



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6-4-08 TIME 10:30 am

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

AMENDED

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
April 22, 2008
May 15, 2008
- E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS
130 E. Santa Fe Avenue
325 & 325 ½ Delgado Street
125 Water Street
610 Miller Street
- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
 - 1. Informational Study Session for the proposal by Hunt Santa Fe, LLC to construct seven mixed-use buildings totaling approximately 154,000 sq. ft., with underground parking, to a maximum height of 42 ft. where the maximum allowable heights are between 16 ft. and 22 ft. for 55% of new structures, between 28 ft. and 35 ft. for 30% of new structures, and 42 ft. for 15% of new structures, and the renovation of two existing historic buildings totaling 9,000 sq. ft. and the former St. Francis School totaling 27,000 square feet. The property is located between Paseo de Peralta, Alameda Street, and Cathedral Place in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. (David Rasch)
 - 2. Santa Fe Plaza. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements that includes banco lighting around the obelisk. (Chip Lilienthal)
 - 3. Discussion of wall and fence study along with current relevant ordinance and policy sections.
- I. OLD BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-07-030. 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to amend a previous approval for railings on a landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)

2. 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)
3. 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)), and to replace one awning and install another awning on the Lensic Theater facade. (David Rasch)

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-056. 343 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Funk, owner/agent, proposes to repaint trim on a Significant building using new colors. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-08-057. 712 Gildersleeve Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. John Craig, agent/owner, proposes to replace windows with French doors and construct a 72 sq. ft. balcony on a non-primary elevation and restucco a contributing residence. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-08-058. 704 Camino Cabra. Historic Review District. Andy Lyons, agent for Sarah Rinehart, proposes to construct an approximately 508 sq. ft second story addition to a height of 22' 11" where the maximum allowable height is 21' 10" (23' 10" per additional for slope) on a non-status garage. (Marissa Barrett)
4. Case #H-08-059. 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to construct a freestanding ATM machine to a height of 7' 6" and install brick pavers on a Landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-08-061. 120 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andree Falls, agent/owner, proposes to remove a 6' high coyote fence and replace with an approximately 5' 11" high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 4' 11" and construct a stucco entry with pedestrian gate to a height of 9' 6" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
6. Case #H-08-062. 1183A Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mud Houses, Inc, agent for Robert Frank, proposes to construct an approximately 310 sq. ft. of portals and an approximately 433 sq. ft. attached garage to a non-contributing building and to construct yard walls to the maximum allowable height of 6' at interior locations and 5' on streetscape. (Marissa Barrett)
7. Case #H-08-63. 223 ½ Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jean-Jacques Deseke, agent for Martha Egen, propose to replace a non-historic door with a window and install an awning over the French doors on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
8. Case #H-08-064. 511 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Suby Bowden + Associates, Mr. J. Altman, proposes to alter a stuccoed entry and pedestrian gate and refinish retaining walls on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
9. Case #H-08-065. 1133 E. Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul Rochford, proposes to construct an approximately 5' to 6' high wall where the maximum allowable height is 5' and to re-stucco and re-paint trim on a contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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 June 10, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, June 10, 2008.

SUMMARY INDEX OF
THE HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
June 10, 2008

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
Call to Order	Convened at 5:30	1
Roll Call	Quorum Established	1
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes		
April 22, 2008	Approved as amended	2
May 13, 2008	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Findings/Conclusions	Approved as presented	2-3
Communications	None	3
Administrative Matters		
1. Paseo de Santa Fe	Discussion	3-12
2. Santa Fe Plaza	Approved banco lighting	12-13
3. Wall and Fence Guidelines	Directed staff to issue a PSA	13, 43
Old Business		
1. Case #H 07-030 530 S. Guadalupe Street	Approved as recommended	13-15
2. Case #H 08-053 444 Camino Don Miguel	Approved with conditions	15-18
3. Case #H 08-046 Sandoval at San Francisco	Approved with conditions	19-27
New Business		
1. Case #H 08-056 343 E. Palace Avenue	Denied	27-29
2. Case #H 08-057 712 Gildersleeve Street	Approved as recommended	29-31
3. Case #H 08-058 704 Camino Cabra	Approved	31-32

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
4. Case #H 08-059 530 S. Guadalupe Street	Postponed for redesign	32-34
5. Case #H 08-061 120 Quintana Street	Approved with conditions	35-36
6. Case #H 08-062 1183A Cerro Gordo Road	Approved as recommended	37-38
7. Case #H 08-063 223½ Canyon Road	Approved with conditions	38-40
8. Case #H 08-064 511 Camino Rancheros	Removed from Agenda	41
9. Case #H 08-064 1133 E. Alameda Street	Approved with conditions	41-43
Matters from the Board	Discussion	43
Adjournment	Adjourned at 9:45	44
Exhibits: A, B		

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

June 10, 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. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Robert Frost

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 noted that three changes needed to be made to the agenda. He said, under D, the wrong date was listed. He said it should be the minutes from May 13th, not the 15th. He said under administrative matters he recommended they move item three to the end of the agenda. He also noted that under New Business, number eight, Case #H-08-064 had been removed by staff. .

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 22, 2008

Ms. Shapiro noted that on page 7, on the 5th line, it said window, but should say corner. She also asked that on page 11, on the 7th line, the word "not" should be removed.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the April 22, 2008 minutes as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

May 13, 2008

Ms. Rios asked that, on page 12, the 9th line be deleted, and replaced with "Ms. Rios said the project was close to being approved with the deletion of the wooden gate." She also gave a correction on page 31, with regard to the motion made; she wished to defer to Ms. Walker, since her motion had been more detailed.

Mr. Boaz noted that the corrections were not needed, since the most recent version of the minutes had been done verbatim on both of those pages.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the May 13, 2008 minutes. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. It passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

Case #H-08-008, 130 E. Santa Fe Avenue
Case #H-08-043, 325 & 325 ½ Delgado Street
Case #H-08-045, 125 Water Street
Case #H-08-049, 610 Miller Street

Ms. Walker asked, regarding Miller Street, if the gate issue had been clarified.

Chair Woods agreed it had.

Mr. Featheringill recused himself from this consideration.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Featheringill who had recused himself.

Mr. Featheringill rejoined the bench.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

John Greenspan, 123 Lorenzo Road, was sworn in. He said he and his wife were owners of 126 Duran Street, and the house across from theirs was 127A Duran. He said 127A Duran was undergoing construction, which had been a nightmare for the neighbors. He said the structure looked too big for the lot, and thought it was destroying the character of the neighborhood.

He said he thought the Board would be surprised at what the structure looked like, and said he hoped the HDRB would be more careful about what it permitted for plans that were proposed for renovating houses on Duran Street.

Chair Woods asked staff to look into the matter to be sure the structure was being renovated according to the plans the Board had approved.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1. Informational Study Session for the proposal by Hunt Santa Fe, LLC to construct seven mixed-use buildings totaling approximately 154,000 sq. ft., with underground parking, to a maximum height of 42 ft. where the maximum allowable heights are between 16 ft. and 22 ft. for 55% of new structures, between 28 ft. and 35 ft. for 30% of new structures, and 42 ft. for 15% of new structures, and the renovation of two existing historic buildings totaling 9,000 sq. ft. and the former St. Francis School totaling 27,000 square feet. The property is located between Paseo de Peralta, Alameda Street, and Cathedral Place in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. (David Rasch)**

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"131, 213, 219, and 223 Cathedral Place and 275 Alameda Street is the 6.28 acre lot owned by the Archdiocese of Santa Fe to the southeast of the Cathedral. There are five existing buildings within the area planned for development, with seven buildings proposed for construction in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The Cathedral Basilica of St. Francis of Assisi is a Significant building on this site. 131 Cathedral Place, known as the Rectory, along with 213 and 223 Cathedral Place are contributing buildings. 219 Cathedral Place, known as the Villa Therese Clinic, has been downgraded to non-contributing. 275 East Alameda Street, known as the St. Francis Cathedral School, is a non-contributing building that is eligible for upgrade in historic status. It is a Meem building from mid 1950s.

"On February 21, 2006, the applicant proposed a massing plan for review with a request for height exceptions. The maximum allowable height as determined by staff using linear and radial calculations range from 16' to 40'. Most buildings are excluded from the streetscape averaging process.

"At the February 2006 hearing, the applicant requested the following maximum heights: one-story structures at 22'; two-story structures at 35' 6"; and three-story structures at 46'. The Historic Design Review Board denied the requested height exceptions stating that the criteria were not met. However, the HDRB approved a preliminary height and massing plan with the following four conditions:

1. 55% of new structures to be one-story with a balance of heights between 16' and 22', and
2. 30% of new structures to be two-story with a balance of heights between 28' and 35', and
3. 15% of new structures to be three-story up to 42', and
4. Appropriately designed setbacks, especially on Cathedral Place.

"On February 27, 2006, the applicant filed an appeal of that decision to the Governing Body. The appeal asserted that the Board:

1. Did not properly apply the exception criteria to the request, and
2. Improperly applied the standards for number of stories for Old Santa Fe Style ("With rare exception, buildings are of one story, few have three stories...") instead of Recent Santa Fe Style ("No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portals, setbacks or other design elements"), and

3. Used arbitrary and contrary criteria to restrict heights.

"The appeal was heard by the Governing Body on June 14, 2006 and the appeal was rescinded on June 15, 2006 during a continuation hearing.

"Now, the applicant is returning to the Board for advice on developing the site. It is believed that the applicant intends to follow the height and massing restrictions established by the HDRB. However, since the applicant has submitted only a site plan and general design features, staff is unable to comment on the submittal with respect to compliance with those restrictions or with other applicable historic district standards.

"The applicant has submitted further information for your advice tonight.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"No action needed at this time. Staff recommends that any historic districts overlay zoning code issues be discussed and recommendations given to address the issues before the applicant submits for formal action by the Board."

Chair Woods asked the applicant to come forward and present their information. She asked the applicant to stay with what the Board had jurisdiction over. She said after the presentation had been made, the Board would break for the public to view the model and drawings. She said they would have public testimony and questions from the Board following the break. She also noted that she did not need to recuse herself, because her company was not involved in the project, and she therefore had no financial interest.

Mr. Lorn Tryk, of 206 McKenzie, Mr. Gary Sapp, with Hunt Development Group, and Mr. Mario Savopoulos, with PNR Architects were sworn in.

Mr. Tryk said they had brought several people, but only three intended to speak. He said they hoped the model would speak for itself. He said they had also brought their local architects and planners. He said the issue of height and scale had been discussed a lot before. He added that the reason they had come was to see if there was anything important that they had missed. He said in the design of buildings, it would be nice to say they had checked in with you on it.

Mr. Tryk said there had been lots of input from neighbors, as well as the neighborhood association on the east side. He explained that what the public would see was fabric very similar to that part of Downtown. He said there were buildings around that were bigger and more massive than what they were proposing.

Mr. Tryk said they had a continuous street system in the block. He said they had located all the parking underground, which would give them a more pedestrian-oriented

area and streetscapes that would be evocative of old Santa Fe.

He said they had assembled a vocabulary of urban elements and style, and had learned from existing buildings on the east side, and had used many of the elements present on existing buildings in their designs. He said they would come back before the Board with detailed proposals for each building.

He said it was their intention to have traditional architecture. He said it would be traditional Santa Fe style, and individual buildings had some unique character. He said they had been sensitive when trying to tweak their plans and respect the historic buildings and create meaningful open space around them.

Mr. Tryk said the zoning of BCD, Alameda subdistrict had design guides which they also had to meet. He explained that it permitted more intense development because it had lots of non-historic buildings, but also was a district where the desire was to strengthen the continuity of block form that was seen.

Mr. Tryk said he was sure the lasting impression was that it would be a big massive project, but said the Board could see from the model that was not the case. He said it did have set backs and upper deck patios.

Mr. Savopoulos pointed to the left side where he said they were being mindful about connectivity and building bridges, and said they had looked at creating a district that felt like it belonged to the center, but was at the same time vibrant, exciting, and viable, with a retail base with restaurants, and residential on top. He said they had tried to create permeability on the sides. He added that they had tried to create an environment that appeared like it had been there for a long time.

He said the mix of styles, all traditional, had been fully researched. He said they had about 23 vision boards that informed the spaces. He explained that the space board showed the different types of spaces with the hierarchy of spaces. He explained that they intended to preserve the garden.

Mr. Savopoulos explained that most of the parking was underground, so the area was pedestrian-friendly. He said they had tried to compliment the Paseo and the River. He said it was a small community, and when walking around it, they had tried to create an environment where one felt like spending several hours.

Mr. Savopoulos said the renderings on the bottom were intended to give the Board a sense of the main plaza. He said the building on the left had been inspired by the St. Francis Hotel. He said native New Mexico Sandstone would go to the most important building, a small scale tower. He said nothing was straight or linear, but there was a massing of organic shape, which built up to the three story areas, with more intimate one-story structures around the perimeter. He said they had placed higher masses in the center of the buildings.

He said every view had an iconic element that was relevant to the community. He said the landscaping was critical to make it feel like it had been there a long time. He pointed out the Archive building.

He also pointed out a base with natural stone, and explained how it had been designed to look organic and casual. He added that the hotel was not on a large lot. He said they wanted to maximize the human scale, and wanted to learn from the expansion and contraction.

Mr. Sapp said they had begun the project quite some time prior. He explained that when they had initially contemplated the project, they had thought that a restaurant, hotel, and residential hospitality would all be appropriate on the site. He said they had found that was not the case, from their contentious relations with the Guardians of Santa Fe, and apologized for the first seven hours of the appeal. He said they wanted to put forth a project that didn't need exceptions or variances to execute. He said they wanted an outstanding collection of buildings on an extraordinary property.

Mr. Sapp explained they had criteria in mind including that the structures be permeable, indigenous, and have the appropriate scale. He said they had focused on whether it was credible to maximize their development envelope. He said they had concluded that the allowable lot coverage and allowable height didn't work. He said they could not achieve it with parking entries from Paseo, and added that they could not achieve the density, so they had got back to the grids and blocks, and developed what they were presenting at that time. He noted it was only 60% instead of 67% lot coverage.

Mr. Sapp said they had met with the public and dealt with uses, etc. He said their current design showed the direction they were headed in and said they wanted an indication that the Board didn't see fundamental disconnects so, with that level of comfort, they could move forward. He said they intended to bring an application that met the requirements both of the Board, and of the BCD. He said they were meeting with BCD the following Thursday. He said they hoped they had been able to distill a site plan that was approvable by the HDRB.

Chair Woods thanked Mr. Tryk, Mr. Savopoulos, and Mr. Sapp. She said the Board would break for about ten minutes for public viewing.

After the break, Chair Woods asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak.

Mr. Boaz swore in the members of the public who wished to address the Board.

Mr. Pen LaFarge said he had been on the committee with the developers giving them advice, as he had been on the previous committee that dealt with the height. He said when the Board had turned down the height request he had refused to give an

opinion, and didn't want to give one now, since he was on the OSFA Board at that time, and also was a member of the cathedral parish community.

He said he thought the process had worked rather well, and said the developers and architects had been forthcoming and had really listened. He said he thought talking was better than fighting, and said this was one of the few times it had worked that way. He said they had tried to incorporate the committee's ideas into the designs.

Mr. Sajimaya Dandi said he wished to commend the architects. He said it looked very pleasing to him. He said he had reservations regarding the historic wall on Cathedral, and said the road was too narrow to accommodate the disabled. He said if the buildings were far out, the public had trouble walking on Cathedral Place.

Mr. Robert Funk, of 343 E Palace, said he thought the drawings looked beautiful, and said he thought it would be a real addition to the City of Santa Fe.

Ms. Luellen Smiley, also of 343 E Palace, said she wanted to commend the project, and said she would like to see it developed.

Ms. Marilyn Bane noted that there were no agendas for the meeting out front. She said she was having a bit of a problem, and thought she would bring it to the Board's attention. She said there had been information submitted very late, and was therefore not available to the public. She said that gave the members of the public a short shrift. She said that even the previous day some of the information had not been available.

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

Ms. Walker asked if the February 2006 letter on heights, with percentages, applied to the whole project.

Mr. Sapp said it applied to new buildings in the whole project.

Ms. Walker said they were not doing the entire project.

Mr. Sapp agreed. He said they would be doing the Church separately, but said the criteria applied to the whole project. He said they were aware of that.

Ms. Walker said it appeared there would be two-way traffic in the project.

Mr. Sapp said there would be some one-way like entrances off Cathedral Place, but said the Alameda and Paseo entrances were two way.

Ms. Walker said the picture showed people walking in the middle of the road with a car way over to the right. She asked about the width.

Mr. Sapp said there was plenty of width under the portales. He said they would have a discussion on BCD regarding the fact that they were not doing rectilinear planning. He said there would be outdoor space and lots of gardens.

Ms. Walker asked for the average width of sidewalks.

Mr. Savopoulos said it was about 10-15 feet wide on the Paseos, and about eight feet on the one-way street.

Mr. Sapp said they anticipated a pedestrian flow through the site. He said they had narrow portales and walkways throughout. He said they would have narrower sidewalks on the one-way street and wider on the two-way streets.

Ms. Walker said the BCD worked with underlying zoning. She said the Board worked with overlay zoning, and explained that if there was a conflict in the zoning, the overlay zoning took precedent over the underlying zoning.

Ms. Rios said she was glad she had heard very positive comments. She said she had taken down notes during the presentation and had heard very positive words in the presentation. She asked if they would indicate the height of each of the buildings.

Mr. Sapp said that was yet to be determined. He said they had indicated one, two, and three story buildings. He said they were looking for the setbacks without the structure being a contrived pyramid. He said they wanted to know if they had the interrelationship right, and they would come back with specifics later.

Mr. Savopoulos said the massing model explained things. He said the three story elements were in two buildings that were stepped back significantly from perimeter. He noted the outer perimeter was single story. He said the plaza was a center point, and the streets radiated from that point. As the sun moves from east to west, the streets would be filled with light.

Ms. Rios asked if they knew any square footages at that time.

Mr. Sapp said they were in a study of the square footages. He said the largest would be the three-story structure in the center. He said the school was about 35,000 square feet. He said the total first floor, including historic buildings was about 140,000 square feet, the second was about 60,000 square feet, and the third story was about 17,000 square feet.

Ms. Rios said she was glad they had a single story on the outer area. She asked if the buildings would go right up to the wall.

Mr. Sapp said there would be a space so they could do landscaping. He said the wall was imposing on the site design. He said there was a real challenge south of the

archive building, because it narrowed down to 15" there.

Ms. Rios asked how much space there would be between the buildings and the wall.

Mr. Sapp said there would be between about two feet and five feet.

Ms. Shapiro thanked them for bringing it back. She said it was nice to see the evolution. She said she was concerned with the wall. She asked if there would be other walls.

Mr. Sapp said there would be a beautiful gate at the Archives building, and a pedestrian gate as well as a few other small openings. He said they didn't want to ask for variances or exceptions.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there would be a wall around the school.

Mr. Sapp said they might put a restaurant there. He noted that there was an existing wall on the Paseo side.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there would be a wall on the north side.

Mr. Sapp said there would not be. He said they would have a ten foot setback on the north side, as would the neighbors.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were pedestrian walkways along building 201.

Mr. Sapp said there would be a service area behind building 201.

Mr. Barrow asked about parking. He said it appeared that they would not have any on-street parking or pull outs.

Mr. Sapp said there would be very little.

Mr. Barrow said it seemed that with a commercial building they would need a little street parking.

Mr. Sapp said they had looked at that. He said there was a mix of residential and commercial, and they chose to focus on the pedestrian right of way.

Mr. Barrow asked why Paseo D would not be all pedestrian. He said it seemed like a good opportunity to have a pedestrian area, and said he did not understand the purpose of having cars there.

Mr. Sapp said the intent was to bring the parking structure entrance and exit into the interior of the area. He said the Paseo did cross the garden, and said they had added a

tall portal on the north side for connectivity. He said they expected to have very low speeds there.

Mr. Barrow said that was interesting. He asked how many levels there were to the underground parking, and how many spaces there were.

Mr. Sapp said there would be 600 spaces in two or three levels. He said the residential parking would be segregated from public access.

Mr. Barrow was impressed with the presentation, and appreciated the details. He said it was helpful. He said he had not seen any internal courtyard.

Mr. Sapp said the historic garden adjacent to the Archive building was accessed through the tight little gate, which created an internal garden with no vehicular interferences. He explained that between building 601 and the School were courtyards for private, residential use, though they were publicly visible.

Mr. Barrow acknowledged their assurance that they would come back with individual designs and asked if that would be stretched back over months or if it would be presented all together.

Mr. Sapp said they would be presented together so the Board could see the total vision as well as the individual components.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the model heights were fairly representational.

Mr. Sapp said they were, but noted the ground was 12 feet higher at Paseo than it was at Cathedral. He said the Cathedral school began 12 feet higher than the Archive building.

Chair Woods said the applicants wanted the Board's feedback and direction. She said they might not have a consensus, but asked each member to give feedback.

Mr. Sapp said they particularly wanted feedback on anything that was glaringly offensive.

Ms. Shapiro said she enjoyed it. She said her primary concern was that there was not enough open space with respect to gardens. She said it might be too early to see that. She said she liked the concepts of what they were doing with the historic wall. She said she would like it if they would not add too many more walls around it, especially around the School.

Ms. Rios would like to see some xeriscaping. She said she liked that it was pedestrian friendly, and would like to see it stay that way. She said it would be better if they could reduce the massing of the large building. She said she also thought they

should keep it open and should not have too many more walls.

Ms. Walker asked that they please not take down the mural at St. Francis School. She said her other concern was the material coverage. She said they had talked about the materials covering might be stone, brick, etc. and she thought they were great but that none of them looked like Scottsdale. She asked that they please not do an Anasazi/Scottsdale thing with the covering.

Mr. Barrow agreed with Ms. Shapiro that there could be more green space. He said they might create more pedestrian-friendly area in Paseo D. He said one very useful tool in drawings was to have sight lines from pedestrian views. He said he thought 101 would benefit from having more setback. He said that because the project being so large and important to Santa Fe, it would be useful, as designs were developed, to have them on public display somewhere.

Mr. Featheringill said having the parking structure underneath meant it would be tough to have large trees. He said they would need to show how they would keep those. He said he thought more open space would be nice, even if it meant they lost some of the smaller walkways, so they could have larger streetscapes.

Chair Woods thanked all of them for the preliminary opportunity for the Board to give feedback. She said she was glad they intended to bring the rest of their plans back before the board all together. She said her biggest concern was that the renderings were great and did capture Santa Fe style and architecture. She said that having that happen in reality was the tricky part. She said it was nice to see the little vignettes, but said the challenge was the architecture. She thanked them again.

2. Santa Fe Plaza. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements that includes banco lighting around the obelisk. (Chip Lilienthal)

Mr. Rasch reported that there was one item. He said it was the central banco with four lights along the length of the banco. He showed what the lights would look like.

Chair Woods asked for the size.

Mr. Rasch said they were about 12" x12". He noted that they would shine down, not up.

Ms. Walker asked if they would be color matched with their surroundings.

Mr. Rasch said he thought they would be a bronze-colored metal, which would make them darker than the banco.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would be flush with the banco.

Mr. Rasch agreed they would be, with light recessed in the banco.

Ms. Rios asked if the banco was historic.

Mr. Rasch said he could not say, but noted that the locations with lights were previously there.

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

Mr. Barrow moved to approve the proposal for banco lighting as proposed. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority vote, with Ms. Rios in opposition.

3. Discussion of wall and fence study along with current relevant ordinance and policy sections.

This item was moved to the end of the agenda.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-07-030.** 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to amend a previous approval for railings on a landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style commercial building known as the Gross Kelly Warehouse was built in 1913 according to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. Character defining elements include corner towers with arched parapets, canales in arched parapet openings, projecting viga beams, and docks on the east and west elevation covered by portals. The Official Map lists the building as Landmark within the City of Santa Fe.

"In August 2004 the HDRB approved replacement of temporary wood stairs on the north elevation with concrete stairs and safety handrails.

"On March 27, 2007 an application proposing the replacement of a temporary, non-historic, wood and wire railing and wood steps on the west elevation with a 3' 5"

high steel railing to meet life safety codes was presented to the HDRB. The simple style railing was to be similar to the existing rail on the west elevation. The stairs were to be steel with checker plated treads and a metal hand safety rail. They were proposed to be located towards the northwest and southwest corners. The HDRB postponed this application, "in order to entertain other design options which could be more transparent such as vertical aircraft cable or simplify the steel rail". The board also recommended that the applicant consider not using the existing portal posts in the design.

"On July 10, 2007 the HDRB approved a safety rail constructed from aircraft cable and vertical steel supports with a dulled finish.

"The applicant now wishes to amend the approval by altering the design and material. The safety rail would be constructed using steel tubing with welded connections for the primary support and wire screen to meet the code requirements. The rail was originally submitted and approved for the west elevation of the Gross Kelly Warehouse. This application also includes construction of the railing on the north elevation since the construction at the Rail Yard has altered the grade.

"The stairs on the north has been eliminated as well.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2(C), Standards for the Treatment of Landmark Buildings since the construction was as transparent as possible and can be easily be removed leaving the Landmark building intact."

Chair Woods asked if the wall below the railing was going to be stuccoed.

Ms. Barrett said she did not know.

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Hogan, of 994 Old Pecos Trail. He noted that the wall below the railing would be restuccoed. He said the reason they had moved away from the cable was that it had seemed to work, but the renovations on Manhattan dropped had the elevation, so they tried to do something just as transparent as the aircraft cable. He said the drawings made the cables look heavier than they were. He noted that they were 1/8" thick. He said they wanted to show off the building and the aircraft cable didn't fit.

Ms. Rios asked what the color of the tubing was.

Mr. Hogan said it would be a gunmetal blue with a little rust. He said they could compare it with the sign on Guadalupe. He said it was almost a dark grey color.

Ms. Rios asked for the height.

Mr. Hogan said it was 32".

Ms. Rios asked how far apart the uprights were.

Mr. Hogan said they were about six feet on center, and said they had tried to make the spacing even.

Chair Woods asked if the railing in the picture was the railing they were proposing.

Mr. Hogan said it was not. He showed a full size drawing of it and pointed out where the tubes would be and showed the thickness of the wire.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it was wire, not a metal slat.

Mr. Hogan agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if they had used it anywhere else.

Mr. Hogan said it had come from an existing building on the corner where there was steel tube railing.

Mr. Barrow said, regarding code requirements, it was as low as possible.

Mr. Hogan agreed.

Mr. Barrow asked if the dimensions were exact.

Mr. Hogan said they were.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods said it was interesting design.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-07-030 per staff recommendations and testimony. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. It passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. 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 was 14'4", increase the

building height from 10' to 13' where the maximum allowable height was 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 was 14' 4". Also proposed for the south elevation was the construction of an approximately 195 square foot portal to a height of 10' 9" where the maximum allowable height was 14' 4". The portal would include wood posts, beams, and carved corbels. All overhangs on the south elevation would be removed.

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

"The applicant also proposes increasing the building height from 10' to 13' where the maximum allowable height was 14' 4". All doors and windows would be replaced and locations would be altered. New windows would be metal clad divided lights in the color tan and would have exposed wood lintels.

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

"Lastly proposed was the construction of a yard wall at the northeastern section of the building to the maximum allowable height of 6' and a yard wall at the southeastern corner of the carport. The wall would be stuccoed to match the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

“Staff recommends approval on the condition that there were no publicly visible skylights or rooftop appurtenances and that exterior light fixtures were brought to staff for approval before a building permit application was 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 Mr. Eric Enfield, of 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said he wished to clarify a few things. He noted they had put the sign on securely this time so the posting was good. He said he had also met with some of the neighbors who had expressed concerns, and said he wished to share how they were dealing with those concerns. He noted he had also learned a lot of history about Don Miguel.

Mr. Enfield listed the neighbors who had attended the meetings. He said they had discussed problems on the property, including drainage issues. He said he had shared that they had to keep the drainage on the property. He said the neighbors had also been concerned about blocking the private drive, and he said they had promised not to block it during construction. He said the neighbors had been worried about the power pole that might need to be moved. He said they were moving the odd planter on the east side instead.

Mr. Enfield also noted that the adjacent neighbor, Ms. Nunez, didn't want them to raise her wall. He said they had agreed to not touch the wall without first contacting her. He said Ms. Nunez had also asked if they would stucco her side of the wall, and he said the owner was willing to do it. He said the other concern had been a privacy screen during construction on site, because her house was on the property line. He said they had also agreed to use a privacy screen during construction to shield her from seeing the workmen.

Finally, he said the neighbors had been concerned about what would be done in the back yard. He said they had agreed that before coming before the board to make changes, they would meet with the neighbors about their concerns. He said the tree would stay. He said the apricot tree was in its final years, but would remain. He said he thought the neighbors were happy that he had met with them and worked it out.

Mr. Barrow asked Mr. Enfield to show the Board where the new wall would be.

Mr. Enfield pointed it out. He explained that the wall out front had to be rebuilt because it was off the property at that time.

Chair Woods said they were putting true divided light windows everywhere on the south elevation. She asked if they could put them under the portal as well.

Mr. Enfield said it was a French door and would be divided light.

Chair Woods said the portal was long with only three skinny posts, so she would propose that they either eliminate the parapet, or use sturdier posts.

Mr. Enfield said they could either add a post or eliminate the parapet.

Chair Woods said it was just her suggestion. She said he also tended to have horizontal muntin patters on the windows. She asked that they make sure none of the muntins were horizontal.

Mr. Enfield said it looked like the windows were traditionally divided.

Ms. Rios asked if they were proposing any skylights or rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Enfield said they were not.

Ms. Rios asked if the windows were to be inset.

Mr. Enfield said they would have a two inch reveal.

Ms. Shapiro said Mr. Enfield had mentioned that the carport and pergola would have exposed lintels. She asked if they intended to use an opaque stain.

Mr. Enfield agreed that they did.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they had planned any exterior lighting.

Mr. Enfield said he would submit it to staff. He noted that he had also promised the neighbors that there would only be exterior lighting under the portal.

Chair Woods for the color of the window trim and stucco.

Mr. Enfield said the windows were metal clad and had a tan color and the stucco was Buckskin.

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

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-08-053 per staff recommendations and with the following conditions:

- 1. That all muntin patters be vertical, not horizontal,**
- 2. That the windows have 2" reveals,**
- 3. That any exterior lighting be submitted to staff,**
- 4. That, under the portal, there be French doors with windows on either side,**

- to be divided light,
5. That the color of the stucco be "Buckskin",
 6. And that the windows be tan in color.

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

3. **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 was 28'4" on Palace Avenue, 27'6" on Sandoval Street, and 22'7" on San Francisco Street. Three exceptions were 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 was not Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2 (E)), and to replace one awning and install another awning on the Lensic Theater facade. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

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

"219-225 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 was recommended for significant historic status, but it was officially listed as not-resurveyed.

"The vacant lot next to the Lensic and the Commercial Building would be infilled with a mixed-use four-story, 17,013 square foot footprint building. The building would be 46' feet high where the maximum allowable height was 28' 4" on Palace Avenue, 27' 6" on Sandoval Street, and 22' 7" on San Francisco Street. A height exception was requested and the required criteria responses were attached (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)).

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

"On May 13, 2008, the Historic Design Review Board postponed action on this

application pending redesign that considers height and style issues raised during the hearing. Now, the applicant requests final action on this application after addressing the Board's concerns.

"The building was designed in an architectural style that was not Territorial Revival or Spanish-Pueblo Revival as required in this District. There were no elements that suggest the Moorish Revival style of the significant Theater. The rounded arches at the street portal were Spanish Baroque Revival in character and reflect similar detailing on the adjacent Commercial Building. Also borrowed from the adjacent building were the brick window surrounds. They have been reduced in scale except at the southwest tower. The parapet cornices, metal railing details, and other character-defining elements on the southwest tower were not firmly rooted in any particular architectural style. An exception was requested to the Santa Fe style requirement for the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the required criteria responses were attached (Section 14-5.2(E)).

"A pitched roof on the top story was proposed. The roof was only minimally visible from several locations, as shown on attached sheets. There were only 2 or 3 pitched roofs in the defined streetscape, so a pitched roof exception was requested and the required criteria responses were attached (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d)).

"The Board should clarify that the proposed building was not to be considered as an addition to the Lencic or Commercial Building. An attachment would require an exception to the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). 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.

"Finally, two awnings would be installed on the façade of the Theater. The existing east side awning would be replaced and the west side awning would be added to restore an appearance that was supported by historic photography, as submitted. The awnings would match the existing awning in color, scale, and detail.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"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 (Sections 14-5.2(D)(9)(c), (D)(9)(d), and (E)). Staff recommends approval of the awning installation on the Theater façade since there was evidence historically of such installation."

Mr. Rasch explained they reduced the height by 19' on the sight line to match the Sandoval garage.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch to comment on how the ordinance spoke to unique

architectural styles in proposals.

Mr. Rasch said the ordinance was quite clear that if the construction adjacent to a significant building mimicked it too closely, so that it degraded the unique style of the existing building, it shall be denied. He noted that in this case, the commercial building in between was non-contributing structures. He said, however, if the proposal mimicked it too closely, it would diminish the significant building. He said it should be done in such a way that it fit in, but did not mimic the elements of other structures too closely.

Ms. Rios said it could borrow some elements in either the significant or possibly-contributing adjacent structure.

Mr. Rasch agreed, and said it was the Board's call as to how many elements could be borrowed.

Present and sworn were Mr. Joseph Karnes, Mr. Karl Sommer, and Mr. Jeff Seres.

Mr. Sommer, P.O. Box 2476, Santa Fe New Mexico, introduced himself. He said they had a very truncated presentation for the Board. He noted that the previous time they had been before the Board, they had agreed to scour the minutes and come back. He said each of the members of the Board had said things that were important to them, and said the Board could track their response. He said Mr. Featheringill had asked them to get rid of the 4th floor. He said they had not, but said they had we worked on reducing the impact of it. He said he thought the issues had been dealt with. He said they had gone directly to what the Board had been concerned about.

Mr. Seres, of Studio Southwest Architecture introduced himself. He said they were there to show the Board their responses to the first meeting. He said they had two new images to show to the Board. He explained that the first was the southwest corner of the building. He showed the image, and explained that they had pushed the fourth floor back nine feet, not 19. He said it had an interesting effect. He said the revised cross-section showed the effect of pushing the fourth floor back, so the eye of the pedestrian would go to the third floor. He said the angle of 30 degrees was down to 27 degrees, like the parking garage.

Mr. Seres went on to explain that the details on the buildings had been modified. He said the detail around the windows had been reduced. He said they could see the brick was a double on the head and single on the verticals. He said the windows had been pushed forward, and said it would carry through the west elevation. He said it would also be a darker brown. He added that they had presented a view on the north side of the building at the previous meeting and said Mr. Karnes would show a video to lead into that.

Mr. Karnes noted that at the previous meeting there had been comments about the view going south on Grant. He said he had taken photographs. He showed the images

and explained them to the Board. He said there had been questions about the view of the loading area as well. He showed a video of the approach down Grant to Palace and onto Sandoval.

Mr. Sommer said a comment Mr. Barrow had made had come up when they had gone through the minutes, and it triggered the whole discussion about the fourth floor. He said they had taken the comment and redesigned the upper floor to hopefully answer the questions Mr. Barrow had asked. He said Mr. Barrow had asked how the space worked and what they had in it. He said the reworking of the facade was based on Mr. Barrow's comment.

Mr. Seres showed another board, which had the rendering of the north elevation and corner of the theater and the loading area. He said the large door screened the compactor, and then there was the colonnade around Sandoval. He said the model showed the changes. He thanked the Board for their consideration.

Chair Woods announced they would break for five minutes to look at the model. Following the break, Chair Woods asked for public comment.

Mr. Sajimaya Dandi, previously sworn, said he had a big problem with the fact that the building was designed so that it had a loading area on a blind curve. He said this was a death trap for pedestrians and bicyclists. He said there was no place on Burrow Alley. He said they had created a canyon on the road.

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

Ms. Rios asked the speakers how they would characterize the style of the building.

Mr. Seres said they had taken elements from the block. He said they had taken copings of precast stone from the Theater; brick elements from the Commercial building, which had been scaled back; arches, which were also from the Commercial building and the theater. He said the style was a hybrid that was similar to the block.

Ms. Rios asked about columns.

Mr. Seres said the base was stone, and was a functional consideration for pedestrians and bikers. He noted that the stone carried up on the inside.

Ms. Rios asked what kind of stone they intended to use.

Mr. Seres said they intended to use limestone, hybrid, or precast. He said the arches were three feet wide by 18" deep.

Ms. Rios asked what color brick they would use for the brick they had proposed on the north elevation.

Mr. Seres said it would be brown brick. He said there was reddish and salt and pepper brick on the theater. He said they were planning to strip the tower on the Commercial center, and said they planned on finding the same salt and pepper brick as the theater. He said they would make the brick browner, so as not to match the theater.

Ms. Rios asked if they intended to use brick on the openings on the corners of the second floor.

Mr. Seres said it was brick, and the opening was approximately ten feet by seven to eight feet, and would match the brick detail on the back of the commercial building, but in a different color. He noted that the brick was 18" side.

Ms. Shapiro asked Mr. Seres to talk about the roof system. She asked if they were calling it a hip roof.

Mr. Seres agreed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there would be any skylights or appurtenances.

Mr. Seres said on the north at the back was the cooling tower, then the stairs to the roof and then the elevator override. He said they had not included those things in their height calculation.

Ms. Shapiro asked for the height.

Mr. Seres said it was 46' to the top of the hip, and the top of the stair would be 52-53' and about the same height for the cooling tower. He said they would not be publicly visible.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there was to be any ducting on the roof.

Mr. Seres said there would be none. He said they would potentially have air compressors, but said any skylights would be below the hip.

Ms. Shapiro said any shiny metal up there should be painted. She noted the Eldorado had some that didn't look great.

Mr. Barrow said he had problems with the architectural drawings.

Mr. Rasch said they did say which was current and which were previous.

Mr. Seres said altitude two had the new drawings.

Mr. Barrow said he understood. He said he had questions about the brick also. He

said he was having trouble understanding the style of brick at the garage side. He said typically buildings reflected stucco and brick. He asked if that was what they were trying to say. He said there was a brick veneer that was aesthetic, not structural. He said he was struggling with it.

Mr. Seres said he would like to speak to the Board about it. He put up another board. He explained that the rear of the Commercial building was all brick wrapping. They said they had thought to bring some brick into the new building that was similar to what was seen on the loading area. He said they were working back into the brick of the theater so there would be a historical component there with respect to the stepped back massing of the new theater there.

Mr. Barrow said some of the Board wanted to make more of a distinction between the Commercial building and the new building. He said the plan on San Francisco was much better with the brick surround reduced. He said it was clearly not a copy of the surround of the Commercial building. He said he was having a little difficulty with the brick at the corner section.

Chair Woods said she was a little irritated by the video. She said it appeared to be an attempt to minimize the Board's concerns. The video made it look like they were on I-25. She said she thought the mass was too large for a walkway. She said City Council had recently held up an appeal of such a mass. She said having the wood door and the brick separated it even more. She said it looked like floating adobe and the adobe just didn't fit.

She was confused on the San Francisco Street with all the surrounds of brick and the sudden change to stone and wood on the Sandoval side. So suddenly you have a different architectural element and didn't think that was working. You need to have one or the other and not have the switch on the two facades that came together.

She also did not like the arches. Mr. Rasch has said it would be a style exception. She thought they would probably need no exception for them if the openings were flat openings instead of arches.

Mr. Seres explained that on the north elevation above the parking garage entry, the second floor has the lintel. He felt it would be better to carry that treatment around on the second floor all the way on that side.

Chair Woods said she was not in agreement with the brick which looked a little fakey there. With the different treatment on each floor and the different surrounds, she was not sure it made sense.

Mr. Seres clarified that the surrounds were meant to distinguish this building from the rest of the block.

Chair Woods said it seemed that on one elevation it reads one way and on another elevation read another way. She found the corner incongruent.

Mr. Featheringill didn't like the brick on the side wall where it came together in the corner. He said he would really like to see an elevation of that whole door.

Mr. Seres said it was in the packet on A-22. He said above the door, it was completely open as a living area.

Mr. Featheringill recalled that last time they talked about the difference in style and some were in favor of Territorial and some preferred the Spanish style. Mr. Seres tried to meet that half way between and Mr. Featheringill was not sure it really worked. It was busy with arches on the bottom floor, then squared openings on the second floor and lintels across the top. It was like someone could not make up their mind and he thought it needed to be dressed down a little. The massing itself had been done really well.

Chair Woods felt they had come such a long way and she knew the applicants wanted action tonight. She knew the Board could make conditions. She asked if they wanted the Board to take one more pass rather than get locked into changes the Board would make in a motion that the applicant really did not want to do.

Mr. Sommer said they ran into a problem on style and it caused what had been created as a result. He felt these suggestions made for consistent treatment were resolvable tonight if the Board had a consensus on the issues. The Board members all pointed out the brick surrounds and the other issue he heard concerned the arches. If the Board had consensus on it, they could go forward. None of the issues seemed like show stoppers to him.

Chair Woods offered to try for a consensus on the four issues raised:

1. Not to have brick on the north side
2. Detail of door back to staff
3. Only brick surround around corner piece and
4. Arches straightened out.

Ms. Rios said she personally liked the arches because they would soften the building.

Mr. Sommer thought Chair Woods articulated the issues well. He said they also liked the arches for the softening they would provide.

Ms. Walker said it could be that arches were historic style. She pointed to the St Francis (the old DeVargas Hotel) that had arches.

Mr. Rasch characterized that building as a pre Santa Fe style and was a significant historic structure.

Chair Woods asked for someone to make a motion and note the exceptions for height and the pitched roof. The question was whether arches were a recent Santa Fe style.

Ms. Walker felt pre Santa Fe style, would not be recent Santa Fe style.

Ms. Rios asked for the proposed colors

Mr. Seres said the building would be in earth tone with cementitious stucco. He offered to bring back colors to staff or board. The windows were clad metal, deeper red than on the renderings which were kind of muted out.

Chair Woods agreed they could bring the color palette back.

Mr. Rasch said the exceptions for height and pitch began on page 110, pitch and style began on page 116.

Mr. Barrow said he liked the condition that on Palace Avenue they bring it forward. He agreed about uniformity of detailing all around and they could have post or pilaster for the shadow on that side. His personal view regarding the corner was that it should not mimic the commercial building there. If the commercial building was 16" or 18" of brick then this building could be twelve inches.

Chair Woods asked if they were could bring the door forward a little and set the second story back a little or the adobe mass back a little, that would help.

Mr. Seres suggested that they hinge the door off of a pilaster.

Chair Woods thought that even setting it back a foot would make a big difference.

Mr. Seres said he understood.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case 08-046 with following conditions:

- 1. That the brick on the north side be eliminated and that area be stuccoed,**
- 2. On the north elevation that the massing be set back 1-2 feet and be supported by pilaster,**
- 3. That the surrounds on windows be wood,**
- 4. That the colors of stucco be an earth tone that would be brought back to the Board as well as the colors of the windows and doors and stucco be cementitious,**

5. No roof top equipment visible
6. That brick on southwest corner openings be reduced to about 12 inches
7. That the exceptions for height and style be granted as the criteria submitted, for the exceptions had been met as expressed on pages 110 and 116 in the packet [attached as Exhibit A].

Ms. Shapiro seconded with the addition

8. That the pitch exception be approved also.

Mr. Barrow requested an amendment

9. that on the Palace Avenue side the window reveals be created by pilasters or column to reflect the design on San Francisco and that brick and stucco colors be chosen that would be distinguishable from the commercial building and brought back for review.

Chair Woods requested an amendment that

10. The entire color palette be brought back to the Board and could be done after building permit was released.

Ms. Rios added

11. That there be step backs on the north elevation above the door.

Ms. Shapiro added

12. That the style of the door detail be brought back.

Ms. Rios accepted them as friendly and that the arches would remain. The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Walker, who said she still could not support a fourth floor.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-08-056.** 343 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Funk, owner/agent, proposes to repaint trim on a Significant building using new colors. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The commercial Dutch Colonial Revival style building located at 343 East Palace Avenue was constructed by 1908 and has had alterations which included additions in 1997. The Official Map lists the building as Significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The building was approved for stripping and repainting of the exterior finish in 1997 by the HDRB. The colors approved were grey for the roof, portal decking, and metal tiles, red for the sides of the dormers and door frame, green for the wood trim and windows, and white for the remaining wood trim and window frames. There were no colored photographs to prove what the original color of the building was.

The applicant proposes altering the existing exterior trim finish. The applicant proposes changing the colors as follows: A pale blue "Cloudless", a pale green "Flower Bulb", and a pale yellow, "Creamy Corn" for window and wood trim as indicated on the plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff first recommended approval of the application since the historic colors cannot be verified but after further review, determined that it does not meet the requirements of Section 14-5.2 (D, 5, b).

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Robert Funk, 343 East Palace, who said they just wanted to paint the trim on the house and would take any questions.

Chair Woods asked if he understood what he was proposing was not allowed.

Mr. Funk said the original color was not known and if they could verify them, there was no way to accurately reproduce them.

Chair Woods explained how it worked and clarified that the colors proposed were not historic colors and the Board was duly bound to protect these buildings.

Mr. Funk produced some color samples.

Mr. Barrow asked if he was involved in the paint stripping that took place.

Mr. Funk said he had not been involved in it.

Mr. Barrow explained that it was very difficult to remove 100% of the paint and thought they could find the original colors somewhere on that building.

Mr. Funk clarified that the former owner submitted those colors.

Mr. Barrow reiterated that it was impossible to remove all of the original paint so it was there somewhere.

Ms. Barrett said she did have the 1997 file and the colors were in the file but there were no color photographs of it.

Ms. Rios thanked the applicant for wanting to paint and to focus on the upkeep of the building even if the Board didn't agree with the colors chosen.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Mr. Funk felt these proposed colors would not take away from the value of the property nor change the architectural features themselves. The colors were part of personal preferences and felt this ordinance should not apply to his house because they could not verify the original colors.

Chair Woods said the Board would have to look at historic colors then. The pale yellow and pale green were not something seen in Santa Fe's historic districts

Ms. Walker explained to the applicant that those might be historic colors in other communities but they were not historic here.

Ms. Walker moved to deny Case #H 08-056 based on Section 14-5.2 D, 5 b. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios explained to the applicant that the house could be painted but must be in historic colors.

Chair Woods explained to the applicant that he could appeal this decision and should talk with staff about it.

- 2. Case #H-08-057.** 712 Gildersleeve Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. John Craig, agent/owner, proposes to replace windows with French doors and construct a 72 sq. ft. balcony on a non-primary elevation and restucco a contributing residence. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

712 Gildersleeve Street was a single-family residence that was constructed before 1936 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with Territorial Revival window surrounds. In 1999 one of the two garage door openings on the west elevation was infilled with a door and window wall. The building was listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The east elevation was considered to be primary.

On September 25, 2007, the Board approved remodeling of the building. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the proposal with the following five items.

1. The 464 square foot addition would not be constructed on the west elevation to a

height of approximately 17' where the adjacent two-story parapet was approximately 19' high.

2. The sloping parapet on the west elevation would not be redesigned with a more traditional stepped configuration.
3. The paired double-hung windows on the west elevation would be removed and replaced with single-light French doors. A triangular pediment would be installed to match existing window trim.
4. A 72 square foot balcony would be installed at the new French doors on the west elevation. The balcony was simple in design and would be painted to match the front door.
5. The building would be restuccoed in a color that was darker than the existing and pre-approved color. The applicant has evidence of a darker color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Craig, 712 Gildersleeve, who shared how the project came about. He clarified that the darker color was a mistake and he had come to be fond of the current color and texture. He added that the proposed project cost would have been \$200,000 and he recently got married.

He said he was sensitive to architecture and this was an extraordinary gem but most of the additions were terrible. They interrupted the flow and style. It led him to the conclusion that one of the Board's functions was limiting how ugly an addition could be before not approved.

He asked if he could get a break on making the big addition and the answer came up yes. He had a beautiful opening to the west and wanted to put a balcony out there to enjoy the sunsets. He added that they would restucco the house and keep everything the same and put a balcony on it.

Ms. Walker asked if he would keep the same texture. Mr. Craig agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if he was planning to put insulation on it. Mr. Craig agreed.

Mr. Rasch said the features would be retained so the insulation plan would not affect its status.

Ms. Shapiro asked how he would hold up the balcony.

Mr. Craig said it would be with 6x6 posts.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it would be in the same color.

Mr. Craig said it would be the same as the windows.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-057 per staff recommendations and citing that color and texture would be in-kind. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-08-058.** 704 Camino Cabra. Historic Review District. Andy Lyons, agent for Sarah Rinehart, proposes to construct an approximately 508 sq. ft second story addition to a height of 22' 11" where the maximum allowable height was 21' 10" (23' 10" per additional for slope) on a non-status 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 garage were built between 1990 and 1993. The City has no Historic Cultural Properties Inventory for the buildings. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Historic Review District.

Historic Staff usually administratively approves application that lie within the Historic Review District unless it was an institutional building, multi-family residential, or an increase in existing height.

The applicant requests approval of an approximately 508 square foot second story addition to a height of 22' 11" where the maximum allowable height was 21' 10". The Board might allow a height increases up to two additional feet for slope. Therefore the maximum allowable height was 23' 10" without a height exception if the Board so grants.

The addition would be to the garage and would include a 4 foot on the east elevation and a 3 foot setback on the north elevation to help breakup the massing. An exterior stair would be located on the west elevation.

Windows would be aluminum clad wood divided light with exposed lintels in the color bronze to match the existing. Stucco would match the existing building in both texture and color. One window on the west elevation has horizontal panes where the other elevation panes were more vertical in style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that there were no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances or skylights, that the exterior light fixtures were approved by staff before a building permit was applied for, and that the window on the west elevation was redesign with vertical style panes. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (G) Historic Review District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Andy Lyons, P.O. Box 8858, Santa Fe, who said the window on the west side was double hung because it was over the stairway and he would have to remove the exterior muntins for a more horizontal look. The ceiling height would put it in the middle of the two foot bonus for slope. Everything would match the existing.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

**Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-058 per staff recommendations.
Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

4. **Case #H-08-059.** 530 S. Guadalupe Street. Landmark, not in Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for David & Lisa Barker, proposes to construct a freestanding ATM machine to a height of 7' 6" and install brick pavers on a Landmark property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival style commercial building known as the Gross Kelly Warehouse was built in 1913 according to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. Character defining elements include corner towers with arched parapets, canales in arched parapet openings, projecting viga beams, and docks on the east and west elevation covered by portals. The Official Map lists the building as Landmark within the City of Santa Fe.

The applicant proposes construction of an approximately 23 square foot enclosed ATM building to a height of 7' 6". The structure was located approximately 13' 6" from

the Gross Kelly Warehouse.

The building would be constructed from aged pale red brick (saved from the Gross Kelly Warehouse when a portal enclosure on the eastside was removed), a beige concrete base and cap, and steel. The building would have a backlit blue ATM sign.

Also proposed was brick paving along the drive and north elevation. The brick would match the existing brick paving as close as possible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application as the new structure and paving do not attach to the Landmark building or cause the building to lose its Landmark status.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Mark Hogan, 994 Old Pecos Trail, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker asked if ATMs were always backlit in blue.

Mr. Hogan said in this one, the only part to be backlit was this top part. He explained when they went to the Railyard Corporation who said backlit signs were not allowed. They did like the lighting at the top so they kept that. The steel would be cut out and only letters illuminated were "ATM."

Mr. Barrow was surprised staff felt this would not impact this landmark building. The façade of this landmark building would be impacted.

Ms. Barrett said she determined no impact because it was not attached to the landmark building. She said it would be 13' 6" away from the building and was only 7' 6" so it would be significantly lower.

Mr. Rasch said the Board could reduce its prominence more with stucco.

Chair Woods thought he had done everything to make it prominent and asked what could be done to minimize it.

Mr. Hogan pointed out that its location was much lower than what the elevations showed so they would lose at least 12" in height. The brick was intended to screen what was otherwise just a generic modern appliance. It was a beige enameled structure that really stood out. There was a railroad crossing nearby which was why they went with the brick. They just wanted to make it look like something that was part of the Railyard and trying to keep it simple.

Chair Woods noted there were seven signs on it and she didn't think it even met the sign ordinance.

Mr. Rasch agreed that the ordinance allowed a maximum of three signs.

Ms. Barrett said Mr. Moquino reviewed all signs to make sure they were in compliance.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the ATM could be under the portal facing the rail yard tracks.

Mr. Hogan said having it under the portal would affect the Gross-Kelly Building. He explained that they looked at several locations – at every location on the property.

Mr. Barrow noted that this ATM would belong to the owners of the building but thought this was a Railyard piece.

Mr. Hogan clarified that the building was owned by the Barkers and on a 100 year lease from city. The Barkers would own this structure.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Chair Woods was concerned about looking at this until the signs met the ordinance so she requested that it be postponing and get it calmed down with signs that met the ordinance.

Mr. Hogan said the signs could be addressed by saying it must comply with the sign ordinance. He added that they were just applied to the structure. He wanted to hear what should be calmed down since it was consistent with size and scale of the Railyard. He said he needed some input.

Mr. Rasch asked him to share with the Board the Railyard architecture guidelines.

Mr. Hogan said the Railyard wanted materials that were rustic and more industrial in character. So that was why they wanted to make it look like a piece for the Railyard.

Ms. Rios asked if it was the narrowest size. Mr. Hogan agreed. He thought it was about 3½ to 4 feet in width.

Ms. Barrett clarified that it was 23 sq ft.

Mr. Rasch said that would be about 4x6.

Mr. Barrow thought perhaps it should be steel, thin and turned the other direction. He thought the design looked like a colonial piece. It should be very simple and reduce the impact on the site.

Chair Woods asked if the Board was postponing or having conditions.

Mr. Barrow thought they would have to see it.

Mr. Hogan explained that he could not turn it because then there would be no access to it. It would block off the sidewalk and they did not own the property on the other side and could not get a lease for it.

Mr. Barrow moved to postpone Case #H 08-059 for redesign based on comments. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Case #H-08-061.** 120 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andree Falls, agent/owner, proposes to remove a 6' high coyote fence and replace with an approximately 5' 11" high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height was 4' 11" and construct a stucco entry with pedestrian gate to a height of 9' 6" on a non-contributing property. (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 120 Quintana Street was constructed post 1945 according to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The building was listed on the Official Map as non-contributing to the Westside- Guadalupe Historic District.

The owners of 120 Quintana Street were issued a stop work order by the Historic Inspector in March 2008 for replacing a coyote fence and constructing an adobe pedestrian gate entry without HDRB approval or a building permit. The owners stopped work and contacted City staff.

The applicant proposes replacing an approximately 6' high coyote fence with a 5' 11" high coyote fence along the street where the maximum allowable height was 4' 11" according to a 600 foot linear height calculation. The wall and fence guidelines allow the Board to grant an addition 20% to the maximum allowable height which would allow the fence to reach the height of 5' 11" which was a 1" under the old fence height.

Also proposed was the construction of an adobe and stuccoed entry with an exposed header and old wood doors. The entry would be set back approximately 20' from the street and would be to a height of about 7' 6". The doors would have a natural finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that the fence not exceed a height of 5' 11", otherwise 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. Barrett referred to letters of support in the packet.

Present and sworn was Ms. Andree Falls, 120 Quintana Street who said she would stand for questions.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. Max Aragon 121 Quintana Street, who handed a letter to the Board [attached as Exhibit B].

He requested that the Board postpone this case because they didn't see the sign until a couple of days ago when they realized it was in a place behind a car. He said he talked to two other neighbors who didn't know about it. If he could not get the Board to postpone it, he asked that the fence could be brought down since the one next door was less than five feet.

Ms. Barrett stated that the neighbor's fence was done in 2000 and added that 5' 11" would be within code.

Mr. Aragon said the building wall was really high and he would like to see it down where the fence was before. The area was being changed with high walls and was no longer the same. He asked the Board to think about it.

Ms. Falls said the new fence was one inch lower than the one that was there and it was set back 20 feet from the street.

She said she posted the sign where the red tag was attached. The wall was well designed and would give her safety. The old one was rotting.

Ms. Rios asked if she was saying the fence it was replacing was the same height.

Ms. Falls said the old fence was one inch higher than the new fence.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Aragon if he agreed that the old fence was higher than this one.

Mr. Aragon said he had photographs and thought the old fence was shorter.

Ms. Barrett showed the photo on page 17.

Ms. Walker asked Ms. Falls if she had measured the height of the fence.

Ms. Falls said next to the neighbor's wall it was 5' 11". She assured the Board that she would make sure it met the height requirements.

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

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-061 the way the fence was built. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by a 3-2 majority voice vote with Mr. Featheringill, Ms. Walker and Ms. Shapiro voting in favor and Mr. Barrow and Ms. Rios voting against.

- 6. Case #H-08-062.** 1183A Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mud Houses, Inc, agent for Robert Frank, proposes to construct an approximately 310 sq. ft. of portals and an approximately 433 sq. ft. attached garage to a non-contributing building and to construct yard walls to the maximum allowable height of 6' at interior locations and 5' on streetscape. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

On September 26, 2006 the Historic Design Review Board approved the remodel of the approximately 1,527 square foot Vernacular style, non-contributing, single family residence located at 1183 Cerro Gordo. The remodel included demolition of all walls except the part of the south elevation. Approximately 1,005 square feet of additions were approved by the Board and the height of the building was increased to 14' 5". The application also included construction of two new single family residences.

The applicant requests approval to construct approximately 121 square foot portal on the north elevation, an approximately 189 square foot portal on the south elevation, and an approximately 433 square foot attached garage on the west elevation.

The north elevation portal would be to a height of 12' 6", the south elevation portal would be to a height of 11' 6", and the garage would be to a height of 12' 7" where the existing height was 14' 5". Portals would include wood posts, beams, and carved corbels as well as a parapet to match the previous approved portal. The garage door would include a wood header and gate material was not clarified. All wood would be stained natural and stucco would be an "Adobe" color which was previously approved.

Lastly proposed was an adobe yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 6' along the property lines. The wall would be stepped every 20' and would be finished to

match the approved building color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that garage door material was clarified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Present and sworn was Mr. Robert Frank, 2642 Caminito, who had nothing to add except that all additions were done in adobe.

Ms. Rios asked how long was the wall would be.

Mr. Frank said the lot was 1.3 acres and they were not doing it around the whole lot. He was not sure how long it was.

Ms. Rios asked what the visibility of the wall was.

Ms. Barrett said it was only visible from a private drive and a portion from Lorenzo Road.

Mr. Barrow said he didn't see a lot of walls there.

Ms. Barrett said the map showed the heights of the walls and fences in the area and the average came up higher than six feet but code says six feet was the maximum.

Mr. Frank responded to the question on the length of the fence. He said on Lorenzo it was 60 feet and 50 feet on the north corner and 40 feet on Rim Road.

Ms. Walker noted that code required in not all be in the same plane.

Mr. Frank said he would be stepping it and where no wall was needed, they would not put in a wall.

Mr. Barrow asked if they had a plan.

Ms. Barrett agreed and referred him to page 9.

Mr. Rasch pointed it out on the site plan.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

**Ms. Rios moved for approval of Case #H 08-062 per staff recommendations.
Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

7. **Case #H-08-63.** 223 ½ Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jean-Jacques Deseke, agent for Martha Egan, proposes to replace a non-historic door with a window and install an awning over the French doors 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 commercial building located at 223 ½ Canyon Rd was constructed in approximately 1959 according to the owner and does not appear on a 1951 aerial photograph. The 1984 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory lists the date of construction as P for post or pre war. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The Historic Inspector issued a stop work order on March 24, 2008 for replacement of a divided light door with divided light window and replacement of French doors without HDRB approval or a City building permit. The business owner stopped work immediately and contacted City Historic staff.

The applicant proposes replacing a divided light door with a 9-light divided light window. The window would be painted white to match the existing window and door trim. The dimension size would remain the same however the sill would be raised. Also proposed was the replacement of 10-light French doors with 15-light French doors. The doors would be painted white as well. Any necessary re-stucco around the window and doors would match the existing.

Lastly proposed was the installation of a 5' 8" long by 30" wide fabric awning over the French doors. The 1984 HCPI shows that an awning used to be present over the French doors. The applicant proposes that the awning was white in color to match the trim or possibly a green or burgundy color.

The applicant's letter also mentions a request for metal steel gates to be installed in front of the door and window. No drawings were submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that the gate details were clarified or the request return to the board with appropriate drawings. 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 Mr. Jean-Jacques Desalle, 560 Camino Tierra Alta. He said the reason for the request was that it was a jewelry store and he got robbed. They used a crow bar. So he just needed to make repairs and putting in smaller panes would prevent people from going through. The new design would match the window pattern with the neighborhood. The awning would help solve his wood floor problems.

Chair Woods said she knew there was an awning there before but there was no portal.

Mr. Desalle said he needed some protection from snow. There were similar awnings in the neighborhood. He explained the design at the screen. He said he had pictures if it would help.

Mr. Featheringill asked if he could extend the portal.

Mr. Desalle felt if he did it would become an ice trap. He felt it would look weird to do that.

Mr. Rasch suggested it would be more like an eyebrow. Mr. Desalle agreed.

There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked how they would be opened if you were inside.

Mr. Rasch said it sounded like metal French doors.

Mr. Desalle said it was so people would not be able to get in. He wanted to do the same as his neighbors.

Chair Woods thought they would need appropriate drawings. It was a major elevation change.

Mr. Desalle shared some pictures and briefly explained them.

Chair Woods asked how many windows he would have.

Mr. Desalle said there would be only the one under the portal.

Chair Woods said these were not adequate elevations to come to this Board.

Mr. Desalle said he was showing the front of the building and a neighbor's window with a gate. The gate followed the line of the French doors.

Ms. Rios asked if he were thinking of painting them white.

Mr. Desalle said he would do whatever the Board wanted.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-063 per staff recommendations for doing the awning. Ms. Rios seconded the motion with the condition that the metal be white and that the awning be green. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Shapiro moved to rescind the previous motion. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-063 per staff recommendations with a white awning and a white metal gate and over door. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-08-064.** 511 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Suby Bowden + Associates, Mr. J. Altman, proposes to alter a stuccoed entry and pedestrian gate and refinish retaining walls on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

This case was removed from the agenda.

9. **Case #H-08-065.** 1133 E. Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul Rochford, proposes to construct an approximately 5' to 6' high wall where the maximum allowable height was 5' and to re-stucco and re-paint trim on a contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence located at 1133 Alameda was constructed in the 1930s and has received minor alterations. The Official Map lists the building as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to re-paint the wood trim in white which was the original color. Also proposed was the re-stucco using El Rey "Adobe" and white under the portals.

Lastly proposed was the construction of a CMU and stuccoed yard wall along south property line (Alameda Street) and east elevation. The wall was proposed to range in height from 5' to 6' where the maximum allowable height was 5'. The east

elevation would have a stuccoed entry surround and wood pedestrian gate to a height of 9'. The stucco would match the El Rey "Adobe" brown color and the gate would have a natural wood finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition that the wall not exceed the maximum allowable height of 5' 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. Richard Martínez, 460 Cerrillos Road. The wall would be only five feet high, no higher. The newspaper article showed there were seven crashes in 1993 and he included an eighth. The gate was in the middle of the yard, not on the street. The 1977 photo was the oldest they could find

Ms. Rios asked if the one on the top met the wall and fence guidelines.

Mr. Martínez said the yard wall was on top of the foundation and was straight across.

Mr. Rasch asked how long that wall was.

Mr. Martínez said it was a little less than 40'.

Ms. Walker asked if it was difficult to break the plane.

Mr. Martínez explained it was on the property line so it could be done but not on that foundation. It was also covered by plants that were now at least five feet tall.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the 9' tall pedestrian gate: had relief from the wall.

Mr. Martínez agreed and said it was 2' thick.

Ms. Shapiro asked how tall the house was and suggested the gate might be too massive compared to the house...

Mr. Martínez said the house was about 12'.

Ms. Shapiro suggested just one layer of adobe on top.

Chair Woods asked if he would be willing to just have pilasters but no arch overhead.

Present and sworn were the owners, Paul Rochford and Michael Vialante, 44A

Lodge Circle Santa Fe.

Chair Woods explained the concern over the mass of the gate.

Mr. Vialante asked to see the photograph and then said he thought they would be open to changing it.

Mr. Rochford said they understood and could make the adjustments. He said they were willing to work with the Board on it.

Ms. Shapiro proposed they could bring a drawing to staff.

Mr. Rochford asked if they could agree on it tonight.

Ms. Rios said yes.

Mr. Featheringill suggested pilasters at 7' and leave the beam off. There were no speakers from the public concerning this case.

Ms. Barrett clarified that the wall would need a step down every 25 feet.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 08-065 with staff recommendations and subject to these conditions:

- 1. Eliminate the mass above the gate with pilasters at 7' and**
- 2. On the front wall an 8" step down each 25' as required by the guidelines.**

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

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

- 3. Discussion of wall and fence study along with current relevant ordinance and policy sections.**

Mr. Barrow asked if there was any money for a research project.

Mr. Rasch said that between \$5,000 and \$25,000 would be available at the new fiscal year.

Mr. Barrow felt the Board could do a lot on its own but it would be good to have a historic basis on which to build it. The idea would be to take the existing guideline and

work on it and circulate it. The existing guideline was created in 1999 and the Board should rework it to make it fit. He said he would try. He thought it had taken six months just to talk about it.

Ms. Rios offered to help.

Mr. Barrow moved to direct staff to do a PSA for rewriting the wall and fence guidelines. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.


L. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer