



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 2/11/12 TIME 9:40  
SUBMITTED BY Camille Veyl  
RECEIVED BY Pat Lopez

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, February 14, 2012 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, February 14, 2012 at 5:30 P.M.

## CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES January 24, 2012
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case # H-11-137 403 Canyon Road  
Case # H-12-001A 939 ½ Acequia Madre  
Case # H-12-001B 939 ½ Acequia Madre

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

1. Case #H-11-039. 8 Camino Pequeno. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Satzinger, agent for Larry & Michelle Martin, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residential property with height increases and other improvements. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-117. 621 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Wayne Lloyd, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes an historic status review of one of three contributing commercial structures. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-119. 411 San Antonio Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Wong, agent for Lewis Kaufman/Anna Davis, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residence with window changes, height changes, and to demolish the remainder of the existing building. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-136A. 576 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Louis Briones, agent for Keri Spiller, owner, proposes an historic status review of a non-statused garage and shed. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-136B. 576 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Louis Briones, agent for Keri Spiller, owner, proposes to alter windows on the west elevation of the contributing residential building and to install a vehicular gate at the driveway. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-143. 207 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Annette Vigil, agent for Andres & Lorren Viamonte, owners, proposes to reconstruct a former second-story portal at less than the adjacent parapet height and replace a square post with a viga post on a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).

7. Case #H-12-002. 645 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent, for Jo Lynn Wilson, owner, proposes to re-roof, replace windows, construct a chimney, install skylights, reconstruct a portal floor, and re-stucco a non-contributing residential property. (John Murphey).
8. Case #H-12-004. 104 Calle La Pena. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Brian Vorig, agent/owner, proposes to restore a pedestrian gate opening on a yardwall where a non-historic infill exists on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-12-005A. 9 Camino Pequeno. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. BC Rimbeaux, agent for BC Rimbeaux and Carlie Lines, trustees/owners, proposes an historic status review of this contributing residential building. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-12-005B. 9 Camino Pequeno. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. BC Rimbeaux, agent for BC Rimbeaux and Carlie Lines, trustees/owners, proposes to demolish this residential building and associated yardwalls. (David Rasch).
11. Case #H-12-006. 617 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Satzinger, agent for Doug & Peggy McDowell, proposes to construct a 2,624 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 16'8" where the maximum allowable height of 16'10" on a vacant lot. (David Rasch).
12. Case # H-11-144. 622 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Judd Kleinman, owner, proposes to remodel an existing yard walls by constructing pilasters, installing metal pedestrian gates, and increasing the height of the walls with additional stuccoed mass and iron fencing to 6' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 10" on a contributing residential property. A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).
13. Case #H-12-003. 204 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stephen Walker, agent for Stephen and Gail Walker, agents, propose to construct a 577 sq. ft. addition and install a window at a former door infill on the south elevation of a significant residential structure, remove a non-historic carport, and construct a low picket fence. Two exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and at less than 10 feet back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. If you wish to attend the February 14, 2012 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, February 14, 2012.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
February 14, 2012

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes January 24, 2012	Approved as presented	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2
Communications	Discussion	2
Business from the Floor	None	2-3
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H 11-039</u> 8 Camino Pequeño	Postponed	3
2. <u>Case #H-11-117</u> 621 Old Santa Fé Trail	Designated non-contributing	3-5
3. <u>Case #H-11-119</u> 411 San Antonio Street	Approved with conditions	5-7
4. <u>Case #H-11-136A</u> 576 Camino del Monte Sol	Designated non-contributing	7-8
5. <u>Case #H-11-136B</u> 576 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved as recommended	8-9
6. <u>Case #H-11-143</u> 207 Sena Street	Postponed with directions	9-11
7. <u>Case #H-12-002</u> 645 Old Santa Fé Trail	Approved with condition	11-13
8. <u>Case #H-12-004</u> 104 Calle La Pena	Approved as recommended	13-14
9. <u>Case #H-12-005A</u> 9 Camino Pequeño	Designated non-contributing	14-15
10. <u>Case #H-12-005B</u> 9 Camino Pequeño	Approved with conditions	15-16
11. <u>Case #H-12-006</u> 617 Garcia Street	Approved with conditions	16-17
12. <u>Case #H-11-144</u> 622 Gomez Road	Approved with conditions	17-19
13. <u>Case #H-12-003</u> 204 E. Santa Fé Avenue	Postponed with direction	19-24
Matters from the Board	Discussion	24-26
Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:30 p.m.	26

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

**February 14, 2012**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair  
Mr. Rad Acton [arriving later]  
Dr. John Kantner  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair [excused]

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

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

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

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Rasch reported that case #1 was postponed to the next meeting.

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

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 24, 2012**

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of January 24, 2012. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

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

Case #H-11-137	403 Canyon Road
Case #H-12-001A	939½ Acequia Madre
Case #H-12-001B	939½ Acequia Madre

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

#### **F. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch announced that the next meeting on February 28 would be in the Lamy Room at the Convention Center.

He also announced that May 25 would be the date for the 2012 Historic Preservation awards at the Masonic Lodge Library.

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, who showed several photographs she had taken of various places in Santa Fé.

Mr. Acton arrived as she was preparing to speak about her pictures.

She showed a casita at 610 Galisteo where the curb had been expanded. She had complained to Mr. O'Reilly since last year and now the contractor was going to just remove it but she thought that would destroy the house and they were not coming to HDRB for any of it. They added the curb onto the new addition. She didn't know why Mr. O'Reilly didn't want to bring them to the HDRB.

She showed the Restaurant Martin and the poles for their tent that had been up since October. The poles were in the ground and blocking the primary façade.

Next she showed the Slurp Air Stream food vendor on Galisteo. It had an electric box on the trailer that was attached to the electric pole so it was a fixed structure.

She also showed the Air Stream trailer at 502 Old Santa Fé Trail which was connected to the building on the next lot to the south. It didn't comply with the Historic Code. When stored on a property the trailers have to be screened from public view. This one was not.

The last one was on a picture of a structure on West Manhattan that was falling down. The stucco was falling off and was likely to hurt someone. Zoning didn't seem to care. At the least they should require the owner to put tarps on the wall. She asked why these historic issues were going to Zoning. She had been told that a Zoning official went out to this property and told the owner not to worry.

Regarding the vendors she related that Mr. O'Reilly claimed they were itinerant vendors. But those were for Fiestas and Indian Market. Itinerant vendors have no location. She quoted that from the code. She added that the vendors at the plaza shouldn't be on public property so she wondered about them, too.

There were no other speakers for Business from the Floor.

## **H. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Case #H-11-039** 8 Camino Pequeño. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Satzinger, agent or Larry & Michelle Martin, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residential property with height increases and other improvements. (David Rasch)

This case was postponed to February 28 under Approval of the Agenda.

2. **Case #H-11-117** 621 Old Santa Fé Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Wayne Lloyd, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes an historic status review of one of three contributing commercial structures. (David Rasch)

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

621 Old Santa Fé Trail is a commercial building that has been altered over time. It was originally constructed in a vernacular manner before 1928. Alterations include architectural character revision in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. Aerial photographs show alterations of additions to building 1, 2, and 3 including an "L"-shaped portal on the south and west elevations of building 1 and 2 between 1958 and 1966. The northeast wing, building 3, was originally a free-standing outbuilding. Additions were placed on the south elevation of building 3 after 1966. Most of the character defining elements can be found on the west and south elevations of the front block with historic windows in good condition. The shed roof with rafter tails and historic windows on the north elevation of building 3 are in good condition.

On October 25, 2011, the HDRB confirmed the contributing historic status for all three buildings with the west and south elevations of buildings 1 and 2 as primary without the non-historic portal and with the north elevation of building 3 as primary.

Now, the applicant has provided additional information about building 3 and requests a reassessment of the structure's historic designation. Research in aerial photographs indicates that the structure had several non-historic alterations in massing, openings, and characteristic details such as protruding vigas. In fact, the south elevation has been altered over time and that is the reason for the north elevation being designated as primary. That primary elevation has no public visibility and is very close to the north lotline.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends downgrading the historic status of building 3 from contributing to non-contributing due to substantial non-historic alterations.

Present and sworn was Mr. Wayne Lloyd, 501 Halona, who apologized for not having this research on building 3 at the last hearing. He shared a series of aerial pictures in order to describe the history of the changes that took place there. It had been altered many times from 1958 through 1966 and again in 1978 and 1995.

In 1958 the portal was not there. He pointed to a darker portion that was possibly a courtyard and a fountain. There was no portal on the west side. By 1966, the two buildings were joined; the portal opened and two separate portals were placed on the south side. By 1973 there were fewer roof parapets. That building was once a livery stable. It appeared that the whole roof was raised by a couple of feet. There was no roof deck but a pergola structure was added.

In 1988 there was a portal added and an addition on the south side in place of one of the portals. The pergola was gone and the viga ends had been patched. By 1995 the portal was not yet added on the southeast but in 2001, that corner was filled in with a portal. He showed where it was evident that the vigas were cut off. A window specialist examined the windows. There was a door filled in. The windows were Marvin windows from the 1980s.

He pointed out down the north side the evidence of the lower wall height. They believed the roof was raised twice. The little building was of concrete block in 1966.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board had fifteen days from the date that Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were approved to file an appeal to the City Council.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve the staff recommendation in Case #H-11-117 to downgrade building 3 to non-contributing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

*[Stenographer's note: The HDRB did not take action on October 25, 2011 to maintain the contributing status of Building #3 at 621 Old Santa Fé Trail as stated in the staff report because there was no HDRB meeting on October 25, 2011. Such an action was taken by the HDRB at their meeting on November 8,*

2011. The motion above did not explicitly reconsider that action or rescind the action taken but by implication reversed the decision made at the November 8, 2011 meeting regarding the historic status of Building #3.]

3. **Case #H-11-119** 411 San Antonio Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Wong, agent for Lewis Kaufman/Anna Davis, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residence with window changes, height changes, and to demolish the remainder of the existing building. (David Rasch)

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

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

411 San Antonio Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner with Mediterranean style tile roof at approximately the 1920s. The tile was removed and a Spanish-Pueblo Revival portal was constructed along with other additions and conversion of the garage at unknown dates. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On November 8, 2011, the HDRB approved an application to substantially remodel the property. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the previous approval with the following three items.

1. The remainder of the standing adobe walls will be removed due to their deteriorated condition as described by the Building Official. Some wall heights will be increased from what was previously approved, but they remain within the maximum allowable height of 16' 3" and they retain a stepped massing.
2. Many minor changes to windows are proposed, as submitted.
3. The north lotline yardwall will be raised from 4' to the maximum allowable height of 6'.

#### **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.

Chair Woods said to Ms. Brennan or Mr. Rasch that essentially this building had been demolished so she asked if the Board was seeing this as new construction or something else.

Mr. Rasch said he had checked with the building inspector and the applicant would address it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Scott Wong, 324 Sanchez who said there were a couple of window changes from the drawings submitted. The owners decided to leave the windows with the original pattern that was previously approved by the Board (#9 and 10 on his list).

The increase in height was over the master bedroom on the south elevation and the kitchen by one foot



and also on a little room off the master bedroom. They had a miscalculation on ceiling heights and would be leaving the maximum at 14' 6".

Chair Woods asked what size the structure would be. Mr. Wong said they were proposing 2,645 square feet.

Ms. Mather asked for him to review the window changes.

Mr. Wong said the four small ones were lowered to 20" above the portal on the north and the same on the east elevation.

On the south they would stay at 24". He removed the window at the storage/mechanical room. They added a steel grid for foliage.

Ms. Mather asked if on that south elevation they were changing the pattern.

Mr. Wong said the owners decided to stay with what the Board had approved. On the back east elevation they had to change the windows at the master bedroom for egress and bumped the corner out in order to keep them at least 3' from the corner. That squeezed out the window in the den so they decided to remove the pergola there to allow a grill area off the kitchen. So they would keep the four-lite pattern.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. John Agresto, 417 San Antonio, an immediate neighbor, who was very pleased that this house was going up next to them. It was remarkable. The neighbors say "bravo."

Ms. Walker asked if they had considered redwood for the trellis for vines instead of steel.

Mr. Wong said the owners wouldn't be opposed to redwood.

Chair Woods asked if their windows were now bronze and not white. Mr. Wong agreed.

Chair Woods asked what the height from natural grade would be.

Mr. Wong said it would be 14' 6" in front and 14' 3" at back at natural grade.

Chair Woods reminded the Board they had already approved the stucco color.

**Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-11-119 with the changes that were mentioned and finding that they met the statutory criteria. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Mather asked for an amendment that window pattern would remain as originally approved with bronze color and that the height would not exceed 14' 6" from grade. Mr. Katz accepted that as a friendly amendment and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

4. **Case #H-136A** 576 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Louis Briones, agent for Keri Spiller, owner, proposes an historic status review of a non-statused garage and shed. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

576 Camino del Monte Sol, known as the Josef Bakos House, was a single-family residence that was constructed by 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with an addition on the south after 1950. Other alterations are present. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. A small, low, free-standing garage/carport/shed was constructed before 1960 at the southwest rear of the property. This accessory structure has no historic status designation.

The 1992 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory recommends that the so-called "Bakos shops" structure be designated as non-contributing to the District. The building has historic integrity but it is not in a good state of preservation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board designate the shops as contributing due to the historic integrity and cultural association with an important Cinco Pintore with the west elevation designated as primary.

Present and sworn was Mr. Louis Briones, 576 Camino del Monte Sol, who had nothing to add to the staff report. It was in bad shape and they wanted a status designation that would allow them to fix it.

Dr. Kantner asked how important it was that the building has either structural integrity or good preservation. It didn't seem to have that at all.

Mr. Rasch said section B in the code required owners to maintain the property. If in bad enough repair, the Board could require it to be replaced in kind.

Ms. Walker noted that the applicant said they wanted to know the status in order to repair it.

Mr. Rasch said if the Board designated it as Contributing they would need to designate a primary elevation. He recommended the west elevation. If there was any defining character on that elevation they need to preserve that character. If it was not contributing they could repair it the way they wanted to demolish it. If it was contributing, the Board could still require retention of architectural features.

Ms. Mather didn't see much architectural character but heard there were murals inside by Bakos and the Board didn't have jurisdiction over them.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He referred the owner to an art appraiser.

Chair Woods asked him what architectural feature he felt was worthy of preservation.

Mr. Rasch said it was really beyond repair.

**Ms. Mather moved in Case 11-136A to designate these shops as non-contributing. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

5. **Case #H-11-136B** 576 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Louis Briones, agent for Keri Spiller, owner, proposes to alter windows on the west elevation of the contributing residential building and to install a vehicular gate at the driveway. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

576 Camino del Monte Sol, known as the Josef Bakos House, is a single-family residence that was constructed by 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with an addition on the south after 1950. Other alterations are present, including on the west elevation. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the north and east elevations recommended as primary.

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

1. A paired single-lite casement window opening on the west elevation will be expanded for installation of three paired casement windows with divided-lites. There was no proof given as to whether this window is historic or not, but the window opening is of historic date.

2. A carved wooden arched 12' wide x 6' 6" high vehicular gate will be installed at the driveway entrance on the west side of the residence. Associated with the gate were the automated controls and an intercom system as well as an iron lantern-style light fixture.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

He pointed out the west elevation with a non-historic addition and the drawings for the new windows and the gate and the equipment. For the light fixture they were going to reproduce the one in the photo.

Mr. Briones said the gate was more important than anything else because they had been broken into already.

Ms. Walker asked if they had considered a fenestrated gate.

Mr. Briones said they had and explained the slope of the driveway.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-11-136B per staff recommendations. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

6. **Case #H-11-143** 207 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Annette Vigil, agent for Andres & Lorren Viamonte, owners, proposes to reconstruct a former second-story portal at less than the adjacent parapet height and replace a square post with a viga post on a non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

207 Sena Street is a two-story single-family residence that is part of a duplex which was constructed in approximately 1982 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. A portal will be reconstructed at the east elevation second-story deck. The portal roof will be lower than the existing adjacent parapet and the roof slope with canale drainage on the residence will be changed from east to north. The shed roof on the portal will be finished with clay tiles in various colors from terracotta to darker reddish brown.

2. The square post at the southeast corner entry portal on the ground floor will be removed and replaced with a viga post that is stained to match existing woodwork.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Ms. Mather noted that this property had been before the Board at various times.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It came forward a couple of times and got postponed and now they had a roof sample for the Board.

Present and sworn was Ms. Annette Vigil who brought samples of the tile and photos of what they wanted. She shared them with the Board.

Chair Woods pointed out that these samples were concrete tile, not clay, but the application said clay.

Ms. Vigil thought visually they would not look different. The sample had a variety of six colors.

Present and sworn was the owner, Ms. Lorren Viamonte, who said the clay tiles were too large for this little porch. This tile gave it a muted old world look and matched other homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Acton had reservations because that feature didn't appear in any other location on the house and would be anomalous. He understood it would soften things on the house but would like to see the style tied in on the house, maybe on the south elevation.

Ms. Walker repeated that the application called for clay tile.

Ms. Vigil thought it was clay but this was what she wanted to use. It was a different material and a different look. She would like that revision to the application.

Ms. Walker suggested that she could consider coming back with clay.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch about such material in this district. She wondered if cement tile was okay for the Don Gaspar Historic District or if it was not typical in the streetscape.

Mr. Rasch said the standards for this district didn't address roof materials.

Chair Woods noted there was a section on roof materials.

Mr. Rasch clarified that it talked about roof forms. He didn't see anywhere it talked about roof materials and that was why he thought this would be acceptable. He didn't know if there were any other cement tiles in the area. He thought these were similar to clay tiles.

Chair Woods had a lot of concern about concrete tiles. They used them in Phoenix and Albuquerque but she had not seen any in the historic district. She was not convinced it was something that should be introduced in the historic district.

She asked Ms. Vigil if her client might consider a change. The wall had a severe façade and asked if she would consider a railing instead.

Ms. Vigil understood. They were trying to keep the expense down. The parapet was already there on that deck. There was a photo that showed a portal and she believed that was part of the original construction.

**Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case #H-11-143 until the applicant submitted a clay tile proposal. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Acton who voted against.**

7. **Case #H-12-002** 645 Old Santa Fé Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Jo Lynn Wilson, owner, proposes to re-roof, replace windows, construct a chimney, install

skylights, reconstruct a portal floor and re-stucco a non-contributing residential property. (John Murphey)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

645 Old Santa Fé Trail is a one-story, essentially rectangular plan adobe and CMU residence exhibiting a modest display of the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The house is non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The origin of the house is unclear. The 1912 King's map shows a small, L-plan dwelling owned by R. Griego situated on a different part of the property than the subject house. As evidenced by reference to aerial maps, the house took its current form by 1967. The existence of steel casement windows suggests either a mid-century construction or a remodeling of an earlier dwelling.

The applicant proposes to remodel the residence with the following items:

- 1) Replace windows with true divided light, insulated glass casement units; the interior portion will be wood; the exterior aluminum clad coated in an aqua ("Sage Green"). These units will replace a mixture of non-historic windows, mostly of a steel casement design. All openings will remain the same size
- 2) Create an opening and install a 30"x48" egress window on south elevation. There is no public visibility of this elevation.
- 3) Demolish and reconstruct roof over the living room portion of house; include installation of two 24"x60" skylights. Work will not result in a change of parapet height or visibility of the skylights from street.
- 4) Install separate 24"x60" skylight near west end of roof; unit will not be visible from street.
- 5) Construct stucco-clad chimney stack, rising approximately 2'.5" feet above parapet. Stack will be at the same height as an existing chimney.
- 6) Clad house with El Rey "Adobe" color cementitious stucco. Work will include adding 2-inch foam insulation. Where fenestration occurs, existing material will be removed to accommodate the increased thickness. Woodwork will be stained to match existing color.
- 7) Reconstruct cement walk under entry portal. Finished work will match color (brown) and finish of existing material.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the application, which complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design

Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Stefan Merdler who felt Mr. Rasch adequately addressed what they were trying to do. At this point the applicant was not absolutely sure on the color of the cladding because of available supplies. He said she would like to give her feelings.

Present and sworn was the owner, Ms. Jo Lynn Wilson, who said the color from the computer was not what they anticipated. What they saw was more of a sage green and she wanted more of a turquoise color. That was the only issue they currently had.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Pen La Farge, 647 Old Santa Fé Trail, who offered to help answer questions since he lived next door to the subject property all his life. He was comfortable with what they were proposing.

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

Mr. Merdler said currently the steel casement windows were turquoise blue and she wanted to get closer to that color than what the computer file showed.

Chair Woods mentioned that some companies would do custom colors for additional cost.

Ms. Walker noted on the south elevation that a 30x40 egress window was proposed but on the drawing for the south elevation both windows appeared to be the same size.

Mr. Merdler said that should be listed on the east elevation for egress.

Ms. Walker thought that might explain why they looked the same.

Dr. Kantner noted there was a new window on the east but that was for the guest bath.

Mr. Merdler clarified that the proposed west elevation at the left side showed that egress window at the bottom of page 4.

Ms. Walker understood it was just the wrong elevation.

Chair Woods asked if it had any publicly visible rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Merdler said it didn't.

Chair Woods asked about exterior light fixtures.

Mr. Merdler said there were no changes to any lighting.

**Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-12-002 per staff recommendation with the window color to**

**be taken to staff for review and approval. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Rasch clarified that regarding the confusion on the elevation that he would go by the drawings which were correct.

- 8 Case #H-12-004** 104 Calle La Pena. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Brian Vorig, agent/owner, proposes to restore a pedestrian gate opening on a yardwall where a non-historic infill exists on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

104 Calle la Pena is a single-family residence and a free-standing guest house that were constructed before 1963 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. A tall street-fronting stuccoed yardwall was constructed at an unknown date and a section was altered in the 1970s by removing bileaf wooden gates and infilling a wall portion to install a smaller iron gate.

The applicant proposes to restore the wider opening and install bileaf wooden gates. The height of the existing yardwall will not be altered. The gates are similar to other existing gates in this wall with the addition of spindled-grilles for visual access.

**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 asked about color of the gate.

Present and sworn was Mr. Brian Vorig who said the wood for the gate would be stained a darker brown like those of surrounding residences.

Ms. Mather asked if the project had any new lighting. Mr. Vorig said no.

Ms. Walker clarified that the road to the east was Abeyta, not Poñiente.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H-12-004 as recommended by staff with the gate stained a darker brown. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**



9. **Case #H-12-005A** 9 Camino Pequeño. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. BC Rimbeaux, agent for BC Rimbeaux and Carlie Lines, trustees/owners, proposes an historic status review of this contributing property (David Rasch)

Ms. Walker announced that she took care of the transaction for buying and selling and now had no financial gain for this case. No one asked her to be recused.

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

9 Camino Pequeño is a single-family residence with attached studios that were constructed in 1950 in a vernacular manner as horse stables. It is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The 1983 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory recommends contributing status, but a recently completed inventory recommends a downgrade in historic status to non-contributing due to a lack of conformity to the required Santa Fé Style in this district and the lack of public visibility.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends an historic status downgrade from Contributing to Non-contributing in compliance with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Historic Structures.

Ms. Mather asked who did the recent inventory.

Mr. Rasch said Katherine Colby did the inventory.

Ms. Walker said there were mistakes in the report. She had given Mr. Rasch a copy of the plat that showed the stables existed in 1940; not 1950. On page six of the HCPI, "Gentle Nudge" was the dude ranch. She pointed out several other errors on it that needed correcting.

Present and sworn was Mr. Brooks White who explained that the applicant was out of state and he agreed with the findings of surveyor and recommendations of staff.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Acton moved to approve the staff recommendations for Case #H-12-005A to downgrade the property to non-contributing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

10. **Case #H-12-005B** 9 Camino Pequeño. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. BC Rimbeaux, agent for BC Rimbeaux and Carlie Lines, trustees/owners, proposes to demolish this residential building and associated yardwalls. (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

If 9 Camino Pequeño was downgraded to non-contributing, then the applicant requests approval to demolish the structures on the property. If the property was not downgraded, then an exception request for demolition of an historic structure will be required before the application can be heard by the Board. The City Building Official has determined that the structure does have structural and code compliance problems.

As per Section 14-3.14 Demolition of Historic Structures, staff has determined that the structures are not historically important, are not an essential part of a streetscape, and the structures are less than 75 years old.

However, there are two tracts shown on the plat. Tract A is 1.015 acres and holds all of the residential structures. The Barker Tract is 1.541 acres and part of the yardwalls are on this tract. This property is located within the River and Trails Archaeological Review District where there is a 2 acre threshold for archaeological investigation. Without a lotline adjustment, it appears that 2.556 acres need to be cleared before a demolition permit can be issued if approved by this Board.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board grant approval for demolition with the condition that a Summary Committee lotline adjustment to include all structures at less than two acres be approved or that ARC clearance be approved before a demolition permit application is submitted. In addition, the HCPI consultant recommends that the structures be appropriately documented before demolition.

Ms. Walker said there were three tracts; not two. They had a total of 2.75 acres.

Mr. White had nothing to add to the staff report except that they just purchased the property and had lived in the neighborhood. The owner was the mayor domo of the acequia behind. They purchased it in order to preserve this property. They wanted to replace the family house with a modest home to recreate the same character on that property.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H-12-005B per staff recommendations granting the applicant the right to demolish this structure with the condition that a Summary Committee lotline adjustment to include all structures at less than two acres be approved or that Archaeological Review Committee clearance be approved before a demolition permit application is submitted and that the structures be appropriately documented before demolition.. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 11. Case #H-12-006** 617 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. James Satzinger, agent for Doug & Peggy McDowell, proposes to construct a 2,624 sq. ft. single family residence to a

height of 16' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 10" on a vacant lot. (David Rasch)

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

617 Garcia Street is a 6,792 square foot vacant lot in the Las Placitas Compound within the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The HDRB previously granted a maximum allowable height of 16' 10".

The applicant proposes to construct a 2,624 square foot single-family residence with an attached garage in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The 16' 8" high building features stepped massing with rounded corners and parapets. Divided-lite windows and doors will be bronze clad, wood will be a medium brown stain, and stucco will be El Rey "Adobe." Roof-mounted solar panels will be installed below parapet lines.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that yardwalls shall not exceed 6' high at any point on the higher grade sides.

Present and sworn was Mr. Doug McDowell, 1617 Cerro Gordo who shared a rendering of the proposal to the board members. [Exhibit 1] He said they would like to have Cobalt Blue on the windows instead of bronze and secondly , they would like to change the square posts to round vigas and round posts.

Ms. Mather said on the south elevation the rendering of the garage doors was different that the drawings in the packet.

Mr. McDowell agreed. The drawing didn't show much. It would be like a carriage door with wooden spindles on the top of it.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-006 with the conditions that the windows be Cobalt Blue, that square beams and posts could be changed to round ones and the design of the garage door would be a carriage style as depicted in the rendering. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 12. Case #H-11-144** 622 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Judd Kleinman, owner, proposes to remodel an existing yard wall by constructing pilasters, installing metal pedestrian gates and increasing the height of the walls with additional stuccoed mass and iron fencing to 6' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 10" on a contributing residential property. A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D) (9)). (David Rasch)

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

622 Gomez Street is a single-family residence that was constructed by 1938 in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. The existing south yardwall will be redesigned with the removal of angled wall tops, increasing the height of the stuccoed yardwall, constructing pilasters flanking the pedestrian gate opening.

2. The yardwall will be increased in height on all three elevations with the installation of a metal railing with finials on top of the stuccoed yardwalls to 6' where the maximum allowable is 4' 10". A height exception (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) is requested and the required responses are at the end of this report.

3. The two existing metal pedestrian gates will be removed and replaced with new metal gates that match the new height.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the height exception for the fence extension on the yardwall. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

**WALL/FENCE HEIGHT EXCEPTION:**

1. Do not damage the character of the streetscape

Approval of the requested addition of railing would not damage the character of the streetscape nor diminish the character of the district. The addition of railing is small in size and will not create any concern of visibility and would not be detrimental, but would in fact restore the streetscape to a style more compatible with the existing historic structures in the neighborhood.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

Failure to approve the addition would result in a hardship to the owners. Due to past problems the owners experienced issues with dogs jumping the existing wall and unwanted visitors roaming their yard. For security issues the addition of railing not only provides protection but a piece of mind for them and their small children.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

The owners are willing to work with the design and provide a step down at the railing to provide a lower height at the north elevation.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

Due to the existing grade conditions and the overall slope all around the existing yard wall. The given allowable height of 4'-10" gives the owner minimal railing on top of the yard wall on a portion of the north elevation, the entire east elevation and at the south elevation with ease of stepping over to get inside the yard.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

The yard is easily accessible to unwanted visitors due to the short and inconsistent height to the existing yard wall. The approval to the proposed railing at a maximum height of 6'-0" from the lowest point of grade would not only provide a challenge to people from jumping over but would deter them from even attempting.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

In this instance, the ability to construct a small addition of railing is the least negative solution to the security issues property. The railing would blend with the architecture of the neighborhood, and would allow the owners a solution without excessive financial penalty.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

Ms. Mather asked if Mr. Rasch had been provided with the metal finishes.

Mr. Rasch said he had not.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dominic Sisneros, 7236 Vuelta de la Luz, who said the metal would be dark grey and not painted.

Ms. Walker noted on the north elevation further west there seemed to be an existing vehicle gate.

Mr. Sisneros clarified that the gate was on the neighbor's property.

Mr. Acton asked that the metal rails not be the prefabricated tube style. There was so much of it that it would become a detraction. He would like to have seen a sample of the metal work.

Mr. Sisneros clarified that it was not prefabricated but welded by an iron maker.

Ms. Walker believed the neighbor's gate had some spaces in between and asked if he could do that also.

Mr. Sisneros agreed there would be 3" between railings so it was fenestrated, not solid.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-11-144, granting the height exception according to responses presented and with the condition that a sample of the railing be brought to staff before construction. Mr. Acton seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Mather requested an additional condition that the gate have a 3" fenestration between railings. Ms. Walker agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 13. Case #H-12-003** 204 E. Santa Fé Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stephen Walker, agent for Stephen and Gail Walker, owners, proposes to construct a 577 sq. ft. addition and install a window at a former door infill on the south elevation of a significant residential structure, remove a non-historic carport and construct a low picket fence. Two exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and at less than 10 feet back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Acton recused himself from consideration of this case and left the room.

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

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

204 East Santa Fé Avenue is a single-family residence that was constructed in brick by 1912 in the Neoclassical Revival style. A small wood-sided porch on the south elevation was constructed sometime between 1958 and 1966. The building is listed as significant to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. A free-standing carport was constructed at an unknown non-historic date at the rear.

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

1. The porch on the south elevation will be remodeled to a 577 square foot addition that is at least 6" lower than the adjacent parapet height per code. Two exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (south) (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to place an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation (east) (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.
2. A historic door opening that was infilled at an unknown date on the south elevation will be partially restored for a window installation at the same header height and opening width. The window will match the historic windows in scale and type.
3. Wooden storm windows, painted white, will be installed in front of the historic windows.

4. The free-standing carport will be removed.

5. The twisted wire fence and pedestrian gate along the north and west lotlines will be remodeled. It is unclear if the fence will be removed or incorporated into the construction of a white picket fence to a maximum height of 3' 8". The metal pedestrian gate with the twisted wire infill will be replaced with a picket fence gate and flanked by wooden pilasters.

6. A gravel walkway on the west side of the residence will be replaced with a brick walkway.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the exception requests for the addition and that otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

### **EXCEPTION FOR AN ADDITION ON A PRIMARY FAÇADE**

#### **(I) "Do not Damage the character of the streetscape"**

As this is a Significant Building, all facades are considered as Primary. The proposed addition in being attached to the south façade minimizes the impact to the front primary façade from East Santa Fé Ave. The proposed addition, as it faces Webber St. is set back from the façade of the existing building and visually broken by a connecting mass of a distinct material (white painted wood). The broken massing of the proposed addition is intended to better reflect scale and proportion of structures typical to the neighborhood streetscape. The house on the adjacent property has a similar addition that is quite pleasant.

Additionally, as this is the back yard of the property where currently sits an unsightly "recently constructed" car port, we feel the addition would be a great visual improvement over what is there now.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

#### **(ii) "Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare"**

We are a family of four, currently living in a much larger home. 204 East Santa Fé Ave. is 955 sq. ft., heated. We need the extra bedroom that we are proposing as it would allow us to occupy the home. We love this house and the location. We want to move in as soon as possible, we just need to have the extra space approved. This is to be our home, not a rental or flip property. Without the addition, it is effectively unlivable for us.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

We plan on using a mix of materials characteristic to the district. We will use a white painted wood siding similar to the back porch to connect to the stucco Territorial addition. The height of the new addition is stepped down from the original so as to be distinct and easily identifiable.

We have replaced the roof, gutters, patched the cement, repaired the plumbing, electrical and replaced all appliances, replaced all lights, bathroom fixtures, shower faucets, and repaired the heating system. We have had all windows extensively repaired, but they are still in poor shape. We have lavished our time and attention to make this home livable once again. We have received praise for our efforts by all of the neighbors. Prior to our purchase, the house was in disrepair, and the neighbors were worried about its impact on the neighborhood. We want to make this home as historically correct and livable as we can.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

The small lot size, building site and off-street parking access prohibit any expansion in other than the proposed location.

As this is a Significant Building, all facades are considered as Primary. We propose to use the south façade or rear façade as the location of the new addition. This would minimize the impact to the Front Primary façade from East Santa Fé Ave, and be less obtrusive to the neighbors.

The original building is too small at 955 sq. ft., heated, particularly as primary residence. There is no storage and only a single small bathroom. Our family (of four) cannot live there comfortably. We need to add the addition in order to move in.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

**(v) "Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant"**

Due to the sale of the rear portion of the lot back in the 1950's; the building envelope available to us is limited and small. The placement of the addition is constrained by the size issue and setback requirements.

As this is a Significant historical home from 1911, it is designed with standard features from that time period. Its size, construction material, windows and plumbing all are different than today's standards. As a one bedroom home, our family of 4 would not be able to live here without the additional space we are requesting.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

In order to minimize any negative impact, the new addition will be located in the rear corner of the property. It will be buffered from view by coyote fence from the neighbors on three sides. The setback from the original building will provide a pleasant stepped appearance and allow landscaping to blend the old and new.

We plan to use materials that blend into the neighborhood and complement the original structure, yet keep it distinctly different, so as not to be confused with the historic original structure.

Landscaping will also blend the new structure into the existing street view.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

## EXCEPTION FOR AN ADDITION LESS THAN 10' BACK FROM A PRIMARY FAÇADE

The area of the footprint of the proposed addition is 550 sq. ft. or 48% of the existing footprint and therefore does not exceed 50% of the existing footprint.

The proposed addition is set back 13' from the west façade along Webber St. where it will be most visible. The proposed pitched metal overhang is 9' from the corner in order to fall just beyond an existing window below it on the existing south façade.

The proposed new addition is 60% of the existing dimension of the west façade and 64% of the south façade.

The proposed addition is attached to the south façade of the building in the same location as the non-contributing screened in porch. While the porch is proposed for demolition, the appearance intended from Webber St. is for the proposed addition to look attached to the existing covered porch structure.

At the south end of the east façade, facing the rear yard of the immediate neighbor the proposed addition project 2' to the east of the existing east façade. This projected portion of the proposed addition is set back 50' from East Santa Fé Ave and will be only marginally visible from that street given that the 14' separation between the neighboring homes. The 2' extension to the east allows for the setback on the west facing Webber St. façade to be more substantial while maintaining the functionality of the added spaces.



It should be noted that Zoning has determined that as a corner lot, RM-1 side yard setbacks shall apply to the south and east sides of the lot with front yard setbacks applying to the areas along the two streets. The east side yard setback is allowed to be reduced to less than 3' given an affidavit with the neighbor agreeing to allow it to maintain a 10' min. building separation.

**(i) "Do not Damage the character of the streetscape"**

All colors and materials will be provided and approved prior to construction. The new addition will provide a more charming appearance, as opposed to the current car port which is to be removed.

The addition will blend into the streetscape. There are numerous stucco homes near by.

The wood porch/entrance way is similar to the house across from us on East Santa Fé Ave.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

**(ii) "Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare"**

The specifications for this addition have been repeatedly modified to provide the most living space with the least impact to the community. We need the addition in order to live in the house. Without the addition, we are not able to occupy the home. Our family of 4 needs more than the one bedroom that is in the original home. Without occupancy, the home will, once again, fall into disrepair. This will then cause the neighborhood to suffer.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

The addition will look very similar to the surrounding neighbors. We plan on using materials that are common to the district. We will use a wood siding similar to the back porch to connect to the stucco Territorial addition. The height will be lower and the new addition will be different from the original so as to be distinct and easily identifiable. We will select the colors to match the scheme of the original home.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

As this is a Significant Building, all facades are considered as Primary. This creates a very difficult situation in adding an extension to the home. Given the lot size and street placement, the proposed addition is very logical and should be allowed.

We propose to use the South or Rear façade as the location of the New Addition. This would minimize the impact to the Front Primary façade from East Santa Fé Ave, and be less obtrusive to the neighbors. The new additions façade on Webber St will be a great improvement over the current wooden car port.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

**(v) "Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant"**

Due to the sale of the rear portion of the lot back in the 1950's; the building envelope available to us is limited and small. The placement of the addition is constrained by this size issue.

The West Façade (Webber Street) setback for the new addition is just over 9 feet. The extension into our East property is necessary in order to create the setback in the Weber or West façade.

We have created a 9 ft setback in order to provide a distinct, visual transition from the old to the new.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

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

The addition will be attached to the rear South façade to minimize the view from East Santa Fé Ave. We plan on attaching directly to the existent, non-contributing porch and to extend out 2 feet into our property to the East, between the two homes. The extension into the area between our house and the neighbors currently has a coyote fence creating the same visual effect as our addition will. This is hardly visible from East Santa Fé Ave due to landscaping and the narrow driveway that is between the two homes. In fact, we could replace the 2' of coyote fence once the addition is complete, thereby making it less visible from East Santa Fé Ave.

The proposed foot print size falls within the guide lines as mentioned above.

Existing façade is 31 ft., addition façade is 14, rear porch is just turned to accommodate entrance steps. The existing south façade is 30', and the south façade of the addition is 26'.

South Porch was constructed AFTER 1960. It does not show in the 1958 aerial photos.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

Dr. Kantner understood the twisted wire fence was historic material but the gate might not need an exception.

Mr. Rasch said it was twisted wire but was a standard gate.

Present and sworn was Mr. Stephen Walker who said they were not sure of the placement of the picket fence because of the tree roots. He would like to keep the wire fence as a backdrop to the picket fence without hurting the trees along Weber Street.

Ms. Walker thought he could probably preserve the majority on the west side.

Mr. Walker added that they might be able to move the picket fence out a little.

Ms. Walker thought it was beautiful.

Mr. Katz asked if it would be brick or stucco.

Mr. Walker said it would be stucco in either Buckskin or Adobe.

Chair Woods asked if there was a coping detail on the stucco on the proposed west elevation.

Mr. Walker said it would match closely the original coping.

Dr. Kantner asked if there would be any new lighting added to the new openings on the west.

Mr. Walker said just by the door. The existing lights were modern Home Depot lights and they wanted something more appropriate.

Dr. Kantner asked if he could take those to staff for review. Mr. Walker agreed.

Chair Woods had concerns about the fenestration of the windows. The existing fenestrations of those on the main part were beautiful. But on the proposed west elevation, the transoms above looked very

contemporary and that was not working with what was going on with the rest of the house. It looked like a ten foot opening and a tin roof above it. So it didn't seem compatible with the rest of the house but rather something one would put on a Las Campanas house.

Mr. Walker asked if she was asking him to consider eliminating the transoms.

Chair Woods thought that would help. She referred to the floor plan where it showed a door going to the landing that looked like a French door but from the inside was not.

Mr. Walker clarified that both doors were on the landing.

Chair Woods said it read as a French door and not a window. If the door and window could be separated it would look like a door and a window.

Mr. Walker agreed. He wasn't sure they could lower the roof because there was a stairwell there. He could understand the transoms and window/door separation but not sure about lowering the roof height.

Chair Woods pointed out that the windows on the original were beautifully proportioned but on the south side they were short and fat and also one on the east side and a skinny one. She asked him to work on the proportion of them.

Mr. Walker said he could make the skinny one to match the others.

Chair Woods's last concern was on the proposed south elevation which looked very contemporary.

Mr. Walker explained that they had a five foot fence on that side and needed to get some light into the rooms there.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Dr. Kantner moved to postpone Case #H-12-003 to see his revisions. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. Mr. Acton was not present for the vote, having recused himself.**

Mr. Walker said they could do more drawings.

Mr. Acton returned to the bench after the vote was taken.

## **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan to address any of Ms. Beninato's issues and specifically about the Restaurant Martin poles that were really not temporary. She asked if the Airstream trailers could be dealt with. This was enforcement and not part of the Board's responsibilities.

Ms. Brennan said Restaurant Martin was a new issue and she would look into it.

The curb at 610 Galisteo was recent and they wanted to reinforce the foundation. Before the final inspection, they had to remove it and the City told him that. She said she would have to report back on it.

Chair Woods thought those poles were not appropriate there and should get red tagged.

Mr. Rasch added that besides the free-standing tent, the owner installed a plastic vestibule with an aluminum screen door without Board approval. As of March 1, the Chapter 14 would require even temporary things to come to the Board.

Ms. Brennan reinforced the March 1 revision date. She didn't know that the City couldn't cite them now, however.

Mr. Rasch said the Manhattan property was a small adobe property in very poor condition and it was a contributing structure.

Ms. Walker noted that the Board had not seen the historic rewrite. She understood it was lengthy - about 800 pages.

Mr. Rasch explained that this was the whole Chapter 14 rewrite and that each division got a single copy.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Rasch if he could get the list that was prepared for Council to the HDRB members by Thursday. Mr. Rasch agreed to try.

Chair Woods said her other issue was that the State wanted to demolish the historic casitas on Galisteo to build an executive office building.

Ms. Brennan said Mr. O'Reilly was going to reach out informally to folks at the state about the approval process to see what the response was and possibly have the Mayor write a letter.

Chair Woods said that was one of the big reasons for HB 360 and the Board didn't have any idea what it would look like.

Ms. Walker said it was to be 3-4 stories and they had plenty of land to avoid destroying those casitas.

Mr. Acton said it was a critical moment when they were drafting the RFP for a design/build.

Mr. Rasch said he already informed them they could not do a design/build in the historic district.

Mr. Acton thought they needed to remind the State of that.

Ms. Brennan said they met a year and a half ago on the RFP and had several meetings on how they were to proceed. The whole process was a little daunting to them and they agreed to include the Board's

review in the RFP but we now have a new administration.

Mr. Rasch said the State thought they would get the RFP out in April.

Mr. Acton thought it would help to give them suggested language for the RFP and then ask for a copy of the RFP.

Ms. Brennan said they could include it right from HB 360. It was finding the balance to keep that working relationship.

Mr. Acton added the Board had to be aware that there were variations on levels of demolition - the back part of the building and the front massing. The state oversimplified it with an all or nothing on it so they didn't see it as adversarial.

Ms. Brennan wasn't sure SHPO was involved in it.

Chair Woods was really concerned so a letter should be sent sooner than later to flush it out.

Mr. Acton asked what the composition of the ad hoc group was.

Mr. Rasch listed them.

Mr. Acton wanted those HB-360 privileges clarified for them and was worried that the State was not pledging a level of cooperation.

Mr. Rasch said the state has already hired an architect to document the 4 casitas and 3 garages (prior to demolition).

## **J. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Approved by:

---

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer