



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 5/8/13 TIME 9:20a

SERVED BY Carroll Verf

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, May 14, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 14, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 23, 2013
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-117	621 Old Santa Fe Trail	Case #H-13-026	222 Gonzales Rd/135 Lorenzo Rd.
Case #H-13-020	523 Canyon Road	Case #H-13-029	324 Camino Cerrito
Case #H-13-009	1020 Canyon Road	Case #H-13-028	855 E. Palace Avenue
Case #H-13-019	925 Old Santa Fe Trail	Case #H-13-031	940A E. Palace Avenue

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

1. Case#H-13-019. 925 Old Santa Fe Trail. Historic Review Historic District. John T. Midyette, agent for Charley Brewer, owner, proposes a preliminary hearing to remodel an existing structure and build an approximately 7,922 sq. ft., 22'6" addition, where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", at this non-stateded residence. An exception is requested to build above the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (John Murphey).
2. Case #H-13-032. 466 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Claire Lange, agent for Susan Larson, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, install roof-mounted mechanical equipment, and increase the height of this non-contributing building to 14'2" where the maximum allowable height is 16'4". (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-13-033. 733 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Lorn Tryk, agent for Henry and Barbara Oliver, owners, proposes to remove coyote latilla fences and replace them with a stuccoed yardwall at the street frontage to the maximum allowable height of 5'1" and a stuccoed yardwall on a side lot line to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a significant property. (David Rasch).

4. Case #H-13-034. 616 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Philip Alarid/Kiva Homes LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 1,656 sq. ft., 14'1" high, where the maximum allowable height is 14'2", single-story, single-family residence on an undeveloped piece of land. (John Murphey).
5. Case#H-13-035. 637 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott & Maika Wong, agent/owners, propose to demolish a 1,000 sq. ft. noncontributing residence and a 900 sq. ft. noncontributing attached casita. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-13-036. 60 E. San Francisco, Suite 301. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. O. Michael Duty, agent for Santa Fe Dining, owner, proposes to replace an awning on the third floor patio of this non-contributing building with a textile-covered steel pergola that matches the height of the adjacent portal. (David Rasch).
7. Case#H-13-038. 218 Ambrosio Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Christi Schackel, agent for Sam and Beth Geisenberger, owners, proposes to construct a 558 sq. ft. attached two-car garage and install 6'-high vehicular gate 30' back from street at this noncontributing residence. (John Murphey).

I. **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD: Vote on Nominations for Heritage Preservation Awards.**

J. **ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.



CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
 Agenda DATE 4/25/13 TIME 8:50a  
 SERVED BY *Camille York*  
 RECEIVED BY *[Signature]*

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, May 14, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

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

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 14, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 23, 2013
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-117	621 Old Santa Fe Trail	Case #H-13-026	222 Gonzales Rd/135 Lorenzo Rd.
Case #H-13-020	523 Canyon Road	Case #H-13-029	324 Camino Cerrito
Case #H-13-009	1020 Canyon Road	Case #H-13-028	855 E. Palace Avenue
Case #H-13-019	925 Old Santa Fe Trail	Case #H-13-031	940A E. Palace Avenue

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

1. Case#H-13-019. 925 Old Santa Fe Trail. Historic Review Historic District. John T. Midyette, agent for Charley Brewer, owner, proposes to remodel an existing structure and build an approximately 7,922 sq. ft., 22'6" addition, where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", at this non-stateded residence. An exception is requested to build above the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (John Murphey).
2. Case #H-13-032. 466 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Claire Lange, agent for Susan Larson, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, install roof-mounted mechanical equipment, and increase the height of this non-contributing building to the maximum allowable height of 14'2". (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-13-033. 733 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Lorn Tryk, agent for Henry and Barbara Oliver, owners, proposes to remove coyote latilla fences and replace them with a stuccoed yardwall at the street frontage to the maximum allowable height of 5'1" and a stuccoed yardwall on a side lot line to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a significant property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-13-034. 616 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Philip Alarid/Kiva Homes LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 1,656 sq. ft., 14'1" high, where the maximum allowable height is 14'2", single-story, single-family residence on an undeveloped piece of land. (John Murphey).

5. Case#H-13-035. 637 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott & Maika Wong, agent/owners, propose to demolish a 1,000 sq. ft. noncontributing residence and a 900 sq. ft. noncontributing attached casita. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-13-036. 60 E. San Francisco, Suite 301. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. O. Michael Duty, agent for Santa Fe Dining, owner, proposes to replace an awning on the third floor patio of this non-contributing building with a textile-covered steel pergola that matches the height of the adjacent portal. (David Rasch).
7. Case#H-13-038. 218 Ambrosio Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Christi Schackel, agent for Sam and Beth Geisenberger, owners, proposes to construct a 558 sq. ft. attached two-car garage and install 6'-high vehicular gate 30' back from street at this noncontributing residence. (John Murphey).

I. **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD: Vote on Nominations for Heritage Preservation Awards.**

J. **ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
May 14, 2013

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes April 23, 2013	Approved as amended	2-3
Communications	Awards announcement	3
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	3-4
Business from the Floor	None	4
Action Items		
1. <u>Case#H-13-019</u> 925 Old Santa Fé Trail	Approved with conditions	4-9
2. <u>Case #H-13-032</u> 466 Camino Don Miguel	Postponed with directions	9-11
3. <u>Case #H-13-033</u> 733 Galisteo Street	Tabled and Postponed	11, 20
4. <u>Case #H-13-034</u> 616 E. Alameda	Tabled and Postponed	17-20
5. <u>Case #H-13-035</u> 637 Garcia Street	Approved as recommended	13-14
6. <u>Case #H-13-036</u> 60 E. San Francisco, Suite 301	Denied	14-17
7. <u>Case #H-13-038</u> 218 Ambrosio Street	Approved with conditions	17-20
I. Matters from the Board	Discussion	20-21
J. Adjournment	adjourned at 7:00 p.m.	21

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

**May 14, 2013**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts 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, City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair  
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Dr. John Kantner  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assistant City Attorney  
Mr. John Murphey, Senior 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 Findings of Fact for 925 Old Santa Fé Trail were postponed because the case was on this agenda.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as amended with findings on Case #H-13-019 postponed to the next meeting. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**April 23, 2013**

Ms. Katz requested a change on page 23 rooftop appurtenances was misspelled.

In the Bold motion he did not think "toppings and yard stain" was accurate but was not sure what it was.

Dr. Kantner said it was the stain for the garage door and it was part of the findings of fact. The motion did have the use of the stain.

Ms. Katz requested a change on page 34, 2/3 down the page where Mr. Rasch referred to page 9 - the topographical survey should say "2' change in elevation."

On page 36, 3/4 down it should say wood paneling.

Ms. Rios requested a change on page 17 at the top should say, "Vice-Chair Rios said usually torrens were rounded."

Mr. Boniface requested a change on page 2 under approval of March 26 2013 minutes it should be changed to say "Mr. Boniface moved to approve the minutes as changed on page 8, paragraph 7 to read that "Ms. Gavin explained that it was another drafting error."

On page 6, in the last paragraph before public comments, it said, "Question on pavers" should read, "Mr. Boniface: please describe the reclaimed pavers for us." The answer would be, "Mr. McDowell: Pavers look like your fired adobe brick, half size, reclaimed."

On page 23, the first paragraph asked a question but didn't show who asked the question and it was Mr. Boniface who asked and there was more to the question. It should read, "Mr. Boniface: Does your recommendation reflect the east as the primary façade and is it possible to eliminate the dummy door and in-fill the opening with stucco?"

On the same page, fifth paragraph, should have a new sixth paragraph saying: "Mr. Boniface: What

color is that metal cap and how far down will it come over the brick? The new seventh paragraph would be as it reads and add at the end "and no rooftop appurtenances."

On page 38 under Communications with the Board, the last item before adjournment should say, "Mr. Boniface suggested that future applicants be asked to submit two sets of color samples and materials with the second set being available for Board members to review during the hearings."

Ms. Mather requested a change on page 11 in the last paragraph it should read in the next to last sentence "that the colors and roofing, (remove the word 'unit) windows and stucco."

On page 18 in the motion - it was not seconded by Ms. Mather because she was recused and not in the room. Mr. Katz made the motion. The applicant for the first case, Mr. Charley Brewer, said Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.

On page 31 in the center of the page, it said the motion was second by "Board Ms. Mather" and asked that "board" be deleted.

On page 36 toward the bottom where Mr. Boniface added "wood paneling" it should also say, "two single garage doors." And two lines down it should say, "Ms. Mather explained the discrepancy between 3,040 and 2,600 feet. Ms. Jenkins' response is 2,600 heated square feet. Garage and portals were included."

Mr. Rasch figured out the correction Mr. Katz requested on page 23. It should say "no copings and yardwall gate stains to be approved by staff."

**Ms. Mather moved to approve the minutes of April 23, 2013 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **E. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch said the Board was invited to the awards ceremony on May 30 at 6 pm at the NPS building.

## **F. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**Case #H-11-117 621 Old Santa Fé Trail**

**Case #H-13-020 523 Canyon Road**

**Case #H-13-0009 1020 Canyon Road**

**Case #H-13-019 925 Old Santa Fé Trail**

**Mr. Katz moved to postpone the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Case #H-13-019. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**Case #H-13-026 222 Gonzales Rd/135 Lorenzo Road**

**Case #H-13-029 324 Camino Cerrito**

Ms. Walker noted in the description at the second to last paragraph it said "addition" and it didn't say to what. She asked if it was to the residence.

Mr. Rasch assumed so and Mr. Murphey agreed.

**Case #H-13-028 855 E. Palace Avenue**

**Case #H-13-031 940A E. Palace Avenue**

**Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as amended. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

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

There was no business from the floor.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board could file the appeal to the Governing Body within fifteen days after date of the approval of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## **H. ACTION ITEMS**

Ms. Mather recused herself from consideration of this case and left the room.

- 1. Case #H-13-019. 925 Old Santa Fé Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John T. Midyette, agent for Charley Brewer, owner, proposes a preliminary hearing to remodel an existing**

structure and build an approximately 7,922 sq. ft., 22' 6" addition where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4", at this non-stated residence. An exception is requested to build above the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2 (D) (9)). (John Murphey)

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Situated to the relative north of Amelia White Park, the subject adobe house was constructed in 1974 after a design by architect, John T. Midyette III. The 2,847-square-foot, roughly L-plan adobe house exhibits a modern Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. It is non-stated in the Historic Review District.

### **Project**

The applicant appeared at the May 2, 2013 hearing with a request for an addition featuring a "torreon" structure with a pitched roof.

The Board found the applicant had not met the exception to build the torreon higher than the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D) (9)), nor the exception to use a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2 (D) (9) (d)). The Board, however, approved the addition without the torreon feature.

The applicant has revised the design to lessen the height and profile of this feature which is no longer an observation deck (the torreon) but now a roofed clerestory mass.

As a preliminary review, the Board may advise the applicant on the revised design and standards or exceptions that may be required. At the following hearing the Board will take action on the final application.

### **Addition**

Proposed across the house's relative west elevation is an approximately 7,922-square-foot addition. To be composed of adobe and presenting a complex footprint, the addition will take up the function of the older residence, and will include a bedroom wing, living/dining room area, expansive portal and a porte-cochere.

It is designed in the modern Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, with room-block massing, exposed wood beams and lintels and a wraparound portal with a standing-seam roof.

Fenestration will consist of mostly tall, rectangular Pella casement windows to match the remodeled house. It will be clad with synthetic "stucco" to match the older dwelling.

Near its center is now proposed a roofed clerestory mass. The feature, at approximately 19'-6" (where the maximum allowable height is 14'-0"), is the tallest point of the addition, and will require an exception to build higher than the allowed maximum height. It is proposed with either pitched (Option A) or flat roof (Option B). The first option will require an exception, as no roofs of this design are found in the radius "streetscape."

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff defers to the Board to render a preliminary recommendation on the revised design.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan or Mr. Murphey to explain how they determined the maximum allowable height.

Mr. Murphey said staff used a radius streetscape analysis from the center of where the door of this addition would be, using a City GIS layer, out 300' in all directions and picked up any roof that had a designated height. In this case, there was only the structure at Amelia White Park, another structure to the north at 25' 5". They had to discount that because the practice was to remove any non-historic house over 16' and the house itself.

Chair Woods clarified that it was only historic buildings that were chosen to include in determining the average maximum height in order to eliminate height creep. So there could be taller buildings in that radius but because they were not historic, they were not included in this determination.

Ms. Rios asked if the exception just referred to the pitched roof.

Mr. Murphey agreed but clarified that it was whether the Board agreed to the two designs and which one they would approve. It was somewhat of a grey area but it was a different feature.

Dr. Kantner asked if the Board approved the height last time. Mr. Murphey agreed - without the torreon feature.

Chair Woods asked him to explain what it meant that this was a preliminary hearing.

Mr. Murphey clarified that the Board was giving advice on which option of the proposal met code and the exceptions required and articulate that for the applicant who would come back for approval.

Chair Woods asked if either option required an exception.

Mr. Murphey said both options would require a height exception and if pitched, would require a pitched roof exception.

Ms. Walker asked if the Board chose a non-pitched option whether they could approve it at this meeting.

Mr. Murphey said that was a grey area because the Board just said no torreon feature but didn't specify another feature.

Mr. Rasch added that as a preliminary hearing, the Board could not approve a final application.

Mr. Katz asked why.

Mr. Rasch said that was what the applicant requested - a preliminary hearing. So it was published as a preliminary hearing.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Midyette, 1124 Canyon Road, who said that at the last meeting there was confusion. They thought they got approval for the height exception but not for the pitched roof. They revisited that pitched roof. What they revised as far as height went. The project sits a football field back from Old Santa Fé Trail and 70% of the structures around it were 2 story or least 1.5 stories tall.

He pointed to several of them on an aerial perspective and on the foam board. So he thought they had to justify the height. The Board approved 22' 6" but not the center portion where they had wanted the torreon which now was a clerestory and lowered to 19' 6". And they lowered the ceiling to 7' 6" which was the minimum we can do and the parapets would have to be higher to get the roof. That would create more of a barrier than if they did the pitched roof in the middle. He pointed out on the elevations where the 7' 6" parapet was located. It would be more of a jut than if they did the pitched roof option. Some of the parapets were 18' but the majority was lower.

Chair Woods concluded they had a difference of opinion between the applicant's understanding and staff's understanding and the Board needed to be clear on what they were voting on at this meeting.

Mr. Rasch said the Board did approve the height for the addition but clarified that if this new feature exceeded the height of the addition, a height exception was still needed of an excess of height above what the Board approved.

Chair Woods asked what was approved.

Mr. Murphey said in the record, it simply stated that- Frank Katz made a motion denying the height exception and the pitch exception or the torreon but approved the addition as presented. There was no further clarification.

Chair Woods asked what the height of the addition was.

Mr. Midyette said the highest height of the addition was 18'.

Chair Woods asked what the height of option A would be.

Mr. Midyette said the height of the pitch would be 19' 6". Plan B would be 22'. The original plan with the torreon was 22' 6".

Chair Woods explained to Mr. Midyette that because the new addition part would be higher than the 18' addition height, he would come back with a height exception.

Mr. Midyette thought the rest was clear.

Ms. Rios asked if the clerestory was still 14' square. Mr. Midyette agreed.

Mr. Katz asked why the corners had to be as high as they were.

Mr. Midyette said it was for the insulation, the 8" roof roll ups to flash against.

### **Public Testimony.**

Present and sworn was Mr. Matt Gills, 806 Old Santa Fé Trail, who had a gallery at 806 and also rented the house that was next to this property at 919 Old Santa Fé Trail. He said this would benefit their neighborhood. It was located way back behind the park and he didn't see height as an issue. He supported approval of the project.

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

Ms. Walker confirmed the height of Plan B was 22' high and Plan A was 19' 6".

Chair Woods asked if 19' 6" was to the top of the pitch.

Mr. Midyette said it was 19' 6" to the top of the peak.

Chair Woods had no problem with the pitch but had a little problem with the long narrow windows and asked if he could break that up with vertical mullions so it wouldn't be so long and narrow.

Mr. Midyette said he had a mullion every 20".

Chair Woods didn't realize that.

Mr. Midyette said there would be about four windows in that span.

Mr. Katz didn't have a problem with the height but thought it was visible from Old Santa Fé Trail. That was where the public would see it. It wasn't the height that bothered him as much as the pitched roof which wasn't in the neighborhood so he favored the flat roof option.

Mr. Midyette said Old Santa Fé Trail sits six feet lower than at the site. So people would be looking up and that feature was back in the middle of the house. He thought the top of the roof could just barely be seen from a public way.

Mr. Rasch said it would be visible from Amelia White Park.

Mr. Midyette added that the closer you get, the higher up you would have to look.

Mr. Katz asked how it would be from far to the east.

Mr. Midyette said the other buildings would block it completely. That feature was in the middle of the structure. He pointed it out on the floor plan. It was in the center of the structure.

Ms. Walker asked what the pitch would be.

Mr. Midyette said it would be 2.5: 12.

Ms. Walker said she would go for lower height with pitch any day.

Mr. Boniface recalled they approved the addition last time but to clarify further, Mr. Midyette showed on the north side a yard wall with a half-circle bump out and an outdoor fireplace which didn't show on the north elevation. So he asked how tall they would be.

Mr. Midyette said the yardwall was four feet high and the fireplace was a low kiva with a chimney about six to eight feet tall.

Chair Woods asked clarity that the yardwall was never more than four feet high.

Mr. Midyette agreed and added that it was less than 2 feet at the higher grade.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the preliminary design with Option A and directing the application to bring the finished plan with option A with responses to exceptions for pitch and height.

**Chair Woods asked to include vertical mullions on the clerestory and Ms. Rios accepted that as a friendly amendment. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Ms. Mather returned to the bench after the vote was taken.

- 2. Case #H-13-032. 466 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Claire Lange, agent for Susan Larson, owner, proposes to replace doors and windows, install roof-mounted mechanical equipment, and increase the height of this non-contributing building to 14' 2" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 4". (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

466 Camino Don Miguel is a single-family residence that was constructed by 1928 in the Spanish-

Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. All windows and doors will be replaced with units that will be clad in white and with divided lites that meet the 30" rule. Some opening dimensions will be altered.
2. The building will be increased in height from approximately 9' to approximately 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16' 4". The height increase will screen rooftop equipment.
3. The building will be restuccoed in El Rey cementitious "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.

Ms. Mather saw that the applicant wished to raise the parapet by 5' but understood the HVAC units were only 3' high.

Dr. Kantner said the height was on page 13.

Mr. Katz said the bedroom in back was now the kitchen. He asked if the ceilings there were going to change.

Present and sworn was Ms. Claire Lange, 1120 Don Juan Street, who was not sure what unit heights were of those they had investigated but they would choose the lowest possible profile.

Mr. Rasch said the Rheem unit was 30" high.

Mr. Katz asked for confirmation that the ceiling wouldn't change. Ms. Lange agreed.

Ms. Mather thought the profile of new parapets on this modest house seemed very high. It had a big eyebrow that was out of scale.

Ms. Lange agreed and she would like it as low as possible and if they didn't do any units on top they would keep it even lower.

Mr. Boniface said that looking at the submittal, both the existing and proposed, he didn't see a north arrow. He presumed it was to the bottom. Ms. Lange apologized and agreed it was to the bottom.

Mr. Boniface said he was really having a hard time matching elevations with the floor plan. It shows that the bedroom bumps out a foot and there were four or five setbacks where the current dining room was.

But when looking at the north elevation, the existing elevation showed just the opposite. It was showing it on the left and the middle mass was stepped back and he didn't see any reveal.

Ms. Lange said the reveal was on right hand side. It was a common wall that comes out.

Mr. Boniface asked where the alcove was.

Mr. Rasch pointed it out.

Chair Woods agreed that the elevations and floor plan did not match.

Chair Woods said her concern was with the height also. On page 13 it showed that the unit was to the far end of the house - all the way to the end. But if it were in the middle she could feed off the two parallel ducts and it would reduce the eyebrow. Lower parapets would be possible to just cover the ducts and the screen would look more like a chimney. It would be a better looking house and save money.

Ms. Lange agreed and she could do that.

Chair Woods reminded her that the Board would have to have resided drawings to approve.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Katz moved to postpone Case #H-13-32 to allow the applicant to research what unit they wanted and to take into consideration what Chair Woods recommended to move it to the left and hide with a screen either to next meeting or next one after. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case #H-13-033 733 Galisteo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Lorn Tryk, agent for Henry and Barbara Oliver, proposes to remove coyote latilla fences and replace them with stuccoed yardwall at the street frontage to the maximum allowable height of 5' 1" and a stuccoed yardwall on a side lot line to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a significant property. (David Rasch).

The applicant for this case was not present.

**Ms. Walker moved to table Case #H-13-033 to the end of the agenda. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 4. Case#H-13-034. 616 E. Alameda. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Phillip Alarid/Kiva Homes LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 1,656 sq. ft., 14' 1" high, where the maximum allowable height is 14' 2", single-story single-family residence on an undeveloped

piece of land. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Located near the end of a long private lane off East Alameda, Lot 7 is a roughly rectangular undeveloped lot. The lot is associated with the Rodriguez family, who owned the house to the west. The parcel holding the lot was subdivided several years ago, which has resulted in new construction and remodeling of existing residences along the lane.

**Project**

The applicant proposes to build a single-story, single-family residence.

The house, approximately 1,656' sq. ft. and 14'-2" high, where the maximum allowable height is 14'-2", will be designed in the modern Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, with rounded room-block massing and wood beams and lintels.

The front façade, facing west, will feature a recessed portal opening framed by multi-light windows. A wood-framed portal with French-type doors will break up the same location on the east elevation at the rear.

To the south, set back from the wall plane, is a one-car garage with decorative wooden doors.

The proposed windows are Sierra Pacific aluminum clad/wood interior divided light units in a light blue hue. The house will be finished with cementitious El Rey "Buckskin" stucco.

A low 4'-0" stucco-clad wall will frame the house's west elevation and form a courtyard. The wall will be interrupted near the front entrance by two 6'-0"-high stone posts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Ms. Walker noted that this project would exceed the allowable lot coverage. She asked if there was no problem for the zoning staff or if it was RM-1, it might not be in excess.

Mr. Rasch said it was zoned RC 8 AC.

Ms. Walker said the maximum lot coverage was 40% so she didn't know what to do.

Mr. Rasch said if the lot coverage was resolved it could be permitted.

Ms. Brennan said typically the Board asks that the zoning be acceptable before it approves a case.

Chair Woods asked Mr. O'Reilly about it and he left to find out the answer.

Present and sworn was Mr. Philip Alarid, 3217 Rinconada Circle who said the lot was just over 4,000 sq. ft. and the preliminary zoning review should have uncovered any discrepancies of lot coverage. The heated square footage of the house would be 1612 square feet.

Chair Woods said the percentage was calculated on the roofed area.

Mr. Alarid said the roofed area was 2,142 square feet.

Ms. Walker informed Mr. Alarid that the roofed area square footage could not exceed 1,600 square feet.

**Dr. Kantner moved to table Case #H-13-034 until an answer could be given. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

5. **Case #H-13-035. 637 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Scott & Maika Wong, agent/owners, propose to demolish a 1,000 sq. ft. noncontributing residence and a 900 sq. ft. noncontributing attached casita. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The subject property is a one-story, single-family and attached rental located on a tree-shaded lot off Garcia Street. The original house was constructed in the c.1940s with a "casita" addition made in c.1977. Together, the Spanish-Pueblo Revival-style residence is noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

#### **Project**

The applicant requests a status review and permission to demolish the combined structures.

#### **Main House**

Constructed in c.1944, out of hollow tile, the approximately 1,000-square-foot residence sits near the center of the lot. Essentially rectangular in plan, the house exhibits typical Spanish-Pueblo Revival design with its

block form, rounded parapets, recessed window openings and wood canales.

### **Casita**

To the relative north side of the house was appended in c.1977 an approximately 900-square-foot frame addition. The addition includes some of the same stylistic characteristics of the main house but rendered with less detail.

### **Integrity Issues**

Through a review of aerial photographs and field observation, the applicant has determined the house has experienced a number of alterations that would keep it in its noncontributing status. These include:

- The 1977 addition, which resulted in enclosing the front entry portal of the main house;
- The relocation of this entry to the southwest corner;
- The construction of a non-historic portal near the southeast corner.
- The c.1980s replacement of original windows on the main house with metal-clad units.

Considering these changes, the applicant feels the house should remain noncontributing.

During the site visit staff observed many of these alterations, noting that it had experienced significant massing change, changes of primary openings, and a change of historic material, principally the replacement of windows.

Staff recommends maintaining noncontributing status, as the house meets the code's definition of a noncontributing structure:

#### **NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE**

A structure, located in an Historic District, which is less than fifty years old and/or does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the Historic District (Ord. No. 2004-26 §6)

And to grant permission to demolish the combined residence.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of maintaining noncontributing status and, thereby approval of the application as submitted.

Present and sworn were Mr. Richard Martínez and Mr. Scott Wong who lived at 641 Garcia Street. Mr. Wong said he had nothing to add at this time.

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

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Dr. Kantner moved in Case #H-13-035 to approve the staff recommendation to allow demolish and to reaffirm the non-contributing status of the house. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 6. Case#H-13-036. 60 E. San Francisco, Suite 301. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. O. Michael Duty, agent for Santa Fé Dining, owner, proposes to replace an awning on the third floor patio of this non-contributing building with a textile-covered steel pergola that matches the height of the adjacent portal. (David Rasch)**

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

60 East San Francisco Street is a large commercial structure that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. The San Francisco Street façade has two stories while the Water Street façade has three stories. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to alter the outdoor dining deck by removing the existing retractable plastic awning and replacing it with a more permanent ramada. The ramada is designed in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. It will be approximately 9' high above the stuccoed wall and constructed with tube steel painted brown to match adjacent woodwork. Fabric covering will be applied to the roof and west side in the color "Buckskin Beige."

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Mr. Rasch said regarding the code issues clarification that in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District under recent Santa Fé Style (14-5.2 E 2 D) talked about how much of the façade had to be stucco and it said "or another material as approved." That meant the Board could approve another material.

For awnings in the sign ordinance, he found that the Board may approve cloth or other material not used for business signs. Ms. Brennan had brought up the fact that the Board already had a precedent setting case. He reminded the Board of the vendor booths last year for the flea market when the Board approved cloth.

Ms. Mather clarified that the project on the Old Santa Fé Trail at Paseo didn't have cloth as a roofing material.

Mr. Rasch agreed. I was just on the sides. This one would be on top too.

Chair Woods asked if tube steel was among the approved materials. Mr. Rasch said it was as "another material."

Present and sworn was Mr. Charles Rosenberg 404 Kiva Court, who had samples of the actual fabric and shared them with the board members.

Ms. Walker asked the applicant if he had considered alternatives to the steel tubing.

Mr. Rosenberg said they had not. He said tube steel was recommended by Santa Fé Awning, the manufacturer.

Ms. Rios asked if this was on the third story.

Mr. Rosenberg agreed. There was an existing portal and beyond that there was an uncovered porch. It would be attached to the uncovered porch with the awning on top and rolling down on west side.

Ms. Rios asked about the steel color.

Mr. Rosenberg said it would be painted to match the wood.

Dr. Kantner asked if the existing portals would also have this fabric on the west side.

Mr. Rosenberg said it already existed there now.

Dr. Kantner asked if that meant he was asking to double the use of the fabric. Mr. Rosenberg agreed.

Mr. Katz noted on the photo they had a step back and a further step back. He asked to what extent this addition get rid of that that step back and make the second and third floor look like it just went straight up.

Mr. Rasch agreed that the tubing would come up from the corner.

Mr. Rosenberg said he had a photo of a similar project of Santa Fé Awning that might help. He passed around the photo.

Mr. Katz asked if that photo was more or less how it would look. Mr. Rosenberg agreed.

Chair Woods understood Ms. Brennan to say the precedent was set with the flea market case. So she asked if the Board could allow the tube steel & fabric happen right downtown. She felt this would set a

precedent and others would come request a shade structure at their businesses downtown.

Ms. Brennan said she didn't intend for precedent to be the word.

Chair Woods thought they were setting a precedent because everyone wants to eat in the shade. They will point to the Board's approval of the pizza place.

Ms. Brennan said the Board acted on a case by case basis. But if the Board denied an application that was virtually the same as one the Board approved it might be open to questions.

Mr. Katz asked if there was a way to have the furthest support not right at the corner to so clearly make it a box and lose the setback.

Mr. Rasch said it was coming from the deck.

Mr. Rosenberg agreed; it was behind that guard rail.

Mr. Katz asked if it was possible to set it back further.

Mr. Rosenberg agreed it was possible.

Mr. Katz said the shade could come out further but not the support. It could cantilever a little.

Mr. Rosenberg said it was to be attached into the parapet but they could pull it back.

Mr. Boniface was concerned because it added sidewalks and the roof was out of fabric. If the Board substituted materials to stucco and wood it would bother him that they were enclosing this space. It appears to damage the nice massing and setbacks of the existing building.

Ms. Mather pointed out that with the flea market it was temporary structures that would be coming down seasonally. She asked if this was removable.

Mr. Rosenberg said it was intended to be seasonal because it could not take a snow load and people wouldn't dine out there in the winter. The roll down was permanent when the sun was coming in at the side.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods had concerns. She thought they were losing the setback and others would come forward and it was not harmonious with adjacent building and didn't meet 14-5.2 standards. So she was concerned about the proposal.

Mr. Rosenberg understood their concerns.

**Dr. Kantner moved in Case #H-13-036 to deny the application based on its violation of Section**

**14-5.2 E 2 d, Recent Santa Fé Style that the proposed materials didn't achieve harmony with adjacent historic buildings and also violated Section 14-5.2 D 9 f - Massing and floor setbacks. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 4. Case#H-13-034. 616 E. Alameda. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Phillip Alarid/Kiva Homes LLC, proposes to construct an approximately 1,656 sq. ft., 14' 1" high, where the maximum allowable height is 14' 2", single-story single-family residence on an undeveloped piece of land. (John Murphey).**

**Ms. Rios moved to remove from the table, Case #H-13-034 for further consideration. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. O'Reilly said in this zoning district an owner could exceed 40% lot coverage if they provided private open space but it was unclear where that would be provided so staff recommended postponing this case for that location to be determined.

Chair Woods asked if it was possible to provide the private open space on another lot.  
Mr. O'Reilly agreed that was possible.

Mr. Katz wasn't sure what private open space was versus public open space. He presumed that by the roadway would be public.

Mr. O'Reilly said the two types were titled "common" or "private." Private was for a particular dwelling unit only. So it couldn't be a driveway and there were dimensional standards. The site plan didn't show where it would be placed and that could affect the design of the building.

Ms. Walker asked if the amount of private open space would affect the lot coverage.

Mr. O'Reilly thought it could.

**Ms. Rios moved to postpone Case #H-13-034 to give the applicant an opportunity to show where the open space would be located. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 7. Case#H-13-038. 218 Ambrosio Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Christi Schackel, agent for Sam and Beth Geisenberger, owners, proposes to construct a 558 sq. ft. attached two-car garage and install 6' high vehicular gate 30' back from street at this noncontributing residence. (John Murphey)**

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Constructed in the c.1930s, 218 Ambrosio is a roughly L-plan building displaying a stripped down Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The house started as an adobe square, to which was added in c. 2006 a frame rectangular addition and portal, resulting in the "L" footprint. The house is noncontributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

### **Project**

The applicant proposes to build an attached garage and install a vehicular gate.

### **Garage**

To the west side of the house is proposed an approximately 588-square-foot, 12'-6" at maximum height, two-car garage attached to the non-historic portion of the house.

The garage will have a 2:12 sloped shed roof, covered with the same red metal roofing material found on the adjacent portal. It will be entered through a paneled overhead door. The door will be painted the same color of the garage, which will approximate the "Buckskin" color of the house. There are other pitched roofs on the street.

### **Vehicular Gate**

At 30' back from the street, install a two-leaf painted steel vehicular gate. The gate will consist of two 12'-wide, 6'-high picket panels hinged to square steel posts.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the application, as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and the standards of the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Section 14-5.2 (I).

Dr. Kantner asked for a comment on visibility of the pitched roof over the garage.

Mr. Murphey said it was oblique along Ambrosio and more oblique on St. Francis Drive.

Ms. Rios asked if the gate would have see-through elements.

Mr. Murphey agreed. It was a picket gate.

Present and sworn was Ms. Christi Schackel, 122 Valley Drive, who explained that the gate would have two six-foot panels and not two twelve-foot panels as given in the staff report. The client purchased this property during this last year in order to retire here. It was in need of TLC and she had done some interior

work to restore and give attention to the details. They were a real asset to the community. They have had security issues. The garage was not visible from the street except as mentioned.

Ms. Mather didn't have problems with their wish to build the garage there but had a problem with the pitch that didn't seem to be harmonious with the house.

Ms. Schackel said it was designed to pick up with the slope of the portal. Metal roofs have to be a little steeper and the pitch was along the west and not visible. She pointed it out on the elevation and said it would be lower.

Chair Woods asked if the parapets were on two sides and drained.

Ms. Schackel agreed and explained that it gives logical drainage there and the reverse side near the parapet was not visible from anywhere.

Chair Woods thought it would look like western storefront.

Ms. Walker asked what the slope was.

Ms. Schackel said the manufacture recommended 2:12 as far down as possible. The garage span was 22' so it was as minimum as they could get it. It height was a big issue, they could perhaps drop the plate down on the west side to lower it a little. It was convenient because it went right into the existing parapet there and then had the six inch flashing detail. It followed a traditional accretion style building

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked if the roof color was red.

Ms. Schackel agreed and showed the red roof sample and the stucco sample in the lighter tone that matched the existing vocabulary there. The gate would be flat black.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-13-038 per staff recommendation and as submitted. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Walker asked for an amendment to have the gate color match the stucco color. Ms. Mather agreed it was friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case #H-13-033 733 Galisteo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Lorn Tryk, agent for Henry and Barbara Oliver, proposes to remove coyote latilla fences and replace them with stuccoed yardwall at the street frontage to the maximum allowable height of 5' 1" and a stuccoed yardwall on a side lot line to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a significant property. (David Rasch).

**Ms. Walker moved to remove Case #H-13-033 from the table and postpone it to the next meeting. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Ms. Walker pointed out that at Camino Escondido and Canyon Road the owners of the gallery recently restuccoed and painted five protruding vigas on the west side a stark white. She asked that staff look into it and have them shave it down to the natural wood or whatever staff would recommend.

Her other concern was at Canyon Road and Camino de Monte Sol on the southeast corner. They stuccoed exterior in two very different colors and stuck a bunch of rock work in the wall facing Canyon Road that was not typical of the district. She was told the reason they got to do it was because of the stature of the owner. She trusted that would never be taken into account. She asked staff to look into it.

Mr. Rasch agreed to bring a report back.

The Board reviewed the nominees for historic awards and cast their ballots for their choices. Chair Woods listed the presenters.

Ms. Schackel asked the Board if they could look into the problem of the proliferating twinkling lights.

Chair Woods asked if she could bring that concern back under Matters from the Public at the next meeting. Christ agreed.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved by:



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer