security.

He shared a colored elevation to show what it would look like and showed the existing facade.

In summary he said that was why they proposed the wall that way.

He said it would be nice to have a gazebo in front but a pitched roof was not allowed so they put in a ramada with a flat roof.

There was a well on the property. The well was historical - having been there a very long time. About 15 years ago the wooden structure collapsed and the workman fixed it by putting in brick and concrete and it now looked like a sarcophagus. The well was about 30' deep and had not been used recently. Right now it was dangerous. They had nothing in the proposal to deal with it. It would probably have to be covered over. It was potentially possible to use for irrigation but they didn't know about water rights. It would not be impacted on this proposal and they could bring it back later.

Vice Chair Rios thanked Mr. Duty for addressing the Board's suggestions. She asked if the ramada would have a solid roof.

Mr. Duty agreed. It was for shade and would be about 9½ feet high.

Mr. Acton asked if that was on the docket for approval.

Mr. Rasch agreed but they provided no elevation.

Mr. Duty said the detail had not been submitted so they could bring it back or have Mr. Rasch approve it. He explained that they didn't want to have that approved until they dealt with the well. The location was still pending and they would abide by the restrictions imposed.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the rooms were about 300' square feet. Mr. Duty agreed.

Vice Chair Rios said they should do something so the well could be identified.

Ms. Walker felt they did a good job on the rooms. Her only remaining concern was with that south facing facade. Even though they preserved it, the little peep holes wouldn't do. If they had a fully fenestrated top it would be beautiful.

Mr. Duty noted she made that comment last time and it would be good except they had a climbing problem. It would create a situation and hard to see how they could prevent residents from climbing out. He didn't have a problem making the openings of reasonable size. On the back side they would have to glaze them with Lexan. A wrought iron top would make it difficult to manage the residents.

Ms. Walker thought people would feel they were peeping. She asked why they couldn't put glass behind the wrought iron.

Mr. Duty supposed they could but thought it would look unsightly because it would have to have mullions and a frame.

We also heard last time that they could allow people to see in yet keeping control of the patients.

Ms. Mather said as she had looked at the floor plan she didn't see any access to the back rooms.

Mr. Duty said there was another drawing that he submitted with that. In the interior of the existing building all of the proposed restrooms in the lobby would be removed (main room). The new plan would adjust them.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch if when he did the wall height calculations for the street he took in all the walls whether historic or not.

Mr. Rasch agreed. They were to be the average of existing walls and fences. They were shown on page 17. He read off all of the heights on both sides and said the average was 66".

Ms. Mather asked if parts of the wall were going to be 7' 6" high.

Mr. Duty said no but a little section on the drawing popped up. They could live with no part of the wall above 7'.

Ms. Mather wished they had information on what would be an appropriate height for people with this disease.

Mr. Duty said Mr. Jahner did have that information.

Present and sworn was Mr. Al Jahner, CEO of El Castillo, who said when he and Mr. Duty looked at the wall. He made calls to a colleague in Michigan and they came up with a minimum of 6' 6" that would give reasonable height that residents could not get over. It was a very serious problem. Families needed to know their loved one was secure.

Mr. Katz asked if they were talking about Alzheimer patients in that statement.

Mr. Jahner agreed. He clarified that mental problems didn't translate to physical impairment.

Mr. Acton complimented Mr. Duty on the changes. He looked forward to seeing him do the same magic with this wall. The massing of the wall didn't relate to the pergola or the forms on the primary facade nor alignment of the wall in relation to the trees. And with the pergola he could create a composition that would be more harmonious. And the height could vary. The pergola could be seen from the street.

At the entry portal it looked like a passage to the courtyard. That gate would be a little visible to the street so the design was important. He asked how a person would do the raking of leaves, etc. whether a utility gate to the street would be practical. Also looking from the south might need additional consideration. He would like to see the wall relate to trees and pergola with additional modulation that would be like that of the building - front to back and up to down. Perhaps changing the material with half stuccos and half

coyote fence would relate to the vernacular of the street.

He didn't have a problem with changing its aesthetic appearance or including a picket fence on the wall - just to mix that up. Right now it was very massive and pedestrian unfriendly. The windows were very small. By scaling back from the street and lowering it to 6' 6" would allow greater visibility of the facade. He had raised the bar with what he did on the building portion.

Vice Chair Rios asked if they were proposing to leave the picket fence on this rendering.

Mr. Duty said in their current proposal they did not address the picket fence and he originally thought they would leave it. In trying to treat landscape there, they decided to remove the picket fence with the Board's approval. Some of it was rotten and some was poorly maintained. It might have been disapproved when it was constructed. It wasn't part of this application.

Dr. Kantner asked regarding materials if they were matching the existing stucco.

Mr. Duty thought the wall should be slightly different.

Vice Chair Rios said the Board would ask him to distinguish it in some way from the historic building.

Mr. Rasch countered that in this district one color was required except under portals. Texture might be used. It was a difficult standard.

Mr. Duty said they didn't have objections to making it different color or texture.

Dr. Kantner asked if the addition was the same as the existing height.

Mr. Duty said it would be lower.

Mr. Rasch said they would need an exception to have two different colors in this district.

Vice Chair Rios asked the other board members to address the wall.

Dr. Kantner was fine with it as proposed as long as it was no higher than 7'. He could see the necessity for it.

Mr. Katz was also more or less okay with it as proposed but liked Mr. Acton's proposal.

Ms. Walker felt the primary facade should be visible so she would like to see a different design.

Ms. Mather agreed with Dr. Kantner that it was fine as proposed.

Vice Chair Rios thought it would be beautiful with wrought iron fencing

Mr. Acton said the reason he thought they should postpone the wall was that the pergola would impose an impact on the wall and needed to line up with trees. It looked like the pergola got tucked in there.

### **Public Comment**

Present and sworn was Ms. Carolyn Sigstedt who thought Mr. Acton's suggestions were good but not so radical - it could have some indentations in the wall and not be straight - giving it form and making it warm. She thought El Castillo made that mistake with their wall.

She said got depressed when getting ready to visit her mother who had dementia but was happier when she was there. There were privacy issues with this condition. It was good to have the building open to the public but also important to create private spaces where the residents could sit and not be on display - so it was private and public.

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

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-11-105 per staff recommendations and citing that the exception criteria had been met. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker thought it should be without the wall included.

Ms. Mather thought it was appropriate for this use.

The motion failed on a vote of 2-3.

**Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-11-105B to approve per staff recommendations for footprint and the ten foot setback exceptions but to postpone the proposed wall for further consideration. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

5. **Case #H-11-094A.** 1228 Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney & Mr. Francis Payson, agents/owners, request an historic status review of a contributing residential building. (David Rasch)

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1228 Cerro Gordo Road was a single-family residence that was constructed before 1933 in a simplified Bungalow style. The building was listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The applicant requests an historic status review in order to understand the preservation and remodeling standards which may apply to the property.

The building shows evidence of considerable alterations including massing changes from non-historic additions and alteration of the original pitched roof form with a non-historic ProPanel roof treatment. Historic windows are in good to fair condition.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends an historic status downgrade from contributing to non-contributing due to non-historic massing changes.

Vice Chair Rios pointed out that on page 10 of the inventory form it said this property was not in a historic district.

Mr. Rasch explained that this was a state inventory form and it was not in a state historic district. The state form lacked city information.

Present and sworn were Ms. Margaret Denney and Mr. Mr. Francis Payson

Ms. Denney agreed with staff recommendations. They were surprised it was a contributing structure because it had been so extensively remodeled. So they requested the downgrade.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the original historic footprint had changed.

Mr. Rasch said the footprint was there but there were additions in the rear and on the south facing primary facade. The roof area had increased by about 1/3. It was originally flat and then a pitched roof that was historic.

Ms. Denney said the historian felt the original roof had a pitch. The historic windows were in that section and it was a fraction of what had been added. The footprint existed in 1958. And the bungalow pertained only to that section.

Room #2 was a later addition and it had different materials. She didn't know when it was done. She believed 1 & 2 were there first although 4 and 5 were there for a long time. #3 was unheated open space. The former owner used it as a workshop. It was just basically unfinished space with materials just thrown together including corrugated metal to enclose that outdoor space.

### **Public Comment**

Present and sworn was Ms. Vicky Ortega, 1224 B Cerro Gordo, who wanted clarification on what they were requesting.

Vice Chair Rios explained this was just a status review tonight. There was no proposal for what they would do to it.

Ms. Ortega wasn't sure how it would affect her on the west side.

Vice Chair Rios said if they want to do anything to the building, a poster would be posted and Ms. Ortega could come and look at the plans before the meeting and comment at that time.

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

**Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-11-094A per staff recommendation to downgrade the property from contributing to non-contributing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

6. **Case #H-11-107.** 312 Lomita. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Caryn Spain, agent/owner, proposes to construct a storage addition on an existing yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

312 Lomita Street was a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1947. The property was listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property by reconstructing an approximately 68 square foot storage shed at the northwest corner of the lot. The shed will be approximately 7' high with a parapet on three sides, a corrugated plastic shed roof to the rear which will not be publicly visible, and stuccoed to match the adjacent yardwall. Two antique wooden doors will be installed on the west elevation.

**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 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Present and sworn was Ms. Caryn Spain, 312 Lomita, who said this was a replacement of a shed that was there to start with. They were asking that the shed be slightly bigger than the adobe shed. This was really for garbage, etc.

Vice Chair Rios thought it looked like it was already built.

Ms. Spain said it was and they were just expanding it.

Dr. Kantner asked if there was a way to add a parapet there.



Ms. Spain agreed and said it would be added. Mr. Rasch gave them permission to paint it to match the stucco.

Vice Chair Rios asked how much they were adding to the parapet.

Ms. Spain said it was the minimum.

Vice Chair Rios asked what material would be used.

Ms. Spain said it was particle board and would be finished with stucco.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-11-107 per staff recommendations. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

7. **Case #H-11-108.** 100 N. St. Francis Drive. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Pat Joseph, agent for Tom McCollan, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

100 North St. Francis Drive, known as Burger King, was constructed in a simplified Territorial Revival style in 1999. The building was listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the facades of the building in order to meet new corporate standards with the following seven items.

1. The height of the building will be maintained at 18' where the maximum allowable height was 14'.
2. The portal on the west elevation will be enlarged, a window will be added, and an existing window will be relocated. Existing muntin patterns will be removed and single-lite windows will be installed
3. An existing window on the east elevation will be relocated and the muntins will be removed to leave a single lite window.
4. Cable supported eyebrows will be installed.
5. A roof-access ladder and roof drains with downspouts will be installed.
6. Existing signage will be removed and replaced with two types of signs. "The Home of the

Whopper" was compliant with sign height and size standards. A large disc with the new corporate logo will not be mounted above 15' on the façade. The relevant code citation was as follows:

**14-8.10(H)(26) Wall Signs**

(a) Area Limitations

(l) A wall sign was subject to the following limitations:

- A. The maximum allowable size was 15 percent of the façade on which the sign was to be placed. In no case shall the sign area exceed 20 square feet except in the AC and RAC districts where the maximum allowable size was six square feet;
- B. Maximum size of letters shall be 20 inches in height, except in the AC and RAC districts where the maximum size shall be eight inches in height;
- C. There shall be no restriction on the number of letters, words or lines of any sign as long as its overall area was within the maximum allowable square feet; and
- D. No sign shall be permitted 15 feet or more above street grade measured in front of the façade where the sign was to appear.

7. The building colors will be changed from tan walls with white trim including a heavy white cornice to two browns, "Camel Tan" and "Rugged Brown" with an accent of red and retaining white trim. The relevant code citation was as follows:

**14-5.2(l) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District**

(1) District Standards

Compliance with the following structural standards shall occur whenever those exterior features of buildings and other structures subject to public view from any public street, way, or other public place are erected, altered, or demolished:

- (b) The color of stuccoed buildings shall predominantly be in browns, tans, local earth tones and soft pastels. Surfaces of stone or brick shall be in the natural color. Entryways, and portales or porches may be emphasized by the use of white or other colors. Painting of buildings with a color that causes arresting or spectacular effects or with bold repetitive patterns or using buildings as signs was prohibited.

**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 (l) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Mr. Rasch said the drawings did show height that was higher but the applicant didn't want exceptions so they would have it no higher.

Present and sworn was Mr. Pat Joseph who had nothing to add to the staff report. He said this was basically to upgrade the building to corporate standards. Burger King was trying to bring up all buildings.

He shared colored drawings of the proposed changes and explained them.

Mr. Joseph said the main base color would be camel tan which was very close to the existing color. A brown accent would give depth to the building. It was hard to provide the true color. They were trying to match the colors of the Burger King on St. Michael's. This shown drawing was more accurate.

Ms. Mather asked if the muntin removal was acceptable.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The original windows had snap in muntins but he would rather have single pane. The Board could approve snap ins - they just were not required.

He added that it could be debated if this property was even in the historic district - it was so far north in the district. It might be out but the map said it was in.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-11-108 per staff recommendations and as submitted. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

8. **Case #H-11-109.** 509 Plaza Balentine. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Caverly, agent for Grace Hopwood, owner, proposes to construct a free-standing 276 sq. ft. studio to 11' high where the maximum allowable height was 13' 11" on a contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

This case was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

9. **Case #H-11-110.** 441 Cerrillos Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony & Dianne Medina agents/owners, propose to remodel a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

441 Cerrillos Road was a commercial building that was constructed in the Decorative Brick / Territorial style before 1908. The building has lost original historic windows and has several additions, some of which are after 1945. The building was listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. A cable supported steel canopy will be installed on the west, front elevation. The canopy will have a wire mesh roof and it will be painted a brown rust color.
2. A door at the rear east elevation will be increased in width to meet ADA ingress/egress standards.
3. Older north elevation and rear windows and all doors will be replaced. The new windows will meet the 30" rule.
4. The building will be restuccoed in "Buckskin".

**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.

Present and sworn was Mr. Anthony Medina who had nothing to add.

Ms. Mather asked if he had a sample of the brown rust color.

Mr. Medina explained that it was just rusted steel and was not painted. It would be a little darker than the stucco.

Mr. Acton asked if the windows would be Mesa Red.

Mr. Medina agreed but said they were in the back and not visible. The ones in front wouldn't be changed.

Mr. Acton asked Mr. Rasch to comment on that portion.

Mr. Rasch said they were legally non-conforming.

Mr. Acton thought metal should be compatible with metal.

Mr. Medina said over time the rusted steel would get darker and would work with Buckskin and existing windows.

Ms. Walker asked about landscaping.

Mr. Medina said he would try to soften it as much as possible.

Mr. Medina said he was having problems with people driving to the back and drinking and painting graffiti. He tried to post signs and the police were called several times. He hoped they could put some sort

of fence where the second window was and join it with city fence. He proposed something temporary as part of construction.

Mr. Rasch said chain link fences were allowed for construction purposes.

Mr. Medina said there was already an existing chain link fence there now. He said the trespassing had become a hazard. He found where they tried to start a fire.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-11-110 per staff recommendations and that temporary fencing would be allowed to be put up for construction phase and permanent fencing would have to come back to the Board. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**10. Case #H-11-111A.** 940 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mr. Ken Francis, agent for Nancy Mammel, owner, requests an historic status review of a contributing residential/commercial building. (David Rasch)

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

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

940 East Palace Avenue, known as the Santiago Sandoval House, was a residential structure that was constructed in the Territorial Revival style in approximately 1930. The building was listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant requests an historic status review of the property and a designation of any primary elevations in order to understand the preservation or remodeling standards which may apply to the property. Recent research finds that the one-story western mass may have been a shed or a garage and was constructed sometime between 1958 and 1966. An addition to this section was completed after 1966.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends maintaining the contributing historic status of the main building and designating the east and north elevations as primary. As for the garage/shed portion, staff defers to the Board to determine if this structure retains enough historic integrity to be part of the contributing structure and the primary north elevation.

Vice Chair Rios asked about the south elevation.

Mr. Rasch said he was not recommending the south. Staff tried to pull in most character elevations and didn't see anything on the south.

Vice Chair Rios disagreed. She noted that the historic windows were in excellent condition.

Ms. Mather asked if in designating primary elevations, the Board could exclude the lower portion on the north.

Mr. Rasch agreed and would defer to the Board because obviously the stone veneer was not original.

Mr. Francis (previously sworn) just wanted to defer to the Board. It was a veneer stone wall on this facade. He had assumed the south and the east elevations would be primary. The south elevation was right up against the Key House (five to ten feet away) and not visible at all. They were interested in doing something nicer on the stone veneer elevation.

Ms. Mather asked if he said they might consider replacing those windows.

Vice Chair Rios said this was only a status review so they could not comment now on any possible work on the house now.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Vice Chair Rios thought the south elevation was primary because of the windows and it didn't matter if it was visible or not.

**Ms. Walker moved in Case #H-11-111A to retain the contributing status with south, east and north elevations as primary without the veneer section. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**11. Case #H-11-112A.** 215 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gayla Bechtel, agent for Barry Ellsworth, owner, requests an historic status review of a non-contributing commercial building. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

215 East Palace Avenue was a commercial property that was constructed before 1951 in a vernacular manner. It was listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes an historic status review in order to understand the preservation or remodeling standards which apply to the property. Recent research shows that the original shed roof structure was located on the east side of the building with extant historic wooden windows. An arched portico was constructed on the south and west elevations between 1958 and 1964 in a style which was not harmonious

with Santa Fé style.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends maintaining the non-contributing historic status due to substantial non-conforming alterations, including the street-facing facade.

Present and sworn was Ms. Gayla Bechtel who agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. Acton commended her to coming here to confirm it was non-contributing.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved in Case #H-11-112A to approve staff recommendations to maintain its non-contributing status. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Vice Chair Rios believed there would not be a quorum for the next meeting.

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Approved by:

---

Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer