



Agenda

AMENDED

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
April 8, 2008

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS
868 ½ E. Alameda

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Informational Study Session for the proposal by the State of New Mexico General Services Department, Property Control Division to construct a four-story 207,723 square-foot parking garage to a maximum height of 35' 10" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 8" located at 420 Galisteo Street between Don Gaspar Avenue, Galisteo Street, Paseo de Peralta, West Manhattan Avenue, and South Capitol Street in the City of Santa Fe Downtown & Eastside Historic District. (David Rasch)

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-07-148. 824 B Dunlap Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Bill Roth, agent for Kary Myers, proposes to construct an approximately 195 sq. ft. carport to a height of 10' where the existing height is 13' and the maximum allowable height is 14' 11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-08-008. 610 Miller Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Balsler, proposes to replace wooden-slat vehicle gate and pedestrian gates at the lot line on a non-contributing property with a 60" high wrought iron vehicle gate at 23'6" back from the lot line and a 72" high coyote fence vehicle gate at 45' back from the lot line. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-08-045. 130 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Raney St. Peter, proposes to replace a non-historic picture window on the primary elevation of a contributing residence with a four 6-light windows in the existing opening and to define window light patterns on the proposed guest house. (David Rasch)

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-047. 438 Apodaca Hill. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. David Perrigo, agent for Lee Lewin and Charles Williams, proposes to construct an approximately 1,111 sq. ft. addition to the height of 16'6" where the existing height is 28'6" to a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

2. Case #H-08-048. 428 Agua Fria. Historic Transition District. Hoopes + Associates, agent for Mark Hagedorn, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by re-roofing, installing skylights, refurbishing windows, removing iron window grills, railing, and fence, construct an approximately 3'6" high stuccoed wall and construct an electrically operated awning. (Marissa Barrett)
3. Case #H-08-050. 131 Camino Escondido. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cedar Southwest Construction, agent for Bill and Betty Harrison, proposes to construct an approximately 1,243 sq. ft. freestanding guest house to a height of 13'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'8", replace non-historic garage doors on a contributing building, remove a historic window on a contributing building and enlarge opening, create a new opening on a contributing building, construct a 5'8" high stuccoed pilaster and coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 6' and replace pedestrian gates. (Marissa Barrett)
4. Case #H-08-051. 851 Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dolores Vigil, Liaison Planning, agent for Nevid Hartenstein, proposes to construct an approximately 576 sq. ft. freestanding guest house to a height of 15' where the maximum allowable height is 16' on a non-contributing property.(Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-08-052. 951 ½ B Santander Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rowland Builders Inc, agent for Jan Anderson, propose to construct an approximately 51 sq. ft. addition to match the existing height of 10', to construct an approximately 433 sq. ft. addition to match the existing height of 10' on a non-contributing garage. (Marissa Barrett)
6. Case #H-08-053. 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martin Kuziel, agent for Bob Parker, SIVAD LLC, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by removing a non-contributing shed, removing a metal carport, and constructing an approximately 153 sq. ft. addition, an approximately 195 sq. ft. portal, an approximately 204 sq. ft. carport and pergola to a height of 9'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", increase the building height from 10' to 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", alter openings and construct a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)
7. Case #H-08-054. 530 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Wong, agent for Bob & Kris Barrie, proposes to restore historic windows on a primary elevation of a contributing residence, replace all other windows in-kind, and replace a garage door. (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-55. 200 West DeVarges. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robin Gray Architect, LLC, agent for Susan Phillips and David Ater, proposes to replace window, restucco and repair and replace a balcony on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
9. Case #H-08-046. Corner of San Francisco & Sandoval Streets. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Studio S.W. Architects, agent for Greer Enterprises, proposes to construct a 17,013 sq. ft. building footprint on a significant commercial property with a 4-story mixed-use building totaling 53,789 sq. ft. to a maximum height of 46' where the maximum allowable height is 28'4" on Palace Avenue, 27'6" on Sandoval Street, and 22'7" on San Francisco Street. Three exceptions are requested: to exceed the maximum allowable heights (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)); construct a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); and in one of two proposed options to use a design vocabulary which is not Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2 (E)). (David Rasch)
10. Case #H-08-049. 125 Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Granito, agent for Mary & John Granito, proposes to replace a divided-light window in a stepped opening with a larger single-light display window on a non-contributing commercial building and to install an awning over the window and door. An exception is requested to exceed the 30" window pane rule (Section 14-5.2(E)(1)c)). (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the May 13, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, May 13, 2008.

**Summary Index of the
City of Santa Fe
Historic Design Review Board
May 13, 2008**

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes April 8, 2008	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Findings/Conclusions H 08-039b	868½ E. Alameda - Approved	2
Communications	Discussion	2-3
Business From the Floor	None	3
Administrative Matters		
1. State Parking Garage	Suggestions made	3-8
Old Business	None	5
1. <u>Case #H 07-148</u> 824B Dunlap Street	Approved as recommended	8-10
2. <u>Case #H 08-008</u> 610 Miller Street	Approved with conditions	10-13
3. <u>Case #H 08-045</u> 130 E. Santa Fe Avenue	Approved with conditions	13-15
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-047</u> 438 Apodaca Hill	Approved with conditions	15-16
2. <u>Case #H 08-048</u> 428 Agua Fria	Downgraded to non-contributing	65-67

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
3. <u>Case #H 08-050</u> 131 Camino Escondido	Approved with conditions	17-20
4. <u>Case #H 08-051</u> 831 Camino Ranchitos	Approved with conditions	20-21
5. <u>Case #H 08-052</u> 951½ B Santander Lane	Approved with conditions	21-23
6. <u>Case #H 08-053</u> 444 Camino Don Miguel	Postponed	23-25
7. <u>Case #H 08-054</u> 530 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved with conditions	25-29
9. <u>Case #H 08-046</u> San Francisco & Sandoval Streets	Postponed for more design details	29-65
10. <u>Case #H 08-049</u> 125 Water Street	Approved with conditions	67-69
Matters from the Board	Discussion	69-70
Adjournment		70

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Mr. Jake Barrow
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Ms. Karen Walker
Mr. Robert Frost
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Deborah Shapiro

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Historic Planner
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Asst. City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch said staff was requesting that Case H-08-048 under New Business be postponed until the applicant arrived, or that it be moved so that it was last on the agenda. He also noted that Case H-08-055 under New Business had been rescinded by staff.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Agenda as amended. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 8, 2008

Ms. Walker noted on page 2, at the bottom under F, it should read resides no recited. She noted there were many instances where the phrase "taken back" was used instead of "brought back." She disagreed with the use of that phrase. She also noted that on page 12, in the second sentence, she said it should read "Ms Rios agreed with Mr. Barrow, she then asked Mr. Vega to give details on widening the ADA openings."

Ms. Walker noted that on page 25, in the second to last paragraph there was an incomplete sentence. She asked that they strike the sentence. She noted on page 33, she had made a motion and in the third portion of the motion, the word "wall" had been left out. She said it should read "that the wall be five feet, with stucco being cementitious."

Mr. Frost noted on page 17 it said "Mr. Frost had asked it is...." He asked that the word "is" be stricken.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the Minutes as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

Case #H 08-039B 868 ½ E. Alameda

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Case #H 08-039B. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch noted that on Thursday evening, at six in the evening, staff would be presenting the 2008 Heritage Preservation awards. He showed a preview of the poster

for the event. He noted that Ms. Marilyn Bane had graciously allowed them to reproduce one of her oil paintings for the poster.

Ms. Walker noted that Best New Construction had been left off of their list.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Informational Study Session for the proposal by the State of New Mexico General Services Department, Property Control Division to construct a four-story 207,723 square-foot parking garage to a maximum height of 35' 10" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 8" located at 420 Galisteo Street between Don Gaspar Avenue, Galisteo Street, Paseo de Peralta, West Manhattan Avenue, and South Capitol Street in the City of Santa Fe Downtown & Eastside Historic District. (David Rasch)

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

The State of New Mexico, General Services Department, Property Control Division, proposes to construct a four-story 207,723 square foot parking facility on the property bounded by Galisteo Street, Don Gaspar Avenue, Paseo de Peralta, Manhattan Avenue, and South Capitol Street. The maximum height of the building is proposed at 35' 10" and the maximum allowable height is 17' 8".

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with brick coping at the parapets and window surrounds. Other design elements include a few triangular pediments, a balustraded upper floor balcony supported by corbels, and a pergola at the pedestrian entrance.

Consultation with interested parties resulted in a substantial reduction in height and the relocation of interior functions to stepped massing blocks around the perimeter of the building on Don Gaspar, Paseo de Peralta, Manhattan, and Galisteo frontages.

Issues of Santa Fe style, beyond the excessive height, include the non-traditional pergola and multiple colored walls which attempt to break up the massing. There appears to be only one opening which does not comply with the 3-foot corner rule. It is the stair-tower door on the roof parking level at the far east side of the south elevation. This shows on the colored rendering but not on the B&W line-drawn elevation. Unfortunately, this is the highest opening above grade on the structure.

Overall, staff is quite impressed with the design progress and is grateful to the State for their interest to “fit in” with the City historic district standards. The capitol campus consists of Territorial-style buildings that are generally approximately 36 feet high. Staff recommends that the State preserve the significant and contributing casita structures located at the northeast corner of this property in master planning for future development.

Mr. Rasch noted that he had photos of those four historic buildings, and a handout which showed the first pages of the HCPI forms. He said the last page showed what other significant buildings had been demolished in the past.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Katz to give comment regarding the fact that this item was informational.

Frank Katz said there was a legal issue that had come up with the County Courthouse and with the State parking garage. He said that issue was whether they were in fact subject to the Historic Styles Ordinance. He said it had been his opinion all along that they were. He said he suspected the State would ultimately agree with that. He said his purpose in working with the State and the County on the Courthouse and Parking Structure, was to not get involved in litigation, but to get structures that fit in with Santa Fe and would not stick out like sore thumbs. He noted that he thought they had done that, particularly with the parking garage, where incredible changes had been made.

Mr. Katz said there was a statute that allowed us to have that law. He noted the State could change that statute if they so wished. He said if the Board was to try to force it, he thought the State would change the statute. He said the State had passed the ordinance because they wanted cities to preserve their heritage and historic buildings. He said his concern, which was evident in the Mr. Rasch's recitation, that under the Board's code, the maximum height allowed would be 17', which was not realistic for buildings in that area. He said he hoped that, in the future, they could consider amendments in their ordinance for Government buildings by the State building campus. He said they were different from residential structures.

Mr. Katz said what they wanted to do that day was to review where the Garage was at that time, and gain the Board's insights on whether it looked good, or what the Board thought could be changed that would make it fit in better. He noted it was before the Board for informational purposes only, and not for formal approval.

Ms. Rios asked if that meant they could offer their suggestions but not make a motion.

Mr. Katz agreed.

Chair Woods said her biggest concern was the demolition of the historic buildings.

Mr. Katz said there were no demolitions planned for the project. He said the only thing that had been destroyed was the asphalt from the old parking lot.

Ms. Walker said she believed their second phase would incorporate the buildings, six of which were significant structures.

Mr. Bruce Farmer, with FBT Architects, was sworn in. He showed the Board the Power Point Presentation they had presented to interested citizens. He said they had presented the initial design in February. He said they brought in community architects on April 3, and they had made design suggestions. He explained that with revision two, which was the latest revision, they had incorporated further suggestions from a meeting on April 17. He said they also had some 3-D views. He said the changes were pretty dramatic.

Mr. Farmer showed their site plan, noting that they would not touch the casitas. He said the building could not meet the LEED standards because the cars in the building would affect air quality. He noted they did have a water catchment system that would allow reuse of runoff water for the plants around the structure.

Mr. Farmer noted the light blue spaces adjacent to the elevators and stairs were premier parking spaces. He explained to the Board that the sub level was 11' below grade with two entries and two exits. He showed the second and third floor plans. He also showed the initial design drawings. He noted they had taken off the entire top level and had brought the yard walls out further from the façade. He said they had also introduced a brick coping detail and regular cutouts to support the Territorial style.

Mr. Farmer said they had taken the office and storage functions outside of the line of the parking structure and created another tier of lower-mass buildings to help break up the mass of the parking structure. He added that for the large openings in the parking structures, they had incorporated some dividers. He noted they had to maintain 50% open area in order to ventilate the parking structure. He said that made it difficult for them to reduce the open areas of the parking structure. He showed the corner views, and then the entry perspectives. He noted they had created a pedestrian entry centered on the north façade.

Mr. Farmer showed the color palette choices. He said they had selected three buildings to emulate. He noted that one of the colors was the color of one of the casitas. He said they also wanted to match the Bataan, and the Capital. He said when they started putting paint on the building; they would make sure that the colors matched those structures. He also showed the brick coping detail, he noted they had added two additional courses of brick. He said they had incorporated the two-brick coping detail and an angle frame around the openings that they would paint to match the Territorial style.

Mr. Frost said that, in looking at the site plan, the buildings they had been talking about were contributing buildings with significant garages. He said it appeared that one of the garages had been taken out or was not visible.

Mr. Farmer said they were not going to take down the garages. He explained that it was an error in the illustration

Ms. Shapiro asked if they intended to use cementitious stucco.

Mr. Farmer said they were going to use a textured paint on the concrete, because it was not possible to stucco concrete.

Ms. Shapiro said one of the slides had shown the cutouts in the walls and the angle stops. She asked if the angle stop was flush with the surface, or if it would be proud of the surface.

Mr. Farmer said it was an angle that was set into the opening. He said there would be a shadow line.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Farmer to describe, by elevation, the open space in front of the building, as well as the landscaping.

Mr. Farmer explained that the east elevation had large landscape buffer, which was also present on the south elevation. He noted there was also a drive in area on the west elevation with a little landscaping. He said there was not landscaping on the north elevation because they didn't know what would be done to develop the plaza in the future, and because they had to put fire truck access there.

Ms. Rios asked how many feet they had between the sidewalk and the wall of the structure.

Mr. Farmer said there was 50 feet on the east elevation, 35 feet on the south elevation, and 25 feet on the west elevation. He said the north elevation was interior, and so did not come under any kind of setback. He noted they were 40 feet from the next building on the north.

Ms. Rios asked if they wanted to do one color, or multiple colors.

Mr. Farmer said they wanted to do three colors similar to the samples shown. He said the tone differences in the colors would be subtle.

Ms. Rios asked if there were any rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Farmer said there were none. He said there was a future potential for

photovoltaic cells, but noted that was not part of their design at that time.

Ms. Rios asked if they had included any outdoor lighting.

Mr. Farmer said they had interior utility lighting. He said that was the only lighting they were proposing at that time.

Ms. Walker said they had made great improvements. She said on the first slide and on the front of the packet, there was a green shade. She asked if it was some aura from the tress.

Mr. Farmer said they had been afraid of showing an illustration with full grown trees that would make it look like they were trying to hide their building. He said they were ghosted trees.

Mr. Barrow asked if they could present the details of the trim around the windows and doors and the types of the windows, as well as the details around the portal, if they had them. He asked that if they did not have those details, they be presented at a later time.

Mr. Farmer said they were not at that point yet, but said they could present that information when they had it.

Mr. Barrow said he liked what Mr. Farmer had said about colors being subtle. He thought that was a good way to go. He said he did not agree with copying the casita's colors. He said he thought they should stand out from the modern structure and be discernable both in color and style. He noted they were already discernable in style. He suggested that the color of the casitas not be incorporated into the parking structure.

Mr. Featheringill said he had already asked the questions he had in previous meetings. He said it was very pleasant to deal with the State. He applauded them for their efforts.

Chair Woods said there was a vertical wall and three openings just to the left of the pergola on one façade. She asked what the wall was.

Mr. Farmer said they were yard walls. He said they were about 14' tall. He said they were trying to hide the spandral panel. He noted that the wall hid the structural elements. He said it was two feet in front of the structure.

Chair Woods asked if they would want to return it. She said she was uncomfortable with it because it looked like a fake western storefront.

Mr. Featheringill said they did return. He said there was not room to walk behind them.

Chair Woods asked about the long horizontal openings on the west entry. She asked if they could have one more intermediate vertical opening.

Mr. Farmer said they had done that on another façade, and would do it on that one as well.

Chair Woods asked if there was any other material filling in those openings.

Mr. Farmer said they were putting metal grating in those openings. He said they had to do that for security reasons.

Chair Woods thanked the State for working with the Board and the public committee. She said the differences were dramatic.

Richard Ellenberg, of 1417 Canyon Road, was sworn in. He said he wished to give great thanks to the State and Secretary Jaramillo for their determination to come up with a design that was consistent with the designs of Santa Fe. He said he appreciated that they also managed to keep the garage near its full size, with 580 spaces. He said it had taken a great deal of effort and financial ingenuity.

Chair Woods thanked the State and Mr. Farmer for the dramatic improvements. She also asked that they not tear down those buildings.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-07-148.** 824 B Dunlap Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Bill Roth, agent for Kary Myers, proposes to construct an approximately 195 sq. ft. carport to a height of 10' where the existing height is 13' and the maximum allowable height is 14'11" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The Simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence located at 824 B Dunlap was completed in December of 2004 and is one of four buildings located in the Casa De Sueño Condominiums. The Official Map lists this building as having no status in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

"The applicant was heard at the December 19, 2007 hearing for construction of an approximately 200 square foot carport to a height of 9' 2". The proposed carport was setback over 10' from the north, street facing property line and matched the existing

style of the building which included sharper corners, a rusted steel fascia and columns, and an approximately 5' 8" overhang.

"The HDRB denied the carport addition but approved the removal of a 5' high coyote fence along the north elevation, construction of a CMU wall to the maximum allowable height of 6', and the construction of an approximately 26 square foot frame and stucco storage shed and a breezeway area.

"The applicant had redesigned the carport and now proposes the following:

"Construct an approximately 195 square foot carport to a height of 10' where the existing height is 13' and the maximum allowable height is 14' 11". The carport is setback approximately 13' from the north, street facing elevation and 23' from the adjacent building which provides the required zoning backup space.

"The redesigned carport includes openings in the north elevation wall in order to appear more like a building structure rather than a carport from Dunlap Street. The carport will include steel posts and a rusted steel fascia to match the existing building.

"The approved shed storage area has been modified to include one door rather than two, has increased approximately 35 square feet (originally 26 square feet, now approximately 61 square feet), and has shifted slightly towards the east.

"Lastly proposed is the placement of pavers in the unroofed area between the carport and residence.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends approval as this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards."

Ms. Rios asked if the new carport complied with zoning.

Ms. Barrett agreed, and said the setback met it and was signed off.

Present and sworn was Mr. Bill Roth, of 1713 B Montañó St. He noted that there had been a substantial discussion about the carport at the previous hearing. He said he had since driven around and taken pictures. He noted that there were a few carports that were recent and others that were historic. He explained that the owner was a single woman who worked in Los Alamos and needed the carport for secured parking.

Mr. Roth said they had presented it more as part of the house structure. He explained that they had put in the windows, and designed it with a solid wall on the

street size. He said they had been unable to get the true depth of a carport, but said there would be enough room.

Mr. Barrow asked what kind of lighting they would use in and around the carport.

Mr. Roth said there was a security light on the north wall adjacent to bedroom window. He added that they would probably put one on the inside as well. He said there would be no other lights on the outside.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they were using a shed style roof.

Mr. Roth explained that it was a flat roof, which protruded on the west side. She said it matched the existing fascia.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would see the roof.

Mr. Roth said the roof would not be visible, only the parapet on the front. He noted that it was a flat steel roof.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the application as submitted and per staff recommendations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-08-008.** 610 Miller Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Balsler, proposes to replace wooden-slat vehicle gate and pedestrian gates at the lot line on a non-contributing property with a 60" high wrought iron vehicle gate at 23'6" back from the lot line and a 72" high coyote fence vehicle gate at 45' back from the lot line. (David Rasch)

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

Background and Summary:

"431 Camino de las Animas is a single-family residence that was constructed in the 1930s in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. A free-standing studio was constructed at a recent, non-historic date. 610 and 610 ½ Miller Street is a two-family residence that was constructed after 1945 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. Significant remodeling was done to both primary residences. Recently a lot adjustment readjusted the two properties to create three properties, identified as Lot 1, 2 and 3 in this proposal. All buildings, consisting of 10,348 square feet, on both properties are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

“The Historic Design Review Board postponed action on this application on January 8, 2008 pending redesign of four items, including the Animas vehicle gate to be reduced in prominence and located further back on the driveway.

“At the February 12, 2008 hearing, the Animas gate was not reduced in size nor moved further back, but the applicant additionally proposed low stuccoed spur walls flanking the driveway out to the street and the remainder of the driveway beyond the gate to the interior gate will be brick surfaced like the front area.

“The HDRB approved the application with conditions, including that the Animas vehicle gate and yardwall be redrawn to (a) lower the height; (b) provide for visual access through the gate; and (c) relocate the wall and gate further back from the street so that it is not next to the other gate directly to the east.

“Now the applicant proposes to redesign the vehicle gate entry on Camino de las Animas. The driveway will be finished with brick and enclosed on the sides with a 3' high stuccoed yardwall. A 5' high wrought iron vehicle gate flanked by stuccoed pilasters will be installed at 23' 6" back from the lotline. A 6' high coyote fence will be installed at 45' back from the lotline.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, of 460 Cerrillos Road. He said the Board had asked for an open iron work gate, which he had added. He noted that the gate went back to the driveway and the long driveway could be seen through it. He said he was proposing an open gate closer to the street.

Chair Woods said it was an interesting approach.

Mr. Barrow said he understood the proposal but was baffled with it. He said the idea was to have a view through the gate and have a perspective and a sense of depth. He said the solution Mr. Martínez had come up with did not do that because it had a solid gate behind the open gate. He said it looked like the solid gate had been put back, but it did not seem to him that the location had been changed from the previous submittal.

Mr. Martínez explained that the driveway was unlike any others on properties with gates. He said the gate did not reveal a yard, but people could see through the gate into the driveway. He explained that he was trying to allow visibility through the gate, but it was a long driveway. He said the other gates showed a yard. He said they were allowing openness there, but a passer-by would not be able to see all the way back. He

said he thought the owners and neighbors would like to have the open gate pushed all the way back. He said it could allow vagrants there, in a place that was not visible from any house in the area.

Ms. Walker asked if there was an additional function for the gate.

Mr. Martínez said the gate was to prevent people from climbing over into the property.

Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Martínez thought someone could climb the iron gate but not the wooden gate.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Walker asked what would be visible if there was an iron gate but not a wooden one.

Mr. Martínez said there was an unfinished adobe wall at the end.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the iron gate.

Mr. Martínez said it was 5' 3", and noted that the wooden gate was 23' back from the iron one.

Ms. Rios said the Board could almost agree, but she thought they should eliminate the wooden gate.

Mr. Martínez said it was an expensive proposition to have two gates. He said they were trying to make it so the long driveway was not visible, but said he had the impression that the board wanted the long driveway to be visible.

Chair Woods noted there were actually three gates.

Mr. Martínez said the one on page 15 had already been approved. He noted that it was a coyote gate.

Chair Woods asked how far back the iron gate was from the coyote gate.

Mr. Martínez said they were two feet apart.

Mr. Featheringill said he was concerned about the workings of the two gates. He said they would have to be synchronized. He asked if there could be a six foot iron gate set back.

Chair Woods said she thought it was ridiculous. She said she would rather go with a coyote gate. She said she did not think it had been the intention of the Board to approve multiple gates. She suggested they try to satisfy the owner and the Board with one gate and not two.

Mr. Featheringill agreed.

No members of the public wished to speak regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Martínez if there was a way to combine the two gates into one.

Mr. Martínez agreed they could. He said the intention was to make the back gate look like a fence and not a gate at all. He said the owners wanted a way to not view the entire back driveway. He pointed it out on the site plan. He said they would be agreeable to having only one gate if it was closed visually.

Ms. Walker mentioned a recent case where a gate had been used that had a solid lower part, with some see through elements at the top. She said that might also work in this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would be willing to remove the iron gate and have a coyote gate at the back. She said the gate would be the same as the yard wall at six feet.

Mr. Martínez said the mechanism would be behind the gate. He said the owner and neighbors were all very supportive of the plan.

Chair Woods agreed, but said that the neighbors were not present to verify that.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve case #H 08-008, with the amendment that the iron gate be removed from the plans, that the rear gate be approved so long as it has some fenestration as encouraged by the guidelines, and that the gate be in the same location as proposed. Mr. Frost seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow withdrew the motion.

Ms. Walker moved, regarding Case #H 08-008, to approve the front gate, with the condition that the gate design be submitted to staff, and that it not exceed six feet in height. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-08-045.** 130 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Richard Horcasitas, agent for Raney St. Peter, proposes to replace a non-historic picture window on the primary elevation of a contributing residence with a four 6-light windows in the existing opening and to define window light patterns on the proposed guest house. (David Rasch)

Mr. Featheringill recused himself.

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

Background and Summary:

“130 East Santa Fe Avenue is a wood-frame single-family residence that was constructed before 1930 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is officially listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District and its street-facing north elevation is considered as primary.

“On April 22, 2008, the HDRB approved the demolition of a free-standing garage, remodeling of the residence, and construction of a guest house with the condition that window designs from the front elevation of the existing residence and the window designs for the guest house be resubmitted to the Board for review.

“Now, the applicant proposes to present the window designs.

“The front elevation of the contributing residence will have true divided-light windows that are fixed in the center and have sliders on the sides. The four sections are the same in light pattern.

“The guest house will have true divided-light windows of varying sizes. All will be sliders or fixed.

Staff Recommendation:

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards, and 14-5.2 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas, of 421 St. Michael's Drive. He said they felt comfortable with staff's recommendations. He said they would keep the original opening on the primary elevation. He said there were some pretty old fixed aluminum windows there. He said the six lights could slide to the center with a 12 light fixed window. He said there would be sliding windows on the studio.

Chair Woods asked what the variety meant.

Mr. Horcasitas reviewed the windows as shown on page 12. He explained that the ones on the south elevation were double-hung windows.

Chair Woods asked if they would be willing to change the windows on the east elevation to double hung windows, like those on the street-facing elevation.

Mr. Horcasitas agreed.

Ms. Walker said she had trouble seeing how they had treated the north elevation.

Mr. Horcasitas said the window would come out and the wall would be pulled toward the north elevation two feet.

Chair Woods asked if they were going to keep with the same muntin pattern with the double hung windows. Mr. Horcasitas agreed.

Mr. Barrow asked if it was required to have the manufacturer's pull sheet.

Mr. Rasch clarified that it was not a requirement.

No members of the public wished to speak regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if the north façade was the only one which was publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch explained that the east elevation was also publicly visible, but no changes were made to it.

Cecilia asked what the inset of the windows was.

Mr. Horcasitas said they had about a three inch bullnose. He said it would be retained.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-045 per staff recommendations as proposed, with the exception that the windows on the north elevation be double hung and that the existing bullnose remain. Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow asked if they were concerned about their composition.

Mr. Rasch explained that the structures were not historic. He said the applicant had not stated the material.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-08-047.** 438 Apodaca Hill. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. David Perrigo, agent for Lee Lewin and Charles Williams, proposes to construct an approximately 1,111 sq. ft. addition to the height of 16'6" where the existing height is 28'6" to a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The two story Spanish Pueblo Revival style building located at 438 Apodaca Hill was constructed in 1988 and is listed on the Official Map as non-contributing.

"The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 1,111 square foot addition to the north elevation to a height of 16' 6" where the existing height is 28' 6" (at the highest point).

"The new one story addition will be constructed from adobe and will include Pozzi aluminum clad wood windows in the color "Hunter Green." The windows will match in size, style, color, and proportion to the existing windows. The mechanical door on the north elevation will be painted to match the stucco which will be cementitious, El Rey Adobe. The door on the south elevation will match the existing one on the east elevation.

"Five skylights are proposed and will be screened by the parapet. No other rooftop appurtenances are proposed.

Staff Recommendations:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. David Perrigo, P.O. Box 8610, resident at 1908 Kiva. He said he was present to answer any questions the Board had.

Ms. Rios asked if the skylights were low profile.

Mr. Perrigo agreed that they were. He noted that the stucco was cementitious, and they would be using three coats.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there was any exterior lighting.

Mr. Perrigo said there was not. He said they were keeping the existing portal lighting.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-047 per staff recommendations, and that no roof top appurtenances be visible. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Case #H-08-048. 428 Agua Fria. Historic Transition District. Hoopes + Associates, agent for Mark Hagedorn, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by re-roofing, installing skylights, refurbishing windows, removing iron window grills, railing, and fence, construct an approximately 3'6" high stuccoed wall and construct an electrically operated awning. (Marissa Barrett)
[postponed until the applicant arrived]

3 Case #H-08-050. 131 Camino Escondido. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cedar Southwest Construction, agent for Bill and Betty Harrison, proposes to construct an approximately 1,243 sq. ft. freestanding guest house to a height of 13'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'8", replace non-historic garage doors on a contributing building, remove a historic window on a contributing building and enlarge opening, create a new opening on a contributing building, construct a 5'8" high stuccoed pilaster and coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 6' and replace pedestrian gates. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"131 Camino Escondido consists of a Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence and free standing garage that have an estimated date of construction sometime in the 1930s. The Official Map lists both buildings as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic Review District.

"The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 1,021 square foot quest house with approximately 222 square feet of portals for a total roofed area of 1,243 square feet. The guest house will be constructed in the vacant area to the rear of the property and will include wood, posts, beams, and carved corbels. The stucco will match the color of the main residence as close as possible which is indicated as "Pueblo Tan".

“No skylights or rooftop appurtenances are indicated on the plans.

“The applicant also proposes remodeling the contributing garage by replacing the believed to be non-historic roll-up garage door with carriage style garage doors on the primary, west elevation. The 8' wide dimension opening will remain. The new garage door finish was not submitted. Also proposed for the garage remodel is a new opening with exposed wood header and carved corbels on the non-primary, north elevation and the removal of a historic divided light wood window with exposed header and replaced with a larger opening with exposed header and carved corbels on the east elevation. The window is the only historic window on the building and is therefore a character defining element which by Section 14-5.2 (D, 1, a) and Section 14-5.2 (D, 5) should be preserved.

“Also proposed for this project is to remove the non-publicly visible concrete in the back patio and replace with flagstone. A new CMU stuccoed pilaster coyote fence is proposed for the south property line to a height of 5' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 6'. A new wood pedestrian gate will be installed in the existing yard wall to the north of the garage and a new coyote gate will be constructed to the south of the garage. The existing wood vehicular gates will be replaced to match the existing gates. Finishes for all gates were not submitted and the new stucco pilasters will match the stucco on the main residence.

Staff Recommendation:

“Staff recommends approval on the condition that the historic garage window is retained, that there are no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances, that the garage door and gate finishes are clarified, and that the exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a permit application is submitted. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation for Contributing Buildings, Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Jim Cebak, of 1807 Second Street, 103B. He had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker asked if they would consider excluding the pilasters in the proposed coyote and pilaster wall.

Mr. Cebak said they were trying to match the existing detail.

Chair Woods asked if Mr. Cebak would clarify the details.

Mr. Cebak explained the finishes would be natural oil base finishes on the gate and

garage door, and on any exposed wood.

Chair Woods said the existing wood trim was painted.

Mr. Cebak said the existing wood trim would be painted blue, but the new wood trim would be stained.

Chair Woods asked if they had a design for the garage door.

Mr. Cebak said they did not have one yet. He said the design for the gate was one by six tongue and groove wood. He said there would be no exterior lighting.

Mr. Barrow said he had not seen an existing coyote fence in the photographs.

Mr. Cebak said that was correct.

Mr. Barrow asked if they had no objection to that change.

Mr. Frost asked about the stucco.

Mr. Cebak said the stucco appeared to be synthetic. He said he had no objection to cementitious stucco if they could match the color.

There were no members of the public who wished to speak regarding this case.

Chair Woods noted that on the far bottom corner, the portal had a high parapet.

Mr. Cebak said they could drop it down.

Mr. Featheringill said they had a nice window on the back of the garage. He asked if the opening could be put in on the side.

Mr. Cebak agreed.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-050 per staff recommendations and with the following conditions:

- 1. That the pilasters in the coyote fence be eliminated, and the tops of the coyote fence be uneven,**
- 2. That the parapet on the portal be reduced in height,**
- 3. That the stucco be cementitious,**
- 4. That the garage door design be submitted to staff for approval**
- 5. That the finish on the door be a natural oil finish,**
- 6. That any light fixtures be submitted to staff.**

7. That the historic window be retained,
8. And that any and all design changes be brought to staff.

Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-08-051.** 851 Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dolores Vigil, Liaison Planning, agent for Nevid Hartenstein, proposes to construct an approximately 576 sq. ft. freestanding guest house to a height of 15' where the maximum allowable height is 16' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

“The single family residence located at 851 Camino Ranchitos was recently constructed and does not appear on the Official Map.

“The applicant proposes construction of an approximately 527 square foot guest house with an approximately 49 square foot portal for a total roofed area of 576 square feet to the rear of the property, behind the existing main residence.

“The simplified Territorial style guest house will include true divided light Pella windows and true divided light French doors in the color Poplar White. Some doors and windows will include wood surrounds painted an off white color. The portal on the west elevation will have decorative posts and a beige standing seam non-reflective metal roof. The building will be stuccoed in an “Adobe” color.

“No skylights or rooftop equipment and proposed.

Staff Recommendation:

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

Ms. Rios asked what the visibility of the proposed guest house would be.

Ms. Barrett said it would be limited. She said there might be some visibility from Caminito.

Present and sworn was Delores Vigil, of 206 McKenzie, G-1. She said she would answer any questions the Board had. She said she had pictures of the light fixtures they

were proposing, which would match those on the main house. She passed them out to the members of the Board.

Ms. Walker said the height map was extremely skewed there. She gave changes in heights.

Ms. Barrett said they had to follow the Official Map.

Ms. Walker agreed. She said the heights were not even close.

Chair Woods suggested they could introduce and correct it. She noted that it had to be approved by the Council. She asked, regarding the drawing on the bottom right corner of page 9, if there was any way to drop the height. She said it would be a nice stepping of massing.

Ms. Vigil agreed.

Ms. Rios asked about the metal roof on the west elevation detail.

Ms. Vigil said the photos showed examples of what it would look like.

Ms. Shapiro asked what the stucco color would be.

Ms. Vigil said it would be cementitious, and would match the existing stucco color that could be seen in the photo colors.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Vigil said they could drop the parapet by a foot above the door.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-051 per staff recommendations with the conditions that the stucco be cementitious, and match the existing house, and that they drop the height of the parapet, on the east elevation, above the door by about a foot. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H-08-052.** 951 ½ B Santander Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rowland Builders Inc, agent for Jan Anderson, proposes to construct an approximately 51 sq. ft. addition to match the existing height of 10', to construct an approximately 433 sq. ft. addition to match the existing height of 10' on a non-contributing garage. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

“The Spanish Pueblo Revival style, single family residence and detached garage located at 951 ½ B Santander Lane has an unknown date of construction and no Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The Official Map lists the buildings as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside historic District.

“The applicant proposes construction of an approximately 51 square foot addition to the north elevation of the main residence. The addition will match the existing height of 10' and will include the reuse of the existing divided light window on the north elevation to be installed on the east elevation addition.

“Also proposed is the construction of an approximately 433 square foot addition to the west, street facing elevation to match the existing height of 10' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 6". The existing wood garage door on the west elevation will be reused and relocated to the south elevation. A new divided light window will be installed on the north and the south elevation. An existing wood door on the south elevation will be removed and the opening will be closed and a new divided light window and divided light French doors will be installed on the east elevation. All window finishes and stucco will match the existing buildings.

“Plans do not indicate any skylights or rooftop appurtenances.

Staff Recommendations:

“Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that windows are architectural series divided lights, that there are no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances, and that any new exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a permit application is submitted. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.”

Present and sworn was Ms. Kary Rowland, of 903 Alameda.

Ms. Walker said the Board wondered, during their on-site trip, if the garage could be offset to break up the façade.

Ms. Rowland said she was a little concerned with the setback, since they wanted to be sure they could get a car in. She said they could set the garage forward.

Chair Woods suggested two feet.

Ms. Rowland agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if they were proposing anything on the roof

Ms. Rowland said they were not.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 08-052 per staff recommendations, and their conditions, with the additional condition that the garage be stepped forward or backward by two feet. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-08-053.** 444 Camino Don Miguel. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martin Kuziel, agent for Bob Parker, SIVAD LLC, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by removing a non-contributing shed, removing a metal carport, and constructing an approximately 153 sq. ft. addition, an approximately 195 sq. ft. portal, an approximately 204 sq. ft. carport and pergola to a height of 9'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", increase the building height from 10' to 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", alter openings and construct a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The Simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style, approximately 909 square foot single family residence located at 444 Camino Don Miguel was constructed around 1932. The building has received alteration which includes total window replacement, including dimension changes, and additions. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes the following alterations:

"Remove the non-historic metal carport and non-historic CMU shed. Remove the wall and brick steps on the north elevation.

"Construct an approximately 153 square foot addition to the non-publicly visible south elevation to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". Also proposed for the south elevation is the construction of an approximately 195 square foot portal to a height of 10' 9" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". The portal will include wood posts, beams, and carved corbels. All overhangs on the south elevation will be removed.

"A new approximately 204 square foot carport will be constructed at the southwest corner of the building and will connect to the new portal by a pergola. The carport and pergola will be to a height of 9' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". All exposed wood for the carport, pergola, and portal will be finished with an opaque grey stain.

"The applicant also proposes increasing the building height from 10' to 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4". All doors and windows will be replaced and locations will be altered. New windows will be metal clad divided lights in the color tan and will have exposed wood lintels. Two windows and one door on the east elevation do not comply with the 30" window rule.

"No skylights or rooftop appurtenances are indicated on the plans. The building will be stuccoed using El Rey "Buckskin". Exterior light fixtures were not submitted.

"Lastly proposed is the construction of a yard wall at the northeastern section of the building to the maximum allowable height of 6'. The wall will be stuccoed to match the building.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that all door and windows no under the portal comply with the 30" window rule, that there are no publicly visible skylights or rooftop appurtenances, and that exterior light fixtures are brought to staff for approval before a building permit application is submitted. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Ms. Barrett also mentioned that the one territorial element to remain was the pediment above the window.

Ms. Rios asked if the section of yard wall was on the front elevation of the property.

Ms. Barrett said it was. She pointed it out.

Ms. Walker asked what the procedure was to go forward when the notice was not publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch explained that typically, if the poster was not visible for the required 14 day period, they would postpone the case.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, of 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said notice had been posted on the fence, but may have blown off. He said the lack of division on the windows on the east elevation was an oversight, and said they would be divided. He

said the windows under the portal would not be. He said there would be a fascia detail on the drawing and apologized.

Ms. Rios asked if they would be doing anything funky.

Mr. Enfield said they would not.

Public Comment

Ms. Racquel Nuñez, of 448 Camino Don Miguel. She said she had expected to see more neighbors present at the hearing, and said their absence might have been due to the fact that the sign had blown down the day after it was posted. She said her house was south of the property. She noted that the distance between the two existing structures was 26'. She said she had a few lighting issues, because she had three rooms on that side of her house where the windows were the only source of light. She said she also had some privacy issues. Otherwise, she said she was okay with the project.

Ms. Rios asked if Ms. Nuñez felt the project had or had not addressed her concerns about lighting and privacy.

Ms. Nuñez said she was not sure. She said she did not know what the height addition would do to her available light, and she was unsure what the height of the windows would be.

No other members of the public wished to speak regarding this case.

Mr. Enfield said he was unaware that the notice had blown off the day after it had been posted. He said he would be happy to discuss, or make a condition to discuss the fence and to work with City staff and Ms. Nuñez regarding her concerns about lighting.

Chair Woods suggested that they postpone the case since the notice had not been properly posted for the full time period. She suggested that Mr. Enfield could work with Ms. Nuñez during that time period.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone case #H 08-053. Mr. Frost seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. Case #H-08-054. 530 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Wong, agent for Bob & Kris Barrie, proposes to restore historic windows on a primary elevation of a contributing residence, replace all other windows in-kind, and replace a garage door. (David Rasch)

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

Background and Summary:

“530 Camino del Monte Sol is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1928. The building, which may have been built by Frank Applegate, has not been altered from between 1969, when Kathryn Seeler Jones purchased the property until 2003 when remodeling was approved by the HDRB. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The south elevation is considered primary.

“On July 25, 2006 the HDRB denied a proposal to construct a portal in front of the north, primary elevation with an 8" stand off. The Board has the applicant advice regarding walls or landscaping to achieve the desired effect of privacy and direction to main entrance.

“On November 14, 2006 the HDRB approved the construction of a yardwall and pedestrian gate with conditions.

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

“1. All historic windows on the primary, south elevation will be repaired and retained.

“2. All other windows will be removed and replaced with new, wood thermal pane windows within the existing jambs and sills. Jambs and sills will be repaired or replaced as needed. Trim color will be “Linen White. ”

“3. The garage door will be removed and replaced with a cedar panel door. The door will be painted to match trim color or stained to match the entry door and entry gate.

Staff Recommendation:

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Sections 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked if the windows proposed to be replaced were all historic.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if anyone had checked the condition of the windows.

Mr. Rasch said they were not in very poor condition. He said they were repairable,

but the applicant wanted to go with thermal pane windows.

Ms. Rios asked if storm windows could be done.

Mr. Rasch said they could be done, but renovation of the current windows and installation of storm windows would need to be looked at, especially regarding price.

Present and sworn was Mr. Scott Wong, of 55 Honeysuckle Circle. He said there had been an addition, and the windows on the addition were replaced with thermal double panes, and were double hung. He said the door on the east elevation was proposed to be replaced with windows. He said it was similar to a Dutch door but was only about five feet tall.

Ms. Rios asked which windows were not historic.

Mr. Wong said the windows at the top on the south elevation were all historic. He said they would restore those. He said on the east elevation, the far left window looked like a Dutch door. He said they had some water issues there. He added that the window above had been replaced probably in the 1970s, and they were proposing to replace that door. He said the window to the right of that was modern. He said the new addition had all new windows.

Mr. Wong said that, on the north elevation, the two windows were historic, but the one on the right was just a pane of glass, which they proposed to replace with a new divided glass window. He said the windows in the kitchen and studio were new. He pointed out the three historic windows. He pointed out the other historic windows. He said they proposed to retain the jambs and put in thermal windows. He said the windows would look like the existing windows.

Ms. Rios asked if they wanted to replace some of the historic windows.

Mr. Wong said they did. He said they wanted a better quality window with more thermal characteristics. He said cost was another factor.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if he agreed with the applicant's evaluation.

Mr. Rasch said the thermal capacity could be managed by adding exterior storm windows, if the Board wished to preserve the historic windows on the non-primary elevations. He said the non-historic windows were not necessary. He added that the windows on the primary had to be retained, but for the other elevations, the Board could make a decision based on the hardship issue.

Chair Woods said she disagreed with the cost issue on repairing the windows versus replacing them. She said they had required refurbishing windows that had been in much worse condition than the ones in this case.

Mr. Wong said it would cost about \$1,000 to refurbish each window. He said it would cost about \$12,000 to replace all with Jelwin windows. He said they had considered moving some of the windows that were in better condition to the primary elevation.

Ms. Walker asked if that meant repairing the windows would cost two thousand dollars less.

Mr. Wong said it would cost around \$10,000 to repair just the windows on the south elevation.

Ms. Walker asked if cost was one of their criteria.

Chair Woods said the Board could consider it a hardship.

Mr. Rasch said by code, the historic material on the primary elevation had to be retained.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they had included labor to install, paint, insulate and do trim work in their cost for installation of new windows.

Mr. Wong said the restoration included everything but painting.

Ms. Shapiro said she would give Mr. Wong the names of some people who could provide a better price.

Mr. Barrow asked about insulating the roof instead of the windows.

Mr. Wong said the building had been reroofed during the last renovation.

Mr. Barrow said he thought roof insulation was much more important.

Chair Woods asked if changes in the windows would impact the historic status.

Mr. Rasch said he did not think it would. He said he would be more comfortable if they retained the windows on the east elevation. He said he did not see a need to retain those on the west and north elevations.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-054 with the conditions that all historic windows be restored, and exterior storms be installed, that the applicant work closely with staff to accomplish this, and that all non-historic windows may be replaced as submitted. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion. The motion passed by

unanimous voice vote.

8. Case #H-08-55. 200 West DeVargas. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robin Gray Architect, LLC, agent for Susan Phillips and David Ater, proposes to replace window, restucco and repair and replace a balcony on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

Removed from the agenda.

9. Case #H-08-046. Corner of San Francisco & Sandoval Streets. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Studio S. W. Architects, agent for Greer Enterprises, proposes to construct a 17,013 sq. ft. building footprint on a significant commercial property with a 4-story mixed-use building totaling 53,789 sq. ft. to a maximum height of 46' where the maximum allowable height is 28'4" on Palace Avenue, 27'6" on Sandoval Street, and 22'7" on San Francisco Street. Three exceptions are requested: to exceed the maximum allowable heights (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)); construct a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); and in one of two proposed options to use a design vocabulary which is not Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2 (E)). (David Rasch)

This portion of the meeting has been transcribed in verbatim format.

Mr. Rasch: 211 San Francisco Street, known as the Lensic Performing Arts Center, was constructed in 1930 in the Moorish Revival style which is unique in Santa Fe. Infill on the west side and rear addition that was approved for 65' high by exception has not diminished the integrity of the building. It is listed as significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

219 through 225 San Francisco Street, originally known as the Santa Fe Vogue College and known today as the Lensic Commercial Building, was constructed in 1930 in the Spanish Baroque Revival style. Minor alterations have occurred in non-historic times. The building is recommended for significant historic status, but it is officially listed as non-resurveyed.

The vacant lot next to the Lensic and the Commercial Building will be infilled with a mixed-use four-story, 17,013 square foot footprint building. The building will be 46' high, where the maximum allowable height is 28' 4" on Palace, 27' 6" on Sandoval, and 22' 7" on San Francisco Street. A height exception is requested and the required criteria responses are attached.

The project proposal includes the removal of a 1970s elevator at the southwest corner of the Commercial Building, the free-standing ATM kiosk, and a low wall surrounding the parking lot.

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with brick coping on parapets with dentils, triangular pediments, and metal balustrades. And I believe you all have the color renditions in your packet.

An alternate design is proposed after input from the Planning Commission and the Business Capitol District Development Review Committee. You'll see here is the Territorial design building, and then here is the alternate in the Spanish Baroque. Both bodies approved the proposal with the recommendation that the Territorial Revival style be substituted for a Spanish Baroque Revival style, although staff believes there was confusion and misidentification of problems with elevations that appear too busy in the Territorial example versus more simplicity in the Baroque example. The issue was not a matter of architectural style; rather it was a matter of design.

The Spanish Baroque Revival style option includes numerous arches at the street portals and brick window surrounds that mimic the Commercial Building. An exception is requested to the Santa Fe style requirement for the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, if the Board would like to entertain this option, the required criteria responses are attached.

Both design options include a pitched roof on the top story. The roof is only minimally visible from several locations, as shown on attached sheets. There are only two or three pitched roofs in the defined streetscape, so a pitched roof exception is requested and the required criteria responses are attached.

The Board should clarify that the proposed building is not to be considered as an addition to the Lencic or Commercial Building. An attachment would require an exception to the 50% footprint rule. According to floor plans the building appears to be not attached, but south elevations show attaching structures. There appears to be a common wall at the Palace Avenue side which should not be allowed to break through in the future without an exception request.

When the Governing Body approved the Lencic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict there were conditions of approval. The HDRB authority for this case will be clarified at the hearing. The

City Attorney has passed out an email that she sent to you stating that the Board's full authority is granted by this ordinance.

Staff recommends denial of the exceptions requested unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the height, pitched roof, and style exceptions needed for this project. The Board should clarify potential addition issues.

Chair Woods: Kelley, as the City Attorney, could you please clarify for the Board, and for the public, the Board's jurisdiction in this project. And Carl, I would like you to hear this, so we don't get into a legal argument here tonight, that this is what the City Attorney has stated. Okay. Go ahead.

Ms. Brennan: The ordinance granting the re-zoning did not deprive the Board of its authority to hear the matter and make decisions on the matter.

Chair Woods: So we would, based on what you're saying, the Board has the exact same authority with this project as it would any project.

Ms. Brennan: Correct.

Chair Woods: Okay. We're okay? Everybody's okay on that? Okay. Any questions for staff? Yes, Cee.

Ms. Rios: Is the proposal 100% lot coverage?

Mr. Rasch: Nearly so, yes. I believe the redevelopment subdistrict has those kinds of standards, so it meets the underlying zoning.

Chair Woods: Any other questions? Okay, here's how we're going to do this. Let's have them present, and then we're going to break so the public can come forward and the Board can come down and look at the model and look at the submittals. Okay? So, could you be sworn in please? And everybody who's going to talk, let's get you sworn in at once.

Carl Boaz: Please state your name and address when you speak. Under penalty of perjury, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Speakers: Yes.

Mr. Sommer: Members of the Board, my name is Karl Sommer, my mailing address is Post Office Box 2476 Santa Fe New Mexico, 87504. I represent Greer Enterprises. I'm here to tonight with Ms. Alexis Girard, who is president of Greer Enterprises and who is the... I guess the Great Granddaughter of Nathan Solomon, who actually began the development of these properties.

I'd like to talk a little bit in my presentation about the history of this property and what the City Council did, and why our proposal is shaped the way it is. Jeff Seres and Joseph Karnes will go through the application particulars. What's in the application, the visual impact and visual analysis under the code and applicable standards and the styles issues that are in front of you. And we'll try to be as quick and as brief as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask me. I'll be glad to answer them as we move along.

But that's the road map for our presentation. In 2004, after many years of working on this project, Alexis directed us to seek an application for a redevelopment subdistrict zoning criteria for the Lensic block.

This block was created as a distinct block by virtue of the Downtown Urban Renewal in 1968, there was a taking which made Sandoval come around to Palace, and it separated this property from everything else by Sandoval and Palace. What it did also was encapsulate the buildings that we've all come to know that are the Lensic and the Lensic Commercial Building, with Burro Alley, San Francisco Street, Sandoval Street, and Palace.

Mr. Sommer: As a consequence, the City Council did impose a redevelopment district. One of the criteria in a redevelopment subdistrict is the height allowed under the code, the height allowed generally to a redevelopment subdistrict is 65 feet. We came in and filed an application and the City Council agreed that the height allowable on this property, and Jeff will go through it, is a maximum as a matter of the zoning, as 49 feet. That does not address the issue in front of you all with respect to the height exception and the calculation under the H-District ordinance which we are here to talk to you about in part.

The other thing that the City Council imposed as a matter of criteria for this subdistrict is that all parking be underground. No surface parking on the Lensic redevelopment subdistrict. What that meant

was, by virtue of City Staff's interpretation of the zoning ordinance, that the existing uses at the Lensic, including the Commercial building and the Lensic Theater, had to be parked in a structure. So the existing uses there plus the additional uses that we propose, have to be in a structure underground.

And as a result, you have a structure that is approximately 81 parking spaces underground. That is far more than the uses that we would be required to do if we were just parking the new uses that we propose. As a consequence of a very large parking structure underneath, it has created a need for this project to go up.

We knew that the project was going to have to go up, that's why we asked for a zoning criteria of 49 feet maximum. We have designed well within that envelope with our parapets at 43 feet, and the highest part of the roof, which David has described as being barely visible from a couple of select places, at 46 feet. So we're below the zoning criteria but we are above the height criteria for the H-District.

I could go through the exception criteria, but they're in front of you in writing and I don't want to belabor the issue. As a part of the process that we undertook after the rezoning was applied to the property, we have done an extensive public outreach, having many, many meetings with citizens in the Downtown Area who are interested in development and concerned about development. We have met with the Old Santa Fe Association Board, made presentations there. We have been in front of the BCD DRC. We have met many, many times with Staff to deal with the design of this project, it's impact.

Mr. Sommer:

And as a consequence of those meetings, this building is very different today than it was when we started out. We believe it is better. We believe the suggestions that have been made along the way have made this a better project.

And with respect to the one that is incorporated in front of you, that shows up within your purview, we believe is a significant one. One of the suggestions made along the way was that the Territorial style, as you see on the second to the left over there was too busy, and the building was too busy. We've incorporated a different style and design to address that issue. We leave it to you all to consider what the options were. We wanted you to see where we came from with respect to that.

There is a preference on the part of Alexis to incorporate and borrow some of the more Spanish Baroque elements from the existing buildings without mimicking them, without copying them, and that's the purpose of the two applications in front of you or the two suggestions in front of you.

Again we leave it to you, and I agree with you, Chairwoman Woods, with Kelley's assessment about the Board's Jurisdiction entirely. We don't believe it's limited by the virtue of the Ordinance or otherwise. When I say...the rezoning ordinance.

And we're here in front of you on all the issues you normally consider. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Jeff, and have him walk through the details of the project, the visual impact and analysis, and the styling issues in detail. And Joseph and he will walk through some of the graphics that we have. Thank you.

Mr. Seres: Thank you Karl. And good evening. My name is Jeff Seres, I'm with Studio Southwest Architecture in Santa Fe. Karl just mentioned, what I'm going to be doing is presenting the design. I'll present the impact on the Downtown, and then the two different styles that we have before you tonight.

So I'm going to move to the boards, is there a mike I can use?

Mr. Rasch: Unless you can move that mike and talk into it.

Chair Woods: Why don't you have one of your people point while you talk into the mike. How's that?

Mr. Seres: Starting with the design. Where we are now, the ground floor here is what you see, Karl is showing the ground floor area. It's a mixed-use building. We have underground floors. The areas in green are shown as retail and or restaurant areas. The areas in yellow are back-of-house lobby areas, and back-of-house functions for the twelve condominium units above on the second, third and fourth floors.

Mr. Seres: The area shown in blue is ramp down to the underground garage. There are 81 spaces underground below this building. Now, a significant aspect of the meetings we had with the ad hoc group, and with OSFA, and doing community outreach with members of these groups was to create a portal on this ground floor.

You can see the heavy dark line is our property line. We could have build all this ground floor to that line, of course, and with the removal of approximately 1,900 square feet, we have created this portal that wraps around the building on San Francisco, Sandoval, and back around to the north side of the building.

That shows up there, of course, in both versions of the 3-D renderings. If you can go to the model now, the building is very unique in terms of this location in the downtown. Of course Karl mentioned that what we have now is a surface parking lot that was created by pushing through Sandoval Street.

We have a very unique condition here in the corner being curved. That's a unique condition in the Downtown. Our building reflects that on the first two stories, the portal wraps around that. And then, as well as along the west side, which is the Sandoval street side, we have notched the building. In the center of that we've carved out a significant amount of space on the second, third, and fourth floors to reflect the mass of the El Dorado opposite the building at that point. That has also the effect of breaking up the building along that façade into two smaller buildings or separate buildings there.

Of course, the portal that wraps around is important in creating pedestrian-friendly amenity at the street level. Again, parking is completely underground. That's essentially the building, where we are now, with the design.

The impact on the downtown is the second part of my presentation and that starts with the 46 foot tall building. And let's put up this board here. The top drawing shows the envelope, the 49 foot envelope given to us in the rezoning of the block to a redevelopment subdistrict. We are at 46 foot tall to the highest portion of the building. That is on the hip roof, as it steps back from the fourth floor parapet. The fourth floor parapet is at 43 feet.

Mr. Seres: Now, this roof design is similar to the Delgado building over on Palace Avenue, where the parapet and the cornice predominates. And then the hip roof is set back from that, so there's no overhang as a roof-dominated structure would have, with eaves soffits.

Mr. Sommer: [Inaudible, away from microphone]

Mr. Seres: Then, in looking at the two-dimensional drawings, our three-dimensional renderings, and of course the model, we have stepped back massing. That was part of the redevelopment

subdistrict design criteria. Starting at the second floor parapet, which is the balcony railing for the third floor, that steps back, then, ten feet to the third floor.

Going up, then, we step back another seven feet to the fourth floor. So we're looking at 17 feet from the property line as a total step back in the massing of the building. These step backs create outdoor terraces for the third and fourth floor units, and on our design, that is, the first design, not the alternate, we show covered portals that are additive elements on those third and fourth floors.

I would like to introduce Joseph Karnes, now, to come up, and we're going to project images that are photo montages. Actual photos of the sight, with a computer rendering of the building placed in those photographs.

Mr. Karnes: Good evening Chair Woods, Board members. My name is Joseph Karnes, with Karl Sommer and Associates. I'm going to spend a couple of minutes walking through some of the 3-D, computer generated images that Ms. Girard commissioned as part of the design process. The intent is to illustrate the context of the proposed building in relation to the existing streetscapes surrounding the building.

The focus is on the massing. As between the two styles before you, the massing is very similar. The massing in the photos that we'll present reflects the Territorial style that was part of the original application. We'll start heading northbound on Sandoval Street, and work around the building in a clockwise direction.

This first photograph is approaching Water Street on the right. You can see the top of the municipal parking garage on the right. The county building behind the proposed building to the north, and the façade of the El Dorado across Sandoval Street to the west.

Mr. Karnes: Here's the building set in, and you can see the stepped back massing that Jeff talked about. You can still see the top of the municipal parking garage. As we move further north towards San Francisco Street, the 56 foot vertical façade of the El Dorado Hotel becomes more prominent.

And also Jeff's going to walk you through another element, reflecting on the context of this site, the four lanes of Sandoval Street, north of San Francisco, along with the sidewalks on either side, help frame the view for pedestrians in this area.

Here's the building set in. The second floor parapet forms the top of the streetscape view for viewers along the west side of Sandoval Street, similar to the view that the pedestrian gets along San Francisco Street on east towards the plaza. Jeff, do you have anything else to add on this?

Mr. Seres: [Inaudible, away from mike]

Mr. Boaz: I'm sorry, I can't hear anything. Can you switch around?

Mr. Seres: The two boards here, that were a part of the handout I gave, show the angle as a pedestrian on the street. And again, this is a function of the width of the street, the height of the building, and the stepped back massing of the building.

Now, we have another board, and you can see that angle as you look across from the El Dorado side of the street. If you come over to the other board, here, Karl. We've analyzed that in different streetscapes in the Downtown, and what we're showing is, we have an angle of view to the top, or the 43 foot point of this building that is similar to other streetscapes in the Downtown, including along Marcy Street, and the new streetscape there to the new Convention Center, yet unnamed.

Then the second one from the bottom shows the...yes, West San Francisco Street approximately just east of Galisteo. As again, the function of the width of the street, looking out from underneath the portals and the height of those buildings.

And then, on the corner where we have our building, across from the municipal parking garage, the anomaly in the Downtown is Burro Alley, where we have severe angles, up to the high points of the theater and the Bokum Building, and then moving farther south to the theater again, and then to the retail buildings there.

Mr. Karnes: So, we're showing, as you can see in this graphic, a very similar sight line, approximately 28 degrees as a viewer, looking up to the parapet of our building.

Mr. Sommer: [Inaudible, away from microphone]

Mr. Seres: This is important, in terms of the context. We have a building that is in a very specific context. It's a very specific site. These are the

conditions. This is all a part how we feel...what the impact is on the Downtown, but then ultimately how we feel this fits.

Mr. Karnes: The next shot shows the same southwest corner of the building, this time looking eastbound along San Francisco Street. As you can see, the façade of the proposed building continues the existing parapets on the north side of San Francisco Street, including the 42 foot high Lensic Commercial Building, and the 52 foot high Lensic Theater.

You can also see that the proposed second story balcony is a little bit lower than the second story windows along the Commercial Building. This view also illustrates the publicly available portal that just about doubles the width of the existing sidewalk on the north side of San Francisco Street.

Mr. Seres: This is important in terms of this, again, pedestrian experience along the street. The two story massing along the street. The horizontal components of the building as they match the other horizontal components going up the block as well as all the way up San Francisco Street.

And the stepped back massing, I think importantly not encroaching on the existing Commercial Building. We're going to reestablish that tower by removing the elevator that's been added on to that tower that will become more apparent there on that southwest corner of the existing Commercial Building. So very importantly that stepped back massing helps keep the status of that building.

Mr. Karnes: I have two more views to show. The next one is from the north, looking west along Grant Avenue, you can see the county building on the right hand side. The top of the El Dorado Hotel poking up above it, and the Fly Loft of the Lensic Theater, which dominates the foreground. Here's the proposed building set into that scenario. And it basically continues the parapet of the lower level of the Lensic Theater on across.

Mr. Karnes: And as you can see, the El Dorado Hotel... the view of the top of that building is not affected. So basically again it fills in and continues the existing view visible to pedestrians along the streets in this vicinity.

The last view is westbound along San Francisco Street. From this perspective, it looks like the El Dorado Hotel is next to the Commercial building, but of course, that is on the east side of

Sandoval street. Here is the building again set in. You can see the second story parapet, which is really what is visible to pedestrians along San Francisco Street. And it filling in and continuing the existing character of San Francisco Street.

Mr. Seres: Importantly in all these images, we're looking at our building not blocking any existing views beyond the Downtown. I think significantly here, the views to the northwest, the Jemez, are already being blocked by El Dorado, and then the other views looking northeast, looking up San Francisco, the views of the Cathedral.

So, again, this is part of the unique character and aspects of this block in terms of a building that, in our opinion, could only be on this site as designed.

Mr. Karnes: And in conclusion, we submit to you that the proposal before you satisfies each and every design standard adopted by the City Council as part of the subdistrict rezoning. And particularly with the inclusion of the public way there, the portals, the extending sidewalk and the notching of the building that Jeff has talked about along Sandoval Street. The project surpasses those standards and creates a project that fits into the context of this site. Thank you.

Mr. Seres: The last component of our presentation is style. We have presented the two styles to you this evening. And I wonder if we can speak to the board here. The board that I put up over here. This board shows a design from previous applications back in the early ... we've been at this eight years now. It's part of a design that picks up the Spanish Baroque style.

In response to community and the issue of the exceptions, we went to a Territorial style building. The Territorial style building, of course, includes the brick coping at the second and fourth stories, precast or stone elements in terms of the door and window casings and pediments, the metal railings along the lines of the metal railings of the existing Lensic commercial building. Again, the portal along the ground floor as a public amenity.

Mr. Seres: My response to the two public hearings that we've been through: the BCD DRC and the Planning Commission – there were conditions of approval. They asked us to look back and look at the Spanish Baroque, to look at the clue from the existing block.

Mr. Seres: Of course our ultimate design will reflect those elements and starting with the southwest corner, you can see the arches were

reintroduced and that shows in the model also as part of the portal. This surrounds on the second floor windows, notch or takes its cue from the existing commercial building.

Then we softened or reduced the treatment on the parapets in terms of the ... from the high Territorial brick copings and dentils to a stone or precast element that would match or be similar to the trims you see on the existing Lensic Theater.

Another aspect of the BCD DRC and Planning Commission was, especially along the west side. And that's the third board in, Karl. Is we've simplified the design. We've done that through a combination of again the same elements that you see from the ... moving from the Territorial to this more Spanish Baroque. As well as the massing on that side where many more pushes and pulls in and out on the building so we reduce that, flatten those out. Of course taking off the projecting portals along that façade and move those into where we carve those out of the third and fourth floors.

Again, we have reduced the ... on the railing of the third floor parapet or the fourth floor railing. We took out the intermediate masses, you know, the railing in between, essentially crenelations along that you see on the west side there. And just have that railing run behind the parapet as a singular element, a horizontal singular element.

So, I think that the corner... another aspect was on the corner where our initial design touched the portal... the portal touches the tower on the southwest corner of the commercial building. We moved that back and set that wall back from that corner to disengage and let the commercial building be more apparent there.

And then, of course, I mentioned the third and fourth floor portals reset.

And so to summarize, I would like to close our presentation and initially thank members of the community here. Some of them are here tonight. We worked a series of meetings, a half dozen or more, with an ad hoc committee. We worked with OSFA. We talked with other people. Many good ideas were exchanged. Many good ideas were incorporated into this design. We feel we have a better building because of that.

Mr. Seres: We have given you the details of the project, explaining why it fits in this context and why we have two styles. We are looking at, you

know, this project combining a mix of uses, filling in a previously essentially undisturbed site, a surface parking lot. And we feel we have created a successful design that recognizes the human scale of downtown.

We think pedestrians will continue to experience in the downtown as an enjoyable and consistent experience. We feel this project is in harmony with this specific block and in harmony with the historic downtown.

I want to thank you and look forward to your consideration.

Chair Woods: Thank you, Jeff. We are going to break for about five or ten minutes if the public will come forward and see the drawings and the model as well the blue.

[The HDRB took a recess here from 8:10 until 8:21 p.m.]

Chair Woods: I'd like to call the meeting back to order, please.

I'd like to thank the applicants for their very thorough presentation, especially the computer renderings, the photographs. I think they have passed the test.

What we are going to do is we are going to listen to the public. And then we will close out the public hearing part. And then the Board can ask questions to the applicant. What I am going to ask the applicant to do after the public finishes is that they show each street elevation in the elevations we have in our packet with both styles. We have got the renderings now. We also need to see the renderings that were not shown – Palace. So we need to see those.

But let's hear from the public first. Anyone who was not sworn in would have to be sworn in. Go ahead, Pat.

Patricia French: My name is Patricia French. I am a downtown property owner. I live close to the downtown. I walk several times a week to Tia Sophia's for breakfast. We have buildings that are, you know, a block and a half away from this site. Some of you might remember that we've been before you before. We were before you before.

Ms. French: I tell you that I know your first responsibility is to care for and protect the historic district which I strongly support and applaud. And that some of these decisions might be hard before you.

Ms. French: I also can tell you that initially, even though Alexis Girard is a twenty year plus close friend, and even though I traveled with her to other places so that she could study this project in other places – see how it was done stylistically – initially I had great reservations about the height of this project. And I can tell you today that I don't. I don't, as a person who has walked here, and walked these footsteps, as probably most of you have too.

I am more concerned about buildings that I understand are not under your purview, such as the new Museum that looms over us as we stand on the other side of the Plaza. We no longer see the Palace of the Governors. We see that instead. Even though that is a wonderful addition to our town.

This building fits. It doesn't affect anyone negatively, and, in fact, creates a fill in that I consider to be negative space. Having been in that parking lot a lot, at dark, this lights up the downtown in a positive way. So I ask you to please consider that and approve it. Thank you.

Peter Komis: Members of the Board, Chairman Woods, my name is Peter B. Komis. I live at 610 Don Gaspar Avenue. I'm wearing several hats here today.

Mr. Boaz May I swear you in?

Mr. Komis: Oh, yes.

Mr. Boaz: Under penalty of perjury, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. Komis: Yes, I do. Can you hear me? I am wearing several hats today. As you know, I am president of the Don Gaspar Neighborhood Association. I am also a commercial property owner of property very near to this property in the downtown area. And I am a concerned citizen as well.

I strongly support this project and I have for quite some time. The plan that I favor is the one that looks... I think you are calling it Spanish Colonial. It kind of reminds me of the Moorish building, the existing Moorish building right now. And the reason why... The Eldorado Hotel is not going to go away.

Mr. Komis The Lensic Building is not going to go away. And if you remember

one of the slides that was shown, you could see the existing corridor. You see on the left the Eldorado Hotel which is a nicely groomed street free of broken glass and graffiti. And you look at this little wall on the Lensic side and you see an empty parking lot, broken glass, graffiti that is being covered up. I'm also on the graffiti task force and it's really a problem we have with these types of areas. And I am glad that I am seeing a proposed building that will take care of this eyesore.

I think it looks beautiful the way it is with the Moorish revival. I think, looking back to 1930, some eighty years ago, you see a historic Moorish building, the Lensic Building, which is one of the most beautiful buildings in Santa Fe, in my opinion. I think 80 years from now if another building similar to that is next to it, 80 years from now they could probably call that 2010 Moorish Revival, and historians like you who are gonna be in Santa Fe will see the difference and will see...this was build this way, but then later in 2010, this was built that way.

And I think it makes sense to have a four story building next to these two masses. Anything smaller kind of looks...it's not as aesthetically pleasing to me. You see something further away, a small postage stamp for a 56 foot courthouse, it just makes no sense to me whatsoever. But this makes sense to me.

I grew up across the street from the Lensic Theater at 210 West San Francisco Street. It was the El Patio Restaurant, and Mr. Nathan Greer was my parents' landlord. And I take pride seeing a family as historic as the Greer family proceeding with this type of building and construction, keeping it in the family. And it's almost the continuity of a historic family in Santa Fe, and what imprint Alexis will leave for this community.

And I think it's a beautiful project and I think she's been patient, she's been fair, she's listened to everyone in the community. And she certainly has won support from me.

I want to bring something up to the Board. I am president of the Don Gaspar Neighborhood Association. We do meet on an as-needed basis. I've spoken with other members of the Board, except for one member, and you know who you are, sir, because there's a conflict of interest. So Robert and I cannot speak on this because he's on the board.

Mr. Komis: But I have spoken with Candice Gillis, and I have spoken to some of the neighbors in our neighborhood, some of whom actually left our neighborhood after 30, 40 years, they've moved to Rio Rancho, which is kind of sad. But I think what would be nice is having something in the Downtown area like this that we, close by residents can walk to. Some residents can be employed in this building, depending on what Alexis has in mind, et cetera.

So it works well for this block, and it works well for the Downtown community and for adjoining property owners. Like myself. So I urge you to support this project, especially the project that has the Moorish Revival, because it's like the continuity of the Lencic.

Chair Woods: Thank you.

Mr. Komis: So, thank you all.

Chair Woods: Mark?

Mr. Boaz: Will you state your name and address, please.

Mr. Hogan: Mark Hogan, 912 Old Pecos Trail.

Mr. Boaz: Under penalty of perjury, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. Hogan: Yes. Madam Chair, members of the Board, I'm here tonight after reviewing this as part of the BCD DRC. I wanted to speak on a couple of key points. Not only, we talked about as a Committee, but as an individual I've been tracking this project.

I can see that Jeff and the design team have been working hard trying to address perceived issues as well as real, bona fide issues in terms of height and effect on the streetscape and the number of sections and things that address sightlines and things I think are very important parts of this study, and go a long way to show what they've done to reduce the impacts of a project of this size.

I think to some extent, almost, at our review at the BCD we thought maybe they went too far in that they were trying to make everybody happy, and so it was more articulation, more step backs, simplify the more typical stylistic changes. And we commented that we thought that some of that needed to be taken away, that it needed to be simplified.

Mr. Hogan: That there was so much going on that the building wasn't reading consistently. And I'm pleased to see that they went back and revised the plans again to address some of those concerns.

I personally was not affected or concerned about the overall height of the building, particularly because of the stepped back massing. I feel like the relationship to the street is one of a pedestrian scale, and typical of the Downtown area. I, too, support the idea of allowing more of the Spanish Baroque influences back into this building. Primarily because I think it's rare when a whole block in a city, particularly in Santa Fe, where there's a family that can have a legacy over a whole block. And this is one of the rare cases where that happens, and I think it's kind of nice to acknowledge that and not to just say, well, it's got to be all Territorial or all Pueblo.

I think allowing for some personalization and allowing some family legacy to come into the picture is appropriate here. So, I just wanted to kind of reflect some of the things that we had talked about, and I would encourage you to support the project. Thank you.

Chair Woods: Thank you, Mark.

Mr. Boaz: You've already been sworn.

Mr. Ellenberg: Thank you. Richard Ellenberg, 1714 Canyon Road. I wanted to address a few points. The ad hoc process is a discretion process that hopefully leads to a better design, and I think was very successful in this point, and leads to a better understanding of each group's considerations and issues and constraints. And hopefully leads to a much cooler and more civil discussion of disagreements. It is not aimed at agreement, in this case, an agreement, particularly on height was not reached, by any means.

The second point I'd like to address is the two designs you have here. The second, so-called Baroque design requires an additional exception, I understand. And you've all heard the discussions as to the uniformity required by the historic ordinance being too much, too little, as opposed to allowing differentiation amongst buildings and diversity. I personally come down in favor somewhat of diversity. I don't think you can write more into the code than is there, but I would urge you to consider allowing some more diversity in Downtown Santa Fe rather than less.

Mr. Ellenberg:

The 49 foot height in the zoning code is in the zoning code. That issue got no attention, nobody appeared at those public hearings because the Historic Code controlled height, so I don't think that's a reason for granting height in this case. Dealing with height, I'll make some observations. I'm not going to try and tell all of you, who have much better trained eyes than I do what to do with it. But a few observations I want to make.

The portal certainly helps the building. The setbacks certainly help the buildings and moderate the impacts of height. This building really does not appear to block any views of mountains, I mean the El Dorado was a disaster in large part because it blocked the view of mountains going down Palace. This building doesn't do that. It's in the only context, I think, in which a four story building could be considered given the huge height of the Lensic addition and the El Dorado.

And I think the presentation and design are as good as they could be, just about, to come up with a fourth story. On the other hand, the vision plan sponsor said the one thing we can't do in this town is have one more four-story building, or we'll cross a threshold that they urged us not to do.

To some extent, the massing and density of this building and other buildings that are going up and being proposed in town are changing the character of Santa Fe. We're going from a vacant lot to a lot of density here. It's permitted by the code. I don't think there's anything could be done about it, and I think that impact should be separated some in thinking about height, but it is certainly a change that is ongoing in Santa Fe and that this continues.

There are some other context buildings that need to be thought about. The courthouse is lower, the property caddy-corner to this is substantially lower. The Lensic Commercial Building is lower than the height of the proposed four story, here. The other thing I would point out is that the four story is not the only thing you have before you want an exception. The third story needs an exception for height.

The third story adds approximately 50% to the square footage of what is permitted without any height exceptions. The fourth story, as proposed, would add approximately 40% to the density that

would be permitted in the first two stories without height exceptions. The third story in this context I think has no controversy. It seems most appropriate.

Mr. Ellenberg: The last point I would like to mention is precedence. To the extent this building has a four story, does it then create the context in which to argue that say a redevelopment caddy-corner from there should be taller, or doesn't it. I really don't have an opinion on that, it really is meant as a question to you, but as we spread out the height, based on the context of two buildings, do we equate a third building which creates more contextual argument for further expansions in height that wouldn't exist otherwise. Thank you.

Chair Woods: Thank you. Marilyn?

Ms. Bane: Hi. My name is Marilyn Bane, I live at 622 ½ B Canyon Road.

Mr. Boaz: Under penalty of perjury, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Ms. Bane: Yes, I do. Thank you. Chair Woods, members of the Historic Design Review Board, I am here this evening speaking on behalf of the Old Santa Fe Association. I would like to start by repeating what Mark previously alluded to and which David started with, which was that there is a confusion, or was a confusion, in terms of the interpretation of the comments, particularly at the BCD DRC, which I attended.

The concern was one of busyness; it was not one of style. So, I just think that's important to keep in mind, regardless of how you react to either one of the two different style versions before you.

Secondly, and what should be first, actually, I would like to thank Alexis Girard and Jeff Seres, and Karl Sommer, for, indeed, their graciousness in coming before the Old Santa Fe Association. I believe we had three meetings. Jeff, does that sound right to you? We had three meetings and we were very grateful for their concern for our concerns. We did not go into much of the detail that you heard from Richard Ellenberg, who spoke right before me. That, as I think he made clear... it points out the difference, I think, between the role of the Old Santa Fe Association and the ad hoc groups.

Our job is not to get into architectural detail. We're not an ad hoc group nor are we the Historic Design Review Board. What we are is

an organization with a mission, and that mission is to look after the general well-being of Santa Fe, and to quote guide the growth and development in such a way as to lose as little as possible.

Ms. Bane: We feel that the height on this building is a significant problem, and will indeed affect future buildings. We're very concerned about that. We feel it is too tall. We feel that... we have said this in every one of our meetings with the applicant. While we have been very complimentary of their very many attempts to make this as palatable as could possibly be made. So I would like to acknowledge that.

Last, indeed, it is the Old Santa Fe's job to take a position, and our position is to ask you to deny this. It is too tall. Thank you very much.

Chair Woods: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public who wishes to speak?

Okay, so we're going to close the public portion of the meeting, and I'm going to open up to the board to ask questions of the applicant. I have asked the applicant if we could take and put the elevations...well, we can still leave those out, but we haven't seen an elevation of Palace yet. So that we have that up there. Yes, Karen?

Ms. Walker: I need to go first because I still couldn't get into the ladies' room.

Chair Woods: Okay.

Ms. Walker: Okay.

Chair Woods: And you had to say that into your microphone. Did you get that... is it in the minutes.

Mr. Boaz: For the record, verbatim. [general laughter]

Chair Woods: Okay, verbatim, you got it.

Ms. Walker: Jeff, I want to say that your changes from the BCD DRC are miraculous. You've cleaned up the drawings so much and simplified them that it's just a huge, huge improvement. And I wanted to say that I completely agree with Alexis that the Moorish style is more gentle, less jarring, with all the different treatments of

the Territorial, and so I'm delighted with that drawing as well.

Ms. Walker: My only question, or my main question, really, is, initially the building was to be or was requested to be, four stories to accommodate affordable housing. Since you won't have affordable housing, I don't see the excuse for a fourth story.

Mr. Sommer: Madam Chair, briefly, we've never said that we needed a fourth story for affordable housing. I don't know where that came up, and I've heard that three or four times now. We've never posited that this would be an affordable housing project, because, under the affordable housing ordinance, this project could not exist.

It can't be done. So it wasn't a calculation on our part to trade height for affordable housing. And I think that...I don't know where that came up. I certainly never said it myself, and I know that Jeff and our consultants have never said that.

Ms. Girard: [Inaudible, away from microphone]

Chair Woods: Alexis, why don't you step up and see...

Ms. Girard: The conception of this project was far ahead of the affordable ordinance before that was conceived. And so it has been a four story and at one time a five story project, way before the affordable ordinance. And really, the cost of the underground parking are what are driving the height necessity.

Ms. Walker: Thank you.

Chair Woods: But, Alexis, doesn't the fourth story add parking to the underground parking?

Ms. Girard: No it doesn't.

Mr. Sommer: It adds three spaces.

Ms. Girard: Well, it adds three spaces because we're having to park the existing Lensic... the uses that went before. So no, there are twelve units, which require one parking space per unit.

Chair Woods: Other members of the Board have questions?

Mr. Featheringill: I have a quick question. In the reconfiguration to the Spanish Baroque, did the square footage change?

Mr. Seres: Yes, there was some square footage change, but we are under, in both cases, we are under the allowed square footage that we brought forward for the BCD and Planning Commission approvals.

Mr. Featheringill: Do you know about what the square footage change was?

Mr. Seres: Hundreds of feet. Just five, six hundred feet.

Mr. Featheringill: Okay.

Chair Woods: Jake?

Mr. Barrow: I had some square footage questions, I might as well get them sorted out, here. And this, I think, relates to the...where some of us feel like we're trying to figure out to mitigate the height of this building. On the fourth floor, if I understand it correctly, there are three units. How many square feet in total, and how much are each unit? I assume they're about the same, I don't.... And I'd like to know that for the third floor as well.

Mr. Seres: The fourth floor, we have a total of heated square footage of 46,351 square feet.

Mr. Barrow: Now, wait a minute, that's a total for what?

Mr. Seres: That's the total heated square footage.

Mr. Barrow: Of the entire building?

Mr. Seres: Yes.

Chair Woods: Would you say that again, Jeff?

Mr. Seres: Total heated square footage, 46,351. Now, those are gross square footages. So the fourth floor of that is 9,424 square feet. Or 19% of our square footage. And that 19%, we did include the 1855 square feet that that portal encompasses along the ground floor. And that's essentially not heated square footage but that's in our property.

Mr. Barrow: So, if I might, just to clarify then, if I'm looking at that correctly,

you're looking at about 2,500 square feet per unit or something like that. Is that...

Mr. Seres: On the fourth floor

Mr. Barrow: I'm just guessing by your figures.

Mr. Seres: 1,976, 2,151, and 2,620, and then the ancillary spaces, stairs, elevators, corridors, trash, recycling, electrical rooms, shafts, exercise, bring it to 9,464.

Mr. Barrow: How many square feet is the exercise room?

Mr. Seres: 699 square feet on the fourth floor, and 866 square feet on the third floor.

Mr. Barrow: For 860... and there's something called the club room on the second floor. How many square feet is that?

Mr. Seres: Second floor, meeting room is 899 square feet-900square feet.

Mr. Barrow: And, if I'm correctly reading this, I think I understand that there's three units in both designs on the fourth floor, four units...five units on the second floor, four units on the third floor?

Mr. Seres: Correct.

Mr. Barrow: And is that reduction simply because of the setback?

Mr. Seres: Setback massing, yes.

Mr. Barrow: I guess the point that I'm thinking about is that when I looked at this... really, I think it was very interesting what you did about the angle of view that you did in those streetscape sections. And I really think that's interesting, and I really think that contributes to our understanding of what we often miss in streetscape view. Because that is impacting.

And I think what's interesting, if I understand about this site, is that the impact of that is really mostly from this side of where I'm sitting on Sandoval, and the corner at the... what are we looking at there, the restaurant of the Hilton, or that corner that belongs to the Hilton Hotel. And to some extent along in front of the El Dorado, but I don't think the impact is so profound there as it is on this corner.

Otherwise, I'm in general agreement with the fact that from the street, you don't really see this, but it does have, in my mind, a significant impact from this corner.

Mr. Barrow: And so when I asked those questions about square feet and club rooms, exercise rooms, et cetera, and the numbers of square feet in these units, which, 2620, 2150, 1976, these are considerably large, fractional... I guess they're being used for fractional rentals...they're quite large. I mean, they're good enough for a single family home. So there may be some savings there possible to gain a little bit of angle from this very significant side. And that's really why I was asking those questions. I was kind of looking for some potential relief.

Chair Woods: Does anyone else wish to speak? Cee.

Ms. Rios: Well, with all my years on the Board, I think that this type of project is one of the most difficult types to judge, because you're dealing with height, you're dealing with massing, you know, where nothing existed before. And you're dealing with a big impact. So, along

[end of tape]

Ms. Rios: -can do that. I have some other questions. In terms of... and this question can be to you, Jeff, and to Staff as well. Do you feel that there will be, if this project is approved as proposed, that there would be an impact of a canyon effect on Sandoval Street because of the El Dorado, and then this building. David first.

Mr. Rasch: Madam Chair, Board members, the street sections that they presented tonight which were not in your packet I think are very revealing that their proposal is less severe in canyon effect than other areas they have identified. I think that is a very good argument that this is less so than many nearby areas.

I personally think that the step backs are working in this case, and in terms of height, if this gets approved as is, height exceptions are not allowed in height calculations. And until the El Dorado is 50 years old, since it was built before the height ordinance and is non-contributing, that won't be used in any nearby height calculations. So, the height creep won't be happening in this local area for some time.

Ms. Rios: Jeff, do you agree with what David has stated?

Mr. Seres: Yes, I agree, and that was one of the most revealing issues on doing those streetscape comparisons in terms of that. Again, given the parameters of street width, height of building, and the stepped back massing that we have a perceived...

Mr. Seres: and looking at this building, it'll be the same angle as looking at the buildings going up Canyon, again just east of Galisteo, there, as well as along Marcy, now with the new Civic Center, which is 39 feet sheer along the street and two significant masses along the street there.

We haven't done that at all in terms our ability, and that was very much, obviously, you know, our issue is dealing with this context of the El Dorado. And I think that is the perception, again, that we will not have the Canyon...the notch in the building was important also in reducing the square footage on the second, third, and fourth floors from the previous drawings or designs that we had that was essentially the stepped back massing consistent along the Sandoval street. So, those are what we took to task, you know, in thinking about this building, and making it fit.

Chair Woods: Thank you.

Ms. Rios: Can you tell us.... Did you have something to say?

Mr. Sommer: I just wanted to add one thing that was incorporated in the design along that. When the Downtown Vision Quest group got together, one of the things that the people that spoke in front of the group was the idea that this corner was going to cap off sort of an empty hole for pedestrians.

And what Alexis and Jeff have done, have tried to make this experience the pedestrian experience match what was described at that meeting. And I remember it well, about people being able to use the sidewalk, and underneath the building and not walk out and feel like it was towering over you and at every step looking up there is a step back, which produced what we thought was a pedestrian friendly human scale to avoid precisely that.

We struggled hard dealing with that first initial term canonization. So I think we worked hard at it from an experience standpoint, what you experience when you're standing next to this building. And ...

Chair Woods: Thank you, Karl.

Mr. Seres: [Inaudible, away from microphone]

Mr. Sommer: And just so the record's clear, he's removed the Lensic, the El Dorado, the parking lot, and the County Building, indicating that none of those buildings are in the height calculation.

Chair Woods: Thank you.

Ms. Rios: Jeff, could you give us an idea of what the interior ceiling heights are?

Mr. Seres: Yes and that's a significant part of our design is structural [inaudible] has been identified is a ten foot six floor to floor height. And using a system that's...well, getting too technical, it's a girder-slab, it's a hybrid steel and pre-cast concrete or di-core concrete slab that will allow for approximately nine foot six on the residential unit ceilings. On the ground floor we have 12 foot floor to floor, which will effectively have a ten and a half foot, or hopefully eleven foot in portions, ceiling height on the ground floor commercial.

Ms. Rios: Okay, and one other question. What is the depth of the porches?

Mr. Seres: They vary. Along the second floor, we're ten feet in places, and then eight foot at the minimum, so it ranges between ten and eight feet on the setback. I mentioned 17 feet as an average. That's something I averaged out across the entire project. 17 feet average from property line to fourth floor face of wall.

Ms. Rios: I have another question. Among you and Alexis and everybody there, what is your preference in terms of the two proposals?

Mr. Seres: We prefer the design that is called the Spanish Baroque. That is the again, simplified design. The elements there that I think are important are the, of course, the simplified massing that we incorporated there, and then the elements from the block. I think Peter spoke very well in terms of describing that as an opportunity here to complete this block and unique family consideration that the buildings on this block were started by Alexis's Great-Grandfather, and at the time, editorials that we've pulled implored Mr. Nathan Solomon not to build quote this Hollywood, decadent, Babylon building, which, you know, of course he [inaudible] and now we have the Lensic Theater. So it is an opportunity that way. We do

prefer that design with the arches and the elements borrowed in terms of details from the block.

Ms. Rios: What was your experience in reference to the different groups that you met? Was there a preference?

Mr. Seres: It's interesting...there was mixed reaction. Different elements were preferred by others. If I speak for Richard, I think he always liked the arches. The arches are something that he always thought were appropriate and well placed. Mark Hogan spoke and he certainly was on significant review of this project already from BCD DRC in terms of the issues there, the detailing and massing issues. And Planning Commission did, in their motion, the Spanish Baroque was part of their motion as a condition of approval. That was explicit, versus, I think, implied, in their condition.

Chair Woods: Thank you.

Ms. Rios: Thank you very much, and I just want to say thank you to all of you. I think you've done a very thorough presentation, you know, with the model, with the elevations with the other attorney giving us the overimposed views. Thank you.

Mr. Seres: Thank you.

Chair Woods: Deborah?

Ms. Shapiro: I'd like to congratulate you on that also. The presentation has been just amazing. But I think there's one thing that we haven't touched on yet, and...It's a little tangential to this Board, but I still think it's a really important element, and that's our energy conservation and resource conservation. I was wondering if there was anything... well I noticed there are an awful lot of windows, okay? And so, windows are always a problem in terms of heat loss and whatever. But I'm assuming you're going to do energy star appliances, and that kind of thing and we don't need to talk about that, but I wondered if there was anything unusual that you were using in this building that could be highlighted as a really positive thing.

Mr. Seres: We haven't' really identified the exterior wall system yet. There's an opportunity there to get a super-insulated panel, whether that's one of the hybrid materials...that has to be explored. That's our remaining opportunity there. Rainwater catchment, there's going to be a possibility to recycle a minimal amount of water for irrigation.

That would be for any planting that would be in structures, you know, along balconies or in terraces. These are all things I think are easy to do at this point and easy to integrate. And of course the performance of the windows and doors is an important issue.

Mr. Seres: Again, one of the dilemmas here was, in terms of building portals and so forth, how that added on our Territorial version there, you know, projected out and added to the perceived massing of the buildings. So, in terms of the design and impact, there was a point of diminishing return for that, which obviously adds shade. So it's always a give and take that way, and we continue to explore, and it's a pertinent issue, and we're looking to integrate as many concepts and ideas that way as possible.

Ms. Shapiro: Just one other thing. You are having a hip roof. Have you thought at all about doing any kind of solar....

Mr. Seres: We have not explored photovoltaics.

Ms. Shapiro: Because you don't have a parapet to hide anything.

Mr. Seres: We have a little bit of a recessed roof area there, and that's going to be, you know, for air conditioning compressors, and other possible appurtenances along those lines. We have the one cooling tower, too that's shown on the model behind the stair to the roof there next to the Lensic flyloft.

Chair Woods: A building of this sort would take a huge amount of energy, I think, to operate it.

Mr. Seres: Yes, we're looking at...there's an existing floor pipe heating and cooling system. We're looking to maintain that throughout the building and as well as other portions like the existing Commercial Building and the office portions of the theater.

Chair Woods: Thank you. Robert?

Mr. Frost: Most of my colleagues have hit on most everything else. I do want to mention just one thing from the green aspect that Deborah was talking about is the catchments of the rainwater...storage for the utilization of watering the outdoor plants. It's proven that plants keep things cooler, and to avoid using City water, use the water that's collected for that type of thing.

Mr. Frost: The other thing is the use, in the Moorish style, I think the use of the brick that is on the Commercial building around the windows, is a unique feature of that building and I think that that works well possibly on the corner. I think that, in looking at the building, the use of brick around all of the windows on the second floor makes that just pretty heavy. In the light of trying to create a family compound of sorts on the block, that we give each one a little bit of its own distinction. Pick up a couple of the pieces, but not try to copy the whole thing. I think it's just a little heavy on that aspect. That's pretty much all I've got on that one.

Chair Woods: Dan, did you have anything?

Mr. Featheringill: Well, I've been sitting here trying to figure out how to get rid of that fourth floor. And I realize you need to have a certain number of units available for resale or lease or whatever you're going to do with them. Trading off, trying to get that third floor bigger, you know, out to the perimeter, because it wouldn't, according to your cross-section there of the street, it really wouldn't affect the sightline any more, but I'm still not entirely sure we could squeeze enough units on that.

I agree with Robert on the windows. I like the old Commercial Building. Can you get a picture up on that? Right there. It has the arch on the corners, and it has the brick around the second floor window on the corners, and then the in-between spans are straight spans and not arches, and the windows up above don't have the brick or rock perimeter on them. And so I think that might be something you might want to look at, too. It's a little tall as far as the building. So if there's any way to get rid of that fourth floor it would be nice, but I understand the constraints to pay for that 85, or whatever it was, parking spots underneath. That's all I have.

Chair Woods: Karen.

Ms. Walker: I was looking at the palace avenue elevation, Jeff, and it was hard to see how far the covered, that being one of the iciest portions, how far that covered portal goes around onto Palace.

Mr. Seres: [Inaudible, away from microphone.] Yes, you can see that carrying around to the entrance to the parking garage there. And then beyond that is the back-of-house functions, the trash and loading and utilities for all buildings on the site.

Ms. Walker: Okay. One other thing. Do you anticipate having to pump water from time to time from the garage.

Mr. Seres: Yes. The garage will have grease and sand separation for any that outflows, either from just washing down the garage or snow melt flows to drains, flows to grease and sand separator, and that will be lifted back to the existing storm sewer system along Sandoval Street that empties into the river.

Ms. Walker: So it will find its way to the river?

Mr. Seres: Yes.

Ms. Walker: That's great.

Mr. Seres: All water coming off this site. As it does now.

Chair Woods: I'm concerned about that Palace elevation because we kind of glossed over the garbage thing as you're looking, where you're entering the parking garage, if you're standing in front of it...right there. That façade on Palace...that's such an important t-corner, and what is that? When you look on this elevation to the left of the parking garage opening.

Mr. Seres: That is a door essentially screening the compactor.

Chair Woods: It doesn't look real attractive to me, because as you go up and down Palace and you tee from Grant, that's right what you're going to see.

Mr. Seres: It is, of course, set back, in the plan you can see the setback there from the most projecting back of the theater.

Chair Woods: I'm just very concerned. I think that needs work, because it's such an important part of when Grant empties into Palace and you're going to see that and it feels like, okay, we did all this stuff going around the building, and this left over spot we've got.... And that happened on the El Dorado. When you're on Johnson Street and where all that garbage happens. And I think Palace is every bit as important as the other two streets, so that's a big concern to me. Is it rounded on both the Territorial version and the other version?

Mr. Seres: The corner? Yes.

Chair Woods: Both are rounded?

Mr. Seres: Yes. The first two stories.

Chair Woods: Okay I'm sorry, Robert. Go ahead.

Mr. Frost: I just had one question that I wanted to ask, and I forgot, sorry. One of the things that we're always talking about is trying to get people living-*living*-back in Downtown Santa Fe. That's why all the condos and things like this are going in. What is your projection...what do you feel...is going to be, based on the construction, the price the costing and the size of the units that we're actually going to get residents living in these versus people who come for a week out of the year.

Chair Woods: Robert, I really don't think that's in our jurisdiction. I understand it's a point, but I think it's a point that is not for this Board to take on right now. I'm sorry. I think there are a lot of things to address as far as style and height. I think that what we do need to do at this point is...maybe...we've been doing this for a while, and we could go around and take a poll of each Board member of their concerns and which style they prefer so we can give some feedback to these gentlemen. Robert, will you start?

Mr. Frost: One of my main concerns is the style. I'd tend to go more with the Moorish style. I, too, am concerned about the height of the building. And those are my two major concerns.

Ms. Shapiro: Well, I'll have to go along with Robert. I like the Moorish style, personally, and I am concerned about the height. But I'm also concerned about the energy consumption of the building. And the canyon effect that we may get on Sandoval Street between the El Dorado and the side of the building, especially where the actual sidewalk portion narrows down so much. Oh, and one other thing. The underground parking garage being right next to the garbage thing...two large openings right next to each other. That concerns me a little.

Mr. Seres: Major discussion in terms of the placement of that with Public Works Traffic Engineer John Romero.

Chair Woods: Jeff, can we let the Board speak now?

Mr. Seres: Yes.

Chair Woods: Thanks. Cee?

Ms. Rios: Well, I haven't decided which style I prefer now, at this moment, but if you could lessen the height, that would help.

Chair Woods: Karen.

Ms. Walker: I prefer the Moorish, but I think Robert's point...no it wasn't, it was

Mr. Featheringill To just have the brick at the corners the way the...that's really a very good idea. My main concern is the height is too great. And I would like to see three stories.

Mr. Barrow: Well, regarding the height, I'm in agreement with my colleagues. And I think that, in looking at this, I think there's some savings...for instance, it might be small, but having an exercise room on two floors for example. Things like that. I think there could be some savings. And I think that with some careful reductions, you can gain a tremendous amount from that view shed.

With regarding to the style, I'm going to be in an absolute minority here. I think the Lensic and the other building, the Lensic being significant, and the other building could be significant, they're very special and unique buildings to Santa Fe, and I think any repetition of those character defining features in another building diminishes the quality and the level of those buildings.

Having said that, there are certain features of that so-called Moorish building that I like, and so if it gets pushed in that direction...I'm going to find myself with Mr. Featheringill here as much as you can reduce using those features from those other buildings exactly as they appear as those buildings and making them distinguishable would be advisable in my opinion.

Chair Woods: Karen? Oh, I'm sorry, Dan. It's getting really late, way past my bedtime.

Mr. Featheringill: I'll hurry. I think we've kind of glossed over the north side of the building. And you have the nice renderings of the San Francisco side, and the west elevation. But we really probably need to look at the North side a little bit better. There are two large openings, as has been mentioned, and I'm concerned about pedestrian traffic in front of both of those.

I'm assuming there's going to be a garbage truck backing into the one for the compactor, and that's going to be very problematic in that intersection. I know you've worked it out with traffic as much as you can, but we're concerned about that here.

The height is excessive for that location. I wish we could figure out a way to get a little more into that third floor, get a couple of additional units in that. Maybe not having the multiple exercise rooms, maybe if we just had the exercise rooms on the fourth floor, and then that fourth floor could be scaled back a lot, and that might be able to help. And, did I hear that there's only going to be one parking space per unit down in the garage? That, I mean, you have two bedroom units. That's going to be a problem, I think.

Mr. Seres: That's the requirement. We may offer more.

Mr. Featheringill: Okay. I'm vacillating between styles. I think the Territorial style here is a little heavy-handed in the coloration of the brick coping which makes it look overwhelming. And it's a little bit busier with the plants and stuff. So it doesn't look as clean and nice as the Baroque one. The Baroque one has some really nice features to it, but it does match the other two buildings a little bit too much...in one way, and then in another way it's overdone with the style. But the biggest concern for me is the height. Being able to see it so much from the roadways. And that north elevation, we really have not had anything to really look at on that.

Chair Woods: I have a quick question Jeff. On this [inaudible] elevation, are those going to be true divided lights?

Mr. Seres: Yes.

Chair Woods: So they're not shown here as TDLs, they're just shown as kind of..

Mr. Seres: Well we showed them...yeah, I guess lack of public visibility is the issue there.

Chair Woods: Are they TDLs or are they not?

Mr. Seres: They're not.

Chair Woods: Okay, so at this point, they're not. So I have a hard time with that because I think that a building has to hold its integrity. And

obviously, I've known Alexis a long time, and all of you have put a lot into making this building have integrity whether we agree exactly with it or not. But, and I know it's less expensive not to do TDLs, but I would have a hard time looking at a building as a whole and seeing this interior space, and I'm not sure you wouldn't see it at some point, because obviously that's how you're lighting these units.

So, I'm very concerned about Palace, because that's the street that I see all the time that's near my office, so I'm very concerned. Where Grant comes into Palace, it's like the forgotten step-sister at the end, here. And again, I'm looking at this with completely fresh eyes as impartially as I can. I haven't put the kind of time and energy, obviously, that you have. I'm very concerned we're going to see the pitched roof and it's going to look incongruous with the other buildings around. I know you're swearing up and down you won't see it. I'm not convinced.

Chair Woods: And I'm going to agree with...and Jake and I don't always agree on things, but this time I agree with him on the Territorial. I think that the other buildings are unique and wonderful and this needs to be its own building. So, I agree. I think to try and introduce this Moorish block on a new building I'm not in agreement with, but I do think that the Territorial has to be simplified. It got a little over the top.

I'm not really sure where to go from here. Based on all this, Jeff, what would you like to see happen? And Karl, you stay sitting, I know what you want. [General laughter] That was a nice try.

Mr. Seres: I'm with him.

Chair Woods: Okay, that's your answer. David?

Mr. Rasch: Madam Chair, you pointed out something that I missed. 30" rule is applicable to all windows in the Downtown and Eastside District, not just public visibility. So if they want to go with non-TDL that's another exception.

Chair Woods: Yes?

Mr. Featheringill: One quick thing. I agree with both of you on the Territorial. That was kind of my point, was the fact that the drawing here, I don't think, is real representative of [inaudible]

- Chair Woods:** So, you guys missed the dinner by an hour—if we get out of here by eight thirty I have to take them to dinner, so. Jake?
- Mr. Barrow:** Just to pick up on that point, and I think this is worth reiterating, depending on where this goes, because, if you dilute this so-called Baroque Moorish much more, then it becomes something really kind of strange. And so I think the more that happens, the more...then I'm going to lean towards really going towards that Territorial style. And I think we have something that's going to be very hard to justify when it's been diluted.
- Mr. Frost:** I do not disagree. The thing, as it is with Dan, I think, the drawings, what we're seeing here is this really dark brick and light wall and the white. There's just a lot, in that particular rendering of the Territorial, it just jumps. And it's just too much. That's why I tended to go a little more towards the Moorish because it's a little simpler. And Territorial is somewhat of a simple design. And so, I could go either way as long as the Territorial is softened up.
- Mr. Seres:** Are we including the arches in this discussion, as something that is not Territorial or could be included in the Territorial design?
- Mr. Rasch:** More than an accent would be an exception.
- Mr. Frost:** You mean, just the one arch on the corner?
- Mr. Seres:** Well, you know the arched portal or our arched streetscape. Our arches versus the square or rectangular openings. That's a major difference in the two designs along the street.
- Mr. Featheringill:** Arch openings do not go in the Territorial design.
- Chair Woods:** I have a question, Jeff. How tall is...I mean I'm back on Palace Avenue. How tall is this door?
- Mr. Seres:** That's at 14 and a half feet. We have to back a semi into that area.
- Chair Woods:** How often are you backing semis into this?
- Mr. Seres:** Eight times a year.
- Chair Woods:** Okay.

Mr. Seres: For Theater shows.

Char Woods: Okay. And we don't know yet what this door looks like?

Mr. Seres: Right now it's very non-descript. We could add detail on that.

Mr. Barrow: You said the door was blocking the trash compactor. Is that the same door you're talking about now?

Mr. Seres: Yes. The 14 and a half foot door. That door could be lower. The compactor is tall it's a...the trash will be picked up after hours, or in the wee hours. A front-load truck will grab the compacted dumpster...overhead, back out and dump that. And then that door is really screening that unit. The unit is quite tall, maybe twelve feet even. So we need all that door to screen that unit.

Mr. Sommer: If I may, Madam Chair. You asked me to sit down, and I've checked with Alexis, and you all have said something--she's asked me to stand up. [General laughter]

Chair Woods: She's obviously spending an exorbitant hourly rate. [General laughter]

Mr. Sommer: You all have said things that we think we can take into account and analyze. Obviously the most difficult one for us is the fourth floor. We've worked hard on it, but [inaudible] some ideas. We can go back on various levels about what you've talked about and analyze them. Particularly a lot of the commentary relating to the style of this building is going to define, in part, its success for us. And we're very sensitive to that.

You've said a lot here tonight. And we can take some of that back, work on it, and then come back in front of you. I'm not up here making promises we're going to redesign this whole building, but I think it's incumbent on us. We've done it at every level, along the way, to take into account what's been told to us to see if we can incorporate it as we move forward. As you all know, the Council is going to take another look at this. I think we've heard things here tonight that we haven't heard in the past. We've heard tweaks on things that we heard, but we'd like to take it and come back to you. So, that's our preference if you all are so inclined, let us have another look at all of the issues that you've raised...

Chair Woods: I really appreciate that. That's great. And I don't think the Board is asking you guys to redesign this building, at all. So, when you said you can't...I don't think that's the expectation. I think they really appreciate everything you've put into it. But we certainly appreciate that you're willing to come back. So with that, could I entertain a motion to postpone?

Ms. Walker: May I ask one last question, please? What are the square footages of the fractionalized ownership units?

Chair Woods: He went through those.

Ms. Walker: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair Woods: Yeah, that was all given to Jake, while you were in the restroom.

Ms. Walker: I was in the restroom. Sorry.

Chair Woods: So, I'd like to entertain a motion for postponement.

Mr. Frost: **Madam Chair, I make a motion we postpone Case #H 08 46 for additional design submittals.**

Chair Woods: **Is there a second? [Ms. Rios signaled non-verbally that she would second the motion] All in favor?**

All: **Aye.**

2. **Case #H-08-048.** 428 Agua Fria. Historic Transition District. Hoopes + Associates, agent for Mark Hagedorn, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by re-roofing, installing skylights, refurbishing windows, removing iron window grills, railing, and fence, construct an approximately 3'6" high stuccoed wall and construct an electrically operated awning. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The commercial building located at 428 Agua Fria was constructed by 1908, as a structure appears on the Sanborn Map within that location, and is listed as Southwest Vernacular style on the 1996 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The building has received major alterations which include modern doors, windows, an addition after 1948, a porch addition, and walls and fences. The Official Map lists the building as

non-contributing to the Historic Transition District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following alteration:

1. Re-roofing and installing approximately four skylights. Skylights will be low profile, grey tinted glass.
2. Remove wrought iron grills from windows and refurbish existing windows to remain the dark natural stained color.
3. Re-stucco to match existing color and texture.
4. Remove the wrought iron fence along north and west property line but retain the existing gates and corner section. Construct an approximately 2' 6" high CMU stuccoed wall along the north and west property line where the triangle visibility will not allow a wall to exceed 3' high. An interior courtyard banco will be constructed. The wall will be stuccoed to match the building.
5. Install an electrically operated awning in the color "Toast" for the fabric and frame parts in black. The awning will be installed at the west elevation portal. The awning will be used during inclement weather in order to utilize the outside dining area. No structural changes are anticipated with the installation of the awning. Awning manufacturing information is provided in the packet.
6. Lastly proposed is the removal of existing signs and the installation of new signs. All signs are approved by the Historic staff as per the City of Santa Fe Land Development Ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that all new signs are approved by the Historic Staff Inspector and that no skylights are publicly visible. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D0 General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (G) Historic Transition District."

Mr. Barrow asked if staff could give him some precedent for these retractable awnings in this district.

Ms. Barrett said this case was in the Historic Transition District and such cases were usually done by staff. Santa Fe has a lot of little awnings in the downtown but she was not aware of any in this district. She said the only issue she had seen with them was that having a business name on the awnings counted as a sign.

Mr. Rasch added that most of them were installed to block the sun in businesses.

Present and sworn was Ms. Jan Brennan 2210 Miguel Chávez. Who said they talked about the awning and decided if the Board didn't permit this they would just extend it.

Ms. Barrett asked if the Board could approve the remainder of the project if the awning was not approved.

Ms. Rios thought the Board could support extending the porch.

Mr. Frost asked why they would take down that nice wrought iron fence.

Ms. Brennan felt it was too medieval. She added that they wanted to put a banco there and they would keep the wrought iron gate.

Chair Woods asked how an extended portal would work with the three-foot wall.

Ms. Walker didn't think they could do that piecemeal without drawings.

Mr. Featheringill said the drawings were on page 14.

Ms. Brennan said they would go up to the wall.

Chair Woods asked if the portal would sit on top of the wall.

Mr. Featheringill said they could get a permit for all interior work for the restaurant.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Frost asked if they couldn't just approve everything except for the awning and portal design.

Chair Woods said the Board could ask that part to come back.

Ms. Barrett agreed that part could come back.

Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 08-049 per staff recommendations with one exception, that the awnings be denied. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

10. ~~Case #H-08-049.~~ 125 Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Granito, agent for Mary & John Granito, proposes to replace a divided-light window in a stepped opening with a larger single-light display window on a

non-contributing commercial building and to install an awning over the window and door. An exception is requested to exceed the 30" window pane rule (Section 14-5.2(E)(1)c)). (David Rasch)

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

Background and Summary:

"125 Water Street is a commercial building that was constructed between 1921 and 1930 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building featured a 24' high false front that hides a pitched roof behind, a deep front porch with stepped front wall, wooden carved corbels, and header beam, and randomly arranged windows and buttresses on the east elevation. The building was remodeled in 1982 and it is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"On July 19, 2005, the HDRB approved remodeling of the building, including a second-story addition matching the existing height and enclosing the front porch while retaining the character-defining stepped opening.

"Now, the applicant proposes to alter the front of the building with the following two items.

"1. A larger, rectangular-shaped opening will be created for more display access from the street. The storefront window exceeds the 30 inch rule and an exception is requested with the required responses attached.

"2. An awning will be installed over the window and door. Awning material and color was not submitted.

Staff Recommendation:

"Staff recommends denial of the exception to exceed the 30 inch glazing rule without a portal (Section 14-5.2 (E) (1) (c)) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exception. Otherwise, this application complies with Sections 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District."

Present and sworn was Mr. John Granito. He said this represented a big hardship for his family because all of their prospective tenants requested better display windows. He said he had taken pictures of other windows that were bigger in the downtown area, including the Lensic and the St Francis Hotel. He said there were many who were willing to have the divided light windows. He said theirs was a small building and they needed that window. He said Packards on the Plaza had gigantic windows and got renovation approval in 1996. He described the awning as oxidized steel – a steel awning oxidized.

Chair Woods said she would not consider that an awning but a permanent fixture.

Mr. Rasch said it was not traditional.

Mr. Featheringill agreed it was not traditional. Typically an awning was something that folded up.

Mr. Granito said he would do a cloth awning.

Mr. Frost commented that they could make the frame very tight. He said he understood the need for the window. The window right across the street was in panels that met the 30" rule. A good number of them did meet the rule.

Mr. Granito said that with the limited space, that was an expense they didn't want. He said the opening was 7' by 6' and was 2.5' from the street level...

Chair Woods asked the reason for the awning.

Mr. Granito said he thought it would help appease the Board. He explained that there were no portals on Water Street.

Chair Woods said she didn't mind a retractable awning but a steel awning was too contemporary.

Mr. Barrow asked why it wouldn't be less of an exception to just have three single panes and do away with any awning. He explained that the tenants were not the deciders of what windows should be there. He said that's why Santa Fe has an ordinance.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Granito said there was such a proliferation of vacant buildings downtown. There were people who didn't want to do business downtown so they were going to other parts of town and that presented a hardship for the Granito family.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-049 per the applicant's submittal to have a single glazed widow and cloth awning, having met the criteria for an exception. With staff to review color and style of awning. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and the vote resulted in a 3 to 3 tie. Chair Woods voted yes. The motion passed 4-3.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Barrow asked if the Board was postponing gates and fence policy until June 10th.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He said staff would bring forth Mr. Barrow's paper and material currently in the code and also the ordinance draft that Ms. Walker found and discuss the rewrite of the guidelines.

Mr. Rasch said the next meeting would be June 10.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer