



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 11-15-07 TIME 4:15

SERVED BY Maya Quam

RECEIVED BY Mike L...

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2007 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2007 – 5:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-04-23. 50 E. San Francisco St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rob Day, agent/owner, proposes to install a 5' X 4' painted wall sign on a non-contributing building at 18'6" high. An exception is requested to exceed the 15' maximum allowable height (Section 14-8.10 H, 26). (David Rasch)

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-07-133. 880 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Joseph Gallegos, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by constructing a 12 sq. ft. mechanical room, an entry stoop, repairing historic material and increasing the height of a non-historic portal 10", to remodel a non-contributing residence by constructing a 258 sq. ft. addition, enclosing a portal, increasing the building height from 10'6" to 12'6" where the maximum allowable height is 16'6", and to replace fences with yardwalls to the maximum allowable height of 65" along Alameda and 54" along Palace. (David Rasch)

2. Case #H-07-136. 626 Don Gaspar. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Ike Kalangis, proposes to remodel a contributing building by restoring architectural character that was altered approximately 47 years ago. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-07-137. 519 Johnson Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Keith Beardmore, owner/agent, proposes to remove and relocate a portion of a 6' high wall and construct a 7' wide gate where the maximum allowable height is 4'10" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
4. Case #H-07-141. 573 ½ W. San Francisco St. Westside-Guadalupe Historic Districts. Linda Schneider, owner/agent, proposes to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' along the side property line and replace a chain link fence with a coyote fence and gate not to exceed the maximum allowable height on a significant property. (Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-07-140. 113 N. Armijo Ln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John and Pamela Oualline, owners/agents, propose to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
6. Case #H-07-139. 303 Staab St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Victoria Roger, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing non-historic windows, removing a non-historic porch, and constructing 408 sq. ft. of additions on the residence and demolishing the 723 sq. ft. guest house and constructing 560 sq. ft. of additions to the remaining garage with an increase in height from 8'6" to 12'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'1". Exceptions are requested to construct an addition nearer than 10' to a primary elevation (14-5.2 D, 2, d) and to demolish an historic contributing structure (14-5.2 D, 1, a). (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-07-135. 707 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Luanne Leeis, proposes to enclose approximately 63 sq. ft. entry porch, replace windows, and construct new windows and door openings. An exception is requested to exceed the 30" window rule (Section 14-5.2 E, c). (Marissa Barrett)
8. Case #H-07-138. 617A Don Felix St. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Toba Tucker, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 6' high coyote fence with wooden gates where the maximum allowable height is 58". A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 D, 9) (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

M. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice.

If you wish to attend the October 23, 2007 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Planning Division by 9:00 am on Tuesday, October 23, 2007 so that transportation can be arranged.

SUMMARY INDEX
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Santa Fe, New Mexico
November 27, 2007

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published	1
Approval of Minutes:		
October 9, 2007	Approved as amended	2
October 23, 2007	Approved as amended	2-3
Communications	Discussion	3
Business from the Floor	Not Considered	3
Administrative Matters	None	3
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 04-23</u> 50 E. San Francisco Street	Approved as Submitted	4-6
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 07-133</u> 880 East Palace Avenue	Approved with conditions	6-9
2. <u>Case #H 07-136</u> 626 Don Gaspar	Approved as recommended	9-12
3. <u>Case #H 07-137</u> 519 Johnson Lane	Approved with conditions	12-13
4. <u>Case #H 07-141</u> 573½ W. San Francisco Street	Approved with conditions	14-15
5. <u>Case #H 07-140</u> 113 N. Armijo Lane	Approved as recommended	15-16
6. <u>Case #H 07-139</u> 303 Staab Street	Approved with conditions	16-20

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
7. <u>Case #H 07-135</u> 707 E. Palace	Approved as submitted	20-21
8. <u>Case #H 07-138</u> 617A Don Felix Street	Approved as submitted	21-24
Matters from the Board	Discussion	24-25
Adjournment	25
Exhibits: A, B		

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

NOVEMBER 27, 2007

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Mr. Jake Barrow
Mr. Charles Newman
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Robert Frost [Excused]
Ms. Deborah Shapiro [excused]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Historic Planner
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 9, 2007

Mr. Barrow requested the following changes to the minutes:

Page 6, paragraph 6 – “they would” should be “they should.”

Page 8, paragraph 4 – should read, “He said a disturbing aspect of streetscape harmony was that uncontrolled creep was occurring.”

Page 15, paragraph 3 – “had in their code” should be “had in the code.”

Page 26, paragraph 13 – should read, “Mr. Barrow said if gates were closed at the time of site visits he would make a motion to deny the case.”

Page 32, paragraph 11 – “when demolition was done” should be “during demolition.”

Page 37, paragraph 12 – should read “Mr. Barrow said he thought we should deal with that at that time. He said if the applicant was trying to avoid the Board, thinking that would simply go to Council for approval, then the Board would likely lose. He said possibly a new motion concerning the status of the neighborhood could send a positive message.”

Ms. Walker requested the following change to the minutes:

Page 27, third paragraph from the bottom – “Carol Scullin built the house.”

Ms. Rios requested the following change to the minutes:

Page 7, 2nd paragraph – “She thought pilaster were not most common...”

Page 7, 7th paragraph – should say, “She asked if he had anything more to add.”

Page 24, 3rd paragraph – could “to” be

Mr. Barrow moved to approve the minutes of October 9, 2007 as corrected. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

October 23, 2007

Ms. Rios requested the following changes to the minutes:

Page 12, 10th paragraph – “Ms. Rios thanked the design team ~~for their comments.~~” She asked that the second sentence be deleted and to insert, “She said the building before the Board was proposed at heights ranging from 48' 6" to 62' and she asked Mr. Rasch to compare these heights to the taller buildings in Santa Fe.”

She asked that the first paragraph on page 13 be deleted and that the last paragraph on page 12 be moved to become the second paragraph on page 13.

Page 20, 2nd paragraph – should read, “Ms. Rios said she agreed with Saul Cohen’s letter. She further state the County should abide by the Ordinance whether or not the Board had jurisdiction over the project.”

Ms. Walker requested the following change:

Page 20, 5th paragraph – “She invited them to take a tour of the State Capital...” She added that her phone number was 982-0118, not 983-0118.

Mr. Barrow moved for approval of the minutes as corrected. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said the second meeting in December was cancelled. He added that they would not be able to meet in Council Chambers on Jan 22 and May 27th and asked if the Board wanted to seek other dates or other locations.

Chair Woods asked him to look for other locations.

Mr. Rasch said he gave everyone the submittal requirements. He said there was a handout on the second case.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Not considered.

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

None.

Chair Woods announced to the public that if anyone disagreed with a Board decision, an appeal could be filed but only if submitted within seven days of this hearing.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-04-23.** 50 E. San Francisco St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rob Day, agent/owner, proposes to install a 5' X 4' painted wall sign on a non-contributing building at 18'6" high. An exception is requested to exceed the 15' maximum allowable height (Section 14-8.10 H, 26). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"50 East San Francisco Street is an adobe commercial building previously known as Mangel's and now under the management of San Francisco Street Br & Grill. The building was constructed in 1878 with additions and remodels in 1912 and 1930 in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant was given an approval for the following proposal on April 13, 2005 but was unable to carry it out and the approval has expired."

"Now, the applicant proposes to install a painted business sign on the south elevation wall. The sign will be 4' x 5' in red design elements and dark green letters. The sign will be illuminated by two faux rust-colored gooseneck fixtures fitted with 100 watt bulbs.

"The applicant cites historic use of this wall for mural advertisement and is requesting an exception to Section 14-8.10 H, 26, D, which prohibits signs on walls above 15' high. The following were responses provided by the applicant to conclusively demonstrate a need for this request.

- "1. The proposed signage will not damage the integrity of the district but rather bring back a unique and creative process that was inherent to the area for years. In addition, the quality of antique light fixtures to be used and the ability of A-1 Signs to do professionally painted signage will, I feel, be well received by others.
- "2. The tenant space in effect has not been used as a broad-based popular public space for some years. The current usage reflects back to a time when the building was a major public building. The signage at the time was painted and prominent on the south wall. While neither hardship nor injury is likely in this variance request, the uniqueness and precedence of the proposal is historical and warranted in nature.
- "3. This proposal will not contribute any negative impact on residential situations in the area. Lighting will be faced downward and towards the wall. Total wattage will be 150 watts. The signage will be low profile and attractive. The design retains the

historic uniqueness and creative profile that early merchants demonstrated to make Santa Fe the rich market place it is today.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

“Staff recommends approval of this application, as previously granted on April 13, 2005, pending a positive finding of fact to grant the height exception needed for this project.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Rob Day 41 Wilderness Gate, who said they were simply unable to move forward on it and simply wanted to renew it.

Chair Woods noted the previous application was for a carved sign and this was a painted sign.

Mr. Day said he first asked for a painted sign on the wall and it was not approved.

Mr. Newman said he wasn't on the Board in 2004 and asked if there was a reason why it was not projecting over the sidewalk.

Mr. Day said it was best rendered on the wall. He said in the original package, this was historically a mercantile building. One interest was to reproduce one of those mural signs.

Mr. Rasch said it was shown on page 21.

Ms. Rios asked if he owned the two story building.

Mr. Day said he was the tenant on the second floor.

Ms. Rios asked if he could summarize why he wanted the exception.

Mr. Day said, at the lower level, it was hidden by the façade of the nearer building.

Ms. Rios asked if he were painting a board to attach to the wall.

Mr. Day agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if anyone was going to look that high.

Mr. Day said from Don Gaspar and St. Francis Hotel, you could see it.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods said the motion needed to cite the five exceptions per staff report.

Ms. Walker asked, if it was approved exactly the same way, why they couldn't it just refer to the 2004 minutes.

Chair Woods said it was because it lapsed.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 04-23 as submitted and citing that the exceptions had been met. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-07-133.** 880 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Joseph Gallegos, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by constructing a 12 sq. ft. mechanical room, an entry stoop, repairing historic material and increasing the height of a non-historic portal 10", to remodel a non-contributing residence by constructing a 258 sq. ft. addition, enclosing a portal, increasing the building height from 10'6" to 13'6" where the maximum allowable height was 13'7", and to replace fences with yardwalls to the maximum allowable height of 65" along Alameda and 54" along Palace. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"800 East Palace Avenue is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed before 1928 in a Vernacular manner. A portal on the north elevation may have been present in historic times, but the present portal appears to be a non-historic remodel or addition. Aerial photographs are inconclusive regarding the date of the portal. In approximately 1947, a CMU addition was constructed at 874 East Alameda Street. 880 East Palace is listed as contributing and 874 East Alameda is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The north and west elevations of 880 East Palace may be considered as primary.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following items:

880 East Palace:

- "1. The non-historic portal on the north elevation will be increased in height by 10" from approximately 7' 9" to 8' 9" with the addition of replacement viga beams and carved corbels.
- "2. Canales will be repaired and straightened on the west elevation.

- "3. All projecting vigas will be removed and replaced. Discussion should clarify if all are beyond repair and that replacements will match existing in diameter and length.
- "4. The south elevation non-historic window will be removed and replaced with a 3 over 1 to match an adjacent window in a restored window opening dimension.
- "5. All historic windows will be repaired and maintained.
- "6. The four concrete steps on the south elevation will be removed and replaced with a concrete stoop with steps and stuccoed 36" high side walls.
- "7. The building will be re-roofed and re-stuccoed to match existing conditions.

874 East Alameda:

- "8. The parapet will be raised from 10' 6" to 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 13' 7" as determined by a linear calculation.
- "9. A 12 square foot mechanical room will be constructed on the south elevation.
- 10. The south elevation portal will be enclosed. There will be a 6' 6" x 3' door with an 18" deep eyebrow overtop and a 3' x 3' window that does not comply with the 30" rule.
- 11. A 258 square foot addition will be constructed on the east elevation. There will be 15-light French doors and an 18" deep eyebrow overtop with a small window at the north end.
- 12. Existing fences will be removed and replaced with stuccoed yardwalls to the maximum allowable heights of 65" along Alameda and 54" along Palace, as determined by linear calculations.

"The yardwalls will feature battered pilasters, nichos, and wooden and coyote pedestrian gates. The stuccoed pilaster on the west elevation of the contributing building attaches to a primary elevation without a stand-off. The wooden pedestrian gates will feature stepped lintels to a maximum height of 8' 2".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the west elevation yardwall not connect to a primary elevation, that the south elevation window comply with the 30" rule, and that the two mechanical room doors not open to the exterior or a 3' corner rule exception is needed. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards

and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic Districts design standards.”

He added that the applicant addressed the conditions in the handout (attached as Exhibit A).

Chair Woods asked how this would impact the contributing building next to it.

Mr. Rasch said it was substantially higher and but he believed the applicant was proposing coming down.

Ms. Walker asked if not all of the projecting vigas were deemed repairable.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Barrow asked for clarification on the height calculation.

Mr. Rasch explained that accent features were not subject to the height ordinance.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas, 421 St. Michael's Drive, Santa Fe, who said he represented Joseph Gallegos in this case. He said after they read the staff report over the weekend they found solutions as presented in the handout.

He said on first one, the wall on the west elevation would not be connected. On page 4 of handout, he pointed out that the gate would be a coyote fence gate and the post next to the house will be a latilla type and not connected to house.

Secondly he said on the south elevation the window would comply with the 30" rule by having a three over one window in that spot.

Thirdly, on the mechanical room doors the solution was shown on page 2 of the handout. He said the mechanical room for 880 E. Palace would be larger to accomplish the three foot rule still opening to the east and the other one would not be visible. He said it would open to the north.

As to the height he said they determined that instead of 13' 6" they could have it at 12' and still have a nine foot ceiling height.

Mr. Newman asked Mr. Rasch if the revised increase in height would not impact its contributing status.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Newman asked Mr. Horcasitas about the little window shown on sheet two on the mechanical room for 874 E. Alameda.

Mr. Horcasitas said it was and they had the opening move in that direction.
Mr. Rasch said it would not be visible.

Ms. Rios asked about the height of 880 E. Palace.

Mr. Horcasitas said they were not raising the height at all.

Ms. Rios asked how much space was between the two houses.

Mr. Horcasitas said they were joined.

Ms. Rios asked about the lining of canales.

Mr. Horcasitas said they would be galvanized and explained they would just straighten those on the front side.

Ms. Rios asked about rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Horcasitas said there would be none.

Ms. Rios asked if he would use cementitious stucco.

Mr. Horcasitas said they would use El Rey Adobe.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked if page three of the handout showed the addition to the mechanical room.

Mr. Horcasitas agreed.

Chair Woods asked if the venting would not be visible.

Mr. Horcasitas said the venting would be on the roof behind the two foot parapet.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-133 as amended by the applicant in the submission dated 11/23 with the height reduced to 12' and the condition that no mechanical equipment be visible. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H-07-136.** 626 Don Gaspar. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Ike Kalangis, proposes to remodel a contributing building by restoring architectural character that was altered approximately 47 years ago. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"626 Don Gaspar is an adobe single-family residence that was built in 1927 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. At approximately 47 years ago, the architectural character of the building was significantly altered by 'inappropriate changes' in style to Territorial Revival and by replacing the wood double-hung windows with steel casements. The building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The east and north elevations may be considered as primary.

"The applicant proposes to restore the character of the property with the following items:

- "1. The brick parapet coping will be removed and the parapets will be stepped and stuccoed to restore them to mimic historic photographs.
- "2. The steel casement windows will be removed and replaced with wood double-hung windows in the existing opening dimensions to mimic historic muntin patterns. The windows will be finished in white and if screens are installed they will be painted dark brown or leaf green.
- "3. The building will be foam insulated and stuccoed with cementitious 'Buckskin' to match existing conditions.
- "4. The low portal walls will be capped with concrete to mimic historic photographs.

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 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards."

Mr. Newman asked if this proposal would mean it would no longer be a contributing building.

Mr. Rasch replied it was an interesting question.

Mr. Newman said he took it that meant "no."

Mr. Rasch explained that the problem was the 50-year rule. He said the proposal was a restoration back to its historic style.

Ms. Walker suggested it could be on the next agenda for upgrading.

Mr. Rasch said it was currently contributing.

Mr. Newman said it would then be classified as a restoration but it would be hard to say it was a restoration.

Mr. Rasch said they were removing non-historic material.

Chair Woods asked that the applicant address it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dale Zinn, P. O. 756, Santa Fe.

He said that was an interesting comment. He said it was a simple project bringing together a unique opportunity for a long-time Santa Fe family who had the desire and the documentation to right some wrongs and re-established the contributing status of the building to even more correct status.

He said if the only part of the building that was the major contributing portion was the windows and they were altering openings and things that distracted, he might agree. He felt "restoration was a sharp-edged word." He noted they had very good photo documentation and had the owner who was there. The footprint and height were exactly the same. So this building was not losing its status at all.

He said it was in the record that the windows and brick coping were doing damage to that contributing status and the proposal took it further back toward the original.

Chair Woods added that the coping that was added in sixties was deteriorating so the choices were either new brick coping or to go back to Pueblo style.

Mr. Zinn said they were not changing any opening sizes. Windows were factory painted wood. Double hung one over ones and they were reestablishing the parapet.

He clarified that because some of the stucco was sharp and thought the original was lime plaster, they would do a fairly thin foam to the outside.

Ms. Rios thought his comments were appropriate to prove contributing status.

Mr. Barrow noted the building was adobe so the rehabilitation of parapets would include an undulated line. He asked how they proposed to do that. He presumed it was brick above adobe.

Mr. Zinn said they would do it with adobe, taking down one course and replacing with adobe and foam.

Mr. Barrow asked if he was trying to recreate the effect; but had no measurements from photos.

Mr. Zinn agreed.

Mr. Newman referred to page 11 and asked if he were proposing to eliminate the plaster post.

Mr. Zinn shared the original photo that showed a wooden post. He said they both were historic photos.

Mr. Newman said he believed it was not a restoration because it was using a wood post.

Mr. Barrow suggested the old survey might need to be revisited at some time.

Ms. Rios asked for the ages of the photos.

Mr. Kalangis said it was a catch 22. He said the picture in the upper right hand was from about 1938 or 1939 and the bottom one was early 1940s.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods clarified that Mr. Rasch said he believed it wouldn't lose its contributing status because the changes were done less than 50 years ago.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 07-136 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Newman who opposed it.

3. **Case #H-07-137.** 519 Johnson Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Keith Beardmore, owner/agent, proposes to remove and relocate a portion of a 6' high wall and construct a 7' wide gate where the maximum allowable height was 4'10" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style, single-family residence located at 519 Johnson Lane was constructed around 1981 according to the 1991 Historic Cultural Property Inventory. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes to repair the existing 6' to 7' high yard wall as well as relocate a portion of the north wall a distance of 5' to the northeast corner of the

property. The new wall will run for approximately 20' along the east property line and 30' along the north property line. The relocated wall is proposed to be 6' high in order to match the existing wall height and to have a gradual step down from the existing 7' high wall. The maximum allowable height for walls and fences in this streetscape is 4' 10" and 6' for side lot lines. The Board may allow for a 20% increase in height to the maximum of 5' 10" without an exception request.

"Latilla windows are proposed for the east, street-facing wall in order to match the existing and to add 'interest.' A 7' wide wooden gate is also proposed for the east elevation wall. The gate will be two 3½' wide swinging doors at a height of 6'. Latilla windows and gate finishes were not submitted.

"The wall will be finished with STO Abiquiu which is the existing stucco for the wall and building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the wall not exceed the maximum allowable height, with the 20% increase, of 5' 10" and that the latilla windows and wood gate finishes are clarified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Ms. Walker asked if the finish was STO.

Ms. Barrett said yes and explained that the ordinance did not prohibit STO

Present and sworn was Mr. Keith Beardmore, 519 Johnson Lane, who asked if staff recommended he reduce the wall from 6' to 5' 10".

Ms. Barrett agreed and clarified the twenty percent discretion of the Board.

Ms. Rios asked what the gate finishes were.

Mr. Beardmore said the gates would be painted to match the existing except the gate would be kept a natural finish.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 07-137 per staff recommendations with the condition that the latilla finish and gate details be submitted to staff for approval, with the allowance of 20% for the wall to be 5' 10". Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-07-141.** 573½ W. San Francisco St. Westside-Guadalupe Historic Districts. Linda Schneider, owner/agent, proposes to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' along the side property line and replace a chain link fence with a coyote fence and gate not to exceed the maximum allowable height on a significant property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"573½ West San Francisco Street is a Vernacular style building that was built between 1859-1912. The building has been separated into a duplex and has undergone remodeling which included window replacements (1997 building permit from remodel/repair). The Official Map lists this building as significant to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

"This application proposes removing the chicken wire fence along the west property line and replacing it with a coyote fence. The coyote fence will be made of juniper/pine posts and will be irregular in height to not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'. A small section of coyote fence and a 4' wide pedestrian gate will also be constructed along the north elevation of the structure (to the west property line) to create a courtyard.

"Lastly proposed is to replace a chain link fence along the south property line, facing West San Francisco Street with a coyote fence and 4' wide pedestrian gate. The fence and gate will have irregular latilla tops to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 9". The Board may increase the height of the fence to approximately 5' 9" according to the wall and fence guidelines. The proposed fence will not block the view of the significant building as the fence is to the west of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the coyote fence along the south property line does not exceed the maximum allowable height of 4' 9". Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulations for Significant Structures, Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District design standards."

She added that her recommendation included having the stringer on the interior.

Present and sworn was Ms. Linda Schneider, 573 W. San Francisco Street who asked for clarification on the recommendation, particularly the 4' 9" height in front.

Ms. Barrett said she supported six feet on the sides but felt the height in front should be at the allowable height.

Ms. Rios said the coyote tops should be uneven.

Mr. Barrow said the supporting posts should be on the inside also.
Ms. Barrett agreed.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 07-141 per staff recommendations and that supporting posts be inside with uneven tops. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Chair Woods clarified the recommendation was to have a 4' 9" height on the street-facing portion and six feet high on the sides.

Mr. Barrow asked what kind of transition would take place at the intersection of side with the front.

Ms. Barrett agreed it needed to step down.

Mr. Barrow suggested the transition be a three foot gradual transition on the southwest corner

Ms. Walker amended to say that dropping at southwest corner be transitioned gradually for three feet. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H-07-140.** 113 N. Armijo Ln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John and Pamela Oualline, owners/agents, propose to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The owners of the Spanish Pueblo Revival style, single-family residence located at 113 North Armijo Lane were issued a stop work order on September 21, 2007 by the Historic Inspector for constructing a coyote fence without HDRB approval or a City building permit. The owners stopped work immediately and contacted City Staff.

"This application proposes the following to the non-contributing property (as listed on the Official Map):

"Construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' along the south property line. As the fence approaches Armijo Lane the height will be lowered gradually to 3'.

"A 6' high coyote fence and two leaf gates totaling 8' wide will be constructed approximately 37' 8" from west, street-facing property line as well.

"All fences will have irregular latilla tops.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. John Oualline, 113 N. Armijo Lane. He apologized for the construction of the fence, noting that the building was non-contributing. He said they had a drive by shooting and there had recently been about a dozen incidents and his wife was traumatized.

He said his neighbor would have sunlight with coyote instead of stucco.

Mr. Barrow asked him to describe the gate design.

Mr. Oualline said it would appear as a coyote fence with no contradiction in material.

Ms. Walker asked if he worked with a broker in purchase of the property.

Mr. Oualline said he had five years ago.

Ms. Walker asked if it had not been explained to him that he was in the historic district where a permit was always needed.

Mr. Oualline said he didn't realize he needed a permit.

Ms. Walker clarified that even though non-contributing, it still had to go through the process.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 07-140 per staff recommendations. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H-07-139.** 303 Staab St. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Victoria Roger, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing non-historic windows, removing a non-historic porch, and constructing 408 sq. ft of additions on the residence and demolishing the 723 sq. ft. guest house and

constructing 560 sq. ft. of additions to the remaining garage with an increase in height from 8'6" to 12'6" where the maximum allowable height was 15'1". Exceptions were requested to construct an addition nearer than 10' to a primary elevation (14-5.2 D, 2, d) and to demolish an historic contributing structure (14-5.2 D, 1, a). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"303 Staab Street is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed between 1930 and 1942 in a Vernacular manner. Alterations to the residence include a frame addition on the rear by 1958, a porch on the southeast corner as early as 1958 which was enclosed at approximately 1969, a porch on the east elevation sometime after the mid 1970s, and replacement of historic windows. A frame guest house was constructed at the rear at an unknown historic date with a frame garage. A carport connected these two structures at an unknown date. The residence and guesthouse are listed as contributing and the garage and carport are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The south elevations of the two contributing structures may be considered as primary.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the followings seven items.

Residence:

- "1. A 360 square foot addition will be constructed at the northeast corner to match the existing adjacent parapet height at 12'. The addition will feature a sculpted fireplace to mimic the existing fireplace at the southwest corner, 8-light French doors, and divided light casement windows.
- "2. A 48 square foot portal addition will be constructed at the southeast corner. The addition is not stepped back at least 10' from the primary south elevation and an exception is requested with the required responses attached per Section 14-5.2 D, 2, d. "The 9' 8" high portal will be constructed with natural-stained wooden elements including posts, carved corbels, and header with a shed roof.
- "3. The non-historic portal on the east elevation will be removed.
- "4. The windows will be replaced with divided-light casements in the same opening dimensions and locations.

Guesthouse:

- "5. The 540 square foot guesthouse and the 128 square foot carport will be demolished. Staff recognizes that the guesthouse is listed as contributing to the historic District and it is not visible from a public way. Inspections staff has

submitted a report identifying significant code and structural violations. An exception is requested to demolish this contributing building and the required responses are attached per Section 14-5.2 D, 1, a.

"A 567 square foot guesthouse will be constructed in the same location to a height of 12' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 1". The City has provided a zero-lot line affidavit for constructing within the alley setback. The building is designed in a simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style with rounded parapets and a sculpted chimney. There are several window openings on the south elevation that are nearer than 3' to an outside corner (Section 14-5.2 E, 2, b).

Garage;

"6. The garage will be remodeled to be included within the guesthouse footprint. It will increase in height from 9' 6" to 11'. There is a door opening that is nearer than 3' to a corner and this is publicly visible.

"7. The buildings will be restuccoed in cementitious 'Buckskin' and trim color will be 'Pebble Tan.'

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of this application unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the two exceptions needed for this project and that all publicly visible elevations meet the 3' corner rule. Otherwise, this application complies with Sections 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Buildings, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District design standards."

Mr. Barrow asked Mr. Rasch regarding the demolition of the building if his recommendation was to deny that and on what basis.

Mr. Rasch said it was his recommendation because it was contributing but it would be a hardship on the applicant.

Chair Woods interpreted the staff recommendation of denial which they had to do because of the ordinance.

Chair Woods asked if the portal would impact its status.

Mr. Rasch said the southeast corner was more significant.

Present and sworn was Victoria Rogers, 311 Staab Street, who said she was just interested to hear the Board's response. Regarding the portal, she said she did file the exceptions. It was not ten feet back but would improve the usability and safety for the building.

Chair Woods asked her if she had to pick one or the other, which would it be.

Ms. Rogers said she would pick the demolition. The building was a hazard and she would like to improve the neighborhood by that.

Ms. Walker noted that this was a city alley and it was blocked.

Chair Woods said it was not blocked. It was open.

Ms. Walker said she was not inclined to grant the less than ten foot setback but asked if it wouldn't interfere with the trees.

Ms. Rogers said it would not. She said she just wanted the portal to have a better presentation. It was not a historic portal so the front would be more historic.

Ms. Walker asked if she set it back ten feet would it give enough space.

Ms. Rogers explained that it was at the kitchen door. She said these had been repaired pretty haphazardly by a manger prior to her ownership and she wanted to see it fit into the neighborhood. She pointed out the proposed portal. It was now about three feet and she wanted to go out less than the existing portal over on the other side.

Mr. Barrow asked Mr. Rasch if the demolition of the portal would not affect the status.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow asked what the purpose of new portal was.

Ms. Rogers thought it would look nicer. She liked that look and felt it made the neighborhood look more historic and it was over the main entrance for protection and safety.

She said the windows were all proposed to be replaced with divided light windows so she felt she was trying to bring it to the look of historic in the neighborhood.

Chair Woods said the exception responses were just before page 40.

Ms. Rogers said the openings in the guest house would all be at three feet or more and had copies for the Board.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H 07-139 with the following conditions:

1. That the rear building demolition be allowed and noting that the applicant had

- met the exception criteria, noting the condition of the building as a factor;
2. That the proposal for a new guest house be approved as designed;
 3. Regarding the main house, that the proposal be approved except for the portal, which is to be postponed for other design considerations;
 4. That the guest house be approved as amended by the applicant;
 5. That there be visible no roof top appurtenances.

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

7. **Case #H-07-135.** 707 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mr. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Luanne Leeis, proposes to enclose approximately 63 sq. ft. entry porch, replace windows, and construct new windows and door openings on a non-contributing building. An exception was requested to exceed the 30" window rule (Section 14-5.2 E, c). (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Vernacular style building, which includes non-compliant windows throughout, located at 707 E. Palace, consists of two units within the La Vereda Compound. The building was built in the 1980's and is listed on the Official Map as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes the following for Unit #28.

"Enclose approximately 63 square feet of an entry porch on the south elevation. The appearance of the south elevation is proposed to remain as it exists which includes four non-compliant windows which do not meet the 30" window rule.

"Proposed for the east elevation is the addition of one window and French doors, the alteration of the size of an existing window opening (one horizontal window will become three vertical windows), and the removal of a window to be replaced with a door.

"Proposed for the north elevation is the addition of two new windows.

"All proposed windows do not meet the 30" window rule. An exception is being requested to exceed the 30" rule, Section 14-5.2 E, c. As required by the City code, the applicant has answered the questions in Section 14-5.2 C, 2, c, I-vi.

"The building will be stuccoed to match the existing in type, color and texture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends denial of the exception unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant windows that do not follow the 30" window rule. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Ms. Barrett added that they needed to get the Compound approval also.

Ms. Rios asked about public visibility -

Ms. Barrett explained that it was in a private compound so none.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas who said he was here to answer questions but briefly described the project.

Rios asked about the front window.

Mr. Horcasitas said it was originally one big window there. It was non-compliant so they were asking for an exception.

Ms. Walker commented that the covenants probably required the look to stay the same.

Mr. Horcasitas said he was not aware of the covenants. He explained that after the HDRB review, the compound committee would meet.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods summarized the discussion

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H 07-135 determining that the applicant has met the exception criteria and the design was in harmony

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

8. **Case #H-07-138.** 617A Don Felix St. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Toba Tucker, owner/agent, proposes to construct a 6' high coyote fence with wooden gates on a contributing property where the maximum allowable height was 58". A height exception was requested (Section 14-5.2 D, 9). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"617-A Don Felix Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in 1933 in a

simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. There have been additions and replacement of windows at unknown dates. The 1998 Historic Cultural Property Inventory cites a 'low fence at front' where a stone wall exists today and it is presumed to be of historic date. A wooden pedestrian gate was installed in 1982. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The south elevation may be considered as primary.

"The applicant began to construct a fence without a permit or permission and a stop work order was issued in September 2007.

"Now, the applicant proposes to construct a coyote fence with level-cut pine latillas to a height of 72" to entirely enclose the property on all sides. The south, street-facing fence will be installed behind the existing stone wall and it will extend above the wall for 29". The maximum allowable height is 58" as determined by a linear calculation. A height exception is requested and the required responses are attached.

"The non-historic pedestrian gate will be removed and the new fence will have a 6' high wooden plank door. The east elevation fence will have a 51" high pine-covered metal pedestrian gate near the parking area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of this application unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exception needed for this project. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District design standards."

Mr. Rasch distributed letters of support for the Board [attached as Exhibit B].

Present and sworn was Ms. Toba Tucker, 617A Don Felix Street, Santa Fe, who apologized for not being aware of the need for a permit. She said she had been a resident for 5½ years as a tenant and the owner put it up for sale and she purchased it.

She said the windows were replaced in 1982.

She explained that on Nov 26, 2006, her house was broken into and she was robbed. She said she was a documentary photographer and lost photos and cameras in that robbery as well as her computer.

She said on June 4, she attended a meeting at Rape Crisis Center. At the meeting the police recommended that women living alone take measures to make sure they were not attacked.

So on July 11th, she put bars on the windows so she could sleep with windows open. She noted the windows were taken from a historic hacienda.

She said that on August 8th she became a first time homeowner at age 72. And on August 10th she installed an alarm system for her home.

She said that on Nov 13th she was going to put in a security door but it was too large and on Nov 14th she was robbed again. She said the robberies had changed her personality and she had become a fearful person. She said she was driven here to this meeting so she could leave her car in front of her house. She added that on Nov 16th there was another theft in her neighborhood. She said she was asking for this fence so she could not be observed.

She said she submitted photographs of the surrounding neighborhood with photos in the packet showing many fences six feet and higher. She also got a police report on the number of thefts there in 2006 and 2007 There were 19. She said a recently published report showed New Mexico as the second most dangerous state in the nation.

She said her neighbors felt she was enhancing the property and had no objection to the fence.

Chair Woods said she was truly sorry for what she had been through.

Mr. Barrow said he was very sympathetic. He thought they were in a very difficult place with the ordinance and what they were trying to do. He explained that the Board didn't have jurisdiction over legal issues and taking action to protect her home.

He asked her if her alarm system had a bell outside the home.

Ms. Tucker said it didn't until it was upgraded and there was one there now. She added that the police told her that the thieves knew they had five minutes before anyone would respond. She said the neighbors actually observed the thieves as they ran down the street with her possessions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Gudwin Herdt, who lived in Eldorado, said she had known Ms. Tucker for over 20 years and was a good friend. She said Ms. Tucker was aesthetically sensitive and would never do anything to make her home less attractive.

She said if the Board could consider making an exception, she thought it would be greatly appreciated and make her feel more safe.

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

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 07-138 to approve the exception to allow a six foot fence based on the responses the applicant gave for the exception

criteria, that it would not damage the streetscape, it would prevent a hardship to the applicant, it would strengthen the heterogeneous character of the City, it was due to special conditions peculiar to the land and structure because of its exposure, due to conditions not the result of the actions of the applicant, and it would provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section of the Code..

Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow felt the fence gave a false sense of security and other measures ought to be taken.

Ms. Walker asked if she had considered going to the animal shelter in addition to the fence.

Ms. Tucker explained that she could not have a dog.

The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Barrow who voted against.

Chair Woods said she hoped Ms. Tucker would take up photography again.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Chair Woods read a letter from Edith Brown on Don Cubero (the second letter received in the last month) who wrote that the meeting was an eye opener. I've never been called stupid in front of anyone I hadn't met before. She explained it was over her responses to the questions staff had instructed her to answer. She credited Mr. Rasch for trying to intervene but left feeling "beat up." She added that when she left she was pretty much in shock.

Chair Woods said the Board did represent the City and was concerned that it was the second time. She urged the Board members to keep in mind that they were just citizens coming before us. She said she would email Ms. Brown and was unhappy about the event.

Mr. Newman said they had to do with his behavior. He said when an architect comes before the Board, he expected them to have done their homework.

Chair Woods said she just didn't want people to leave here feeling beat up.

Ms. Rios commented that the last meeting was very hostile and it permeated the room. She thought it was awful. She said the Board members did need to treat them with respect without tearing them down. She felt there had been some hostility on the board

lately and she didn't like it.

Ms. Rios said the Christmas Party was potluck.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer