



Agenda

DATE 11/18/15 TIME 11:15am

SERVED BY M. Culligan

RECEIVED BY Shirley Hartley

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 24, 2015 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 24, 2015 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

AMENDED

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 10, 2015
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-15-077. 829 West Manhattan Avenue.
Case #H-15-102. 209 and 215 A Polaco Street.

Case #H-15-098. 802 Don Cubero Avenue.

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

1. Case #H-15-036B. 558 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sandra Donner, agent for David Cantor, owner proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including a 114 sq. ft. addition to match existing height. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-15-050B. 107 Cienega Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Albert and Kathy Schultz, owners, proposes to remodel contributing commercial structures including 186 sq. ft. of additions, replacing windows, and constructing walls and fences. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-15-090A. 610 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a significant residential property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-15-090B. 610 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, proposes to demolish a yardwall and construct a 64"-79" high yardwall where the maximum allowable height is 40" along Santa Fe Avenue and 51" along Don Gaspar Avenue on a significant residential property. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-15-103A. 222 McKenzie Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spencer House Real Estate, L.P., owner, requests primary elevation designation on a contributing commercial structure. (Donna Wynant).
6. Case #H-15-103B. 222 McKenzie Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spencer House Real Estate, L.P., owner, proposes to remodel a contributing commercial structure including a 55 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height on a non-historic addition. (Donna Wynant).
7. Case #H-15-104. 538 ½ D Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Martinez, agent for Coyote Development Group LLC, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure including 66 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch).



Agenda

DATE 11/5/15 TIME 3:55 PM

SERVED BY JM/Cullag

RECEIVED BY Melissa Byers

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 24, 2015 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 24, 2015 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 10, 2015
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-15-077. 829 West Manhattan Avenue.
Case #H-15-102. 209 and 215 A Polaco Street.

Case #H-15-098. 802 Don Cubero Avenue.

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

1. Case #H-15-036. 558 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sandra Donner, agent for David Cantor, owner proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including a 114 sq. ft. addition to match existing height. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-15-050. 107 Cienega Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Albert and Kathy Schultz, owners, proposes to remodel contributing commercial structures including 186 sq. ft. of additions, replacing windows, and constructing walls and fences. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-15-090A. 110 West Santa Fe Avenue/610 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a significant residential property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-15-090B. 110 West Santa Fe Avenue/610 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, proposes to demolish a yardwall and construct a 64"-79" high yardwall where the maximum allowable height is 40" along Santa Fe Avenue and 51" along Don Gaspar Avenue on a significant residential property. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-15-103A. 222 McKenzie Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spence House Real Estate, L.P., owner, requests primary elevation designation on a contributing commercial structure. (Donna Wynant).
6. Case #H-15-103B. 222 McKenzie Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spence House Real Estate, L.P., owner, proposes to remodel a contributing commercial structure including a 55 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height on a non-historic addition. (Donna Wynant).
7. Case #H-15-104. 538 ½ D Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Martinez, agent for Coyote Development Group LLC, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure including 66 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-15-105. 604 A Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Bernie Romero, agent for Nancy Lacy, owner, requests a historic status review for a non-contributing residential structure. (Donna Wynant).

8. Case #H-15-105A, 604 A Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Bernie Romero, agent for Nancy Lacy, owner, requests a historic status review for a non-contributing residential structure. (Donna Wynant).
9. Case #H-15-083, 330 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. La Posada de Santa Fe, agent/owner, proposes to install an awning-covered walkway and construct a 96" high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 50" on a contributing commercial property. Two exceptions are requested to construct a structure not in Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2(E)) and to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check <http://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board-hearing-packets> for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

9. Case #H-15-083. 330 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. La Posada de Santa Fe, agent/owner, proposes to install an awning-covered walkway and construct a 96" high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 50" on a contributing commercial property. Two exceptions are requested to construct a structure not in Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2(E)) and to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check <http://www.santafenm.gov/historic-districts-review-board-hearing-packets> for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
November 24, 2015

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
D. Approval of Minutes November 10, 2015	Approved as amended	2
E. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2
F. Business from the Floor	None	2
G. Communications	Presentation by Mr. Rasch	3
H. Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-15-036B</u> 558 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved as recommended	3-5
2. <u>Case #H-15-050B</u> 107 Cienega Street	Approved part/Postponed part	5-12
3. <u>Case #H-15-090A</u> 610 Don Gaspar Avenue	Designated non-contributing	12-14
4. <u>Case #H-15-090B</u> 610 Don Gaspar Avenue	Approved with conditions	14-18
5. <u>Case #H-15-103A</u> 222 McKenzie Street	Primary elevations determined	18-19
6. <u>Case #H-15-103B</u> 222 McKenzie Street	Approved as recommended	19-21
7. <u>Case #H-15-104</u> 538½D Hillside Avenue	Postponed by Staff	21
8. <u>Case #H-15-105A</u> 604A Canyon Road	Designated Contributing	21-23
9. <u>Case #H-15-083</u> 330 East Palace Avenue	Postpone by the applicant	23
I. Matters from the Board	Discussion	23
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:10 p.m.	23-24

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

November 24, 2015

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Mr. Rasch in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THIS MEETING:

Member Roybal moved to elect Edmund Boniface as Chair and William Powell as Vice Chair for this meeting. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Meghan Bayer
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. Edmund Boniface
Mr. William Powell
Mr. Buddy Roybal

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch said item #7 is postponed by Staff and #9 is postponed by the applicant.

Member Roybal moved to approve the agenda as amended. Member Bayer seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 10, 2015

Member Biedscheid requested the following correction to the minutes:

On page 11, under Action of the Board in the first sentence, replace “excluding” with “eliminating.”

Member Bayer requested the following corrections to the minutes:

On page 3, under Business from the Floor, on the 12th line, “compete” should be “completes.”

On page 6, the last line references the HCPI of 1998, not of 1958.

On page 11 in the motion, the primary elevations are north and west, not east.

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the minutes of November 10, 2015 as amended. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Case #H-15-077 829 West Manhattan Avenue

2. Case #H-15-098 802 Don Cubero Avenue

3. Case #H-102 209 and 2015 A Polaco Street

Member Powell moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There were no speakers from the public.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said he will be doing short lectures of 5-10 minutes in future meetings. The first is on premise of Santa Fé Style as described by Sylvanus Morley who was very important in defining Santa Fe Style. The Lovato House was his house and he restored it in a sensitive manner. He came up with five tenets of the Historic Architecture that was published in March, 1915 in Old Santa Fe Magazine. He listed them as: 1) Clings to the natural elevation (long and low and not tall at all); 2) All prominent lines are vertical or horizontal (No Roman arches); 3) has fenestrations like a "fire wall" (parapet); 4) Color should be one of numerous shades of adobe (Strong vivid colors, particularly blues or greens are taboo); 5) Carved wood members in façade decoration (The corbel is Santa Fé capital).

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked about using blue colors. It is Taos Blue was used when the Spanish came to keep the evil eye out of building.

Mr. Rasch said Mr. Morley was thinking only of wall finishes.

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case #H-15-036B. 558 Camino del Monte Sol.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sandra Donnner, Agent for David Cantor, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including a 114 sq. ft. addition to match existing height. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

558 Camino del Monte Sol is a single-family residential building that was constructed in 1921 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the street façade (elevations 1, 2, 3, 15, and 16) designated as primary elevations.

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

1. A 114 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear at the second story to match existing adjacent height of 19' 6".
2. Primary elevation windows will be repaired and retained. Other windows will be replaced and opening dimensions will be changed in one location on the south elevation for a pedestrian door.
3. The rear wall of the garage will have another vehicle door installed.
4. Protruding vigas will be covered with galvanized metal caps.
5. The structure will be restuccoed with El Rey cementitious "La Luz".

6. The header over the front vehicle entry will be raised in height.
7. Metal security bars and a lamp post will be removed and a gas line on the front primary elevation will be painted to match the stucco color.
8. A concrete deck with brick finish will be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked Mr. Rasch to show which façades are primary elevations.

Mr. Rasch pointed out the street façade from east to west.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if these changes would not affect the status or streetscape.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Ms. Sandra Donner, 1021 Don Diego, who said the owners will slowly work on the home and will refurbish the windows as money allows.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Powell referred to the window on the south that is to become a door. It is a little off-grade.

Ms. Donner said it is not quite as high as it is shown. It will be a slight step.

Member Powell asked what the age of that window in the center is.

Ms. Donner said there has been a lot of water damage on the wall so it will be refurbished; not replaced. The window is probably original - around 1928.

Ms. Donner understood the question referred to the window being converted to a door. It is a slightly newer part of the house and she was not sure when it was installed.

Mr. Rasch clarified that even if it is historic, they can replace that since it is not on a primary façade.

Member Powell commented that the driveway gate is very low.

Ms. Donner agreed.

Member Powell asked if the extension across the wall is a beam.

Ms. Donner said it is actually stuccoed so they will put it back and restucco to match. It will look just the same except at 2' higher.

Member Powell said it just caught his eye because it is so thin.

Ms. Donner agreed. It is a thin member to begin with and the clients want to keep it.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if La Luz is the color there now.

Ms. Donner said there are all sorts of variations around the house and La Luz is the closest in approximation. The reality is that they will stucco repair to match. Some parts are closer to Adobe. The owner is a painter and will get it as close as possible.

Member Roybal asked if they would stucco the whole structure.

Ms. Donner said not at this time. They will stucco around the new door on the east and on the back. There are also significant cracks to fill in.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Roybal moved in Case #H-15-036B at 558 Camino del Monte Sol to approve the application per staff recommendations. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H-15-050B. 107 Cienega Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Albert and Kathy Schultz, owners, proposes to remodel contributing commercial structures including 186 sq. ft. of additions, replacing windows, and constructing walls and fences. An exception is requested to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2(D)(5a)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

107 Cienega Street is a commercial property, originally a single-family residence and free-standing garage, that were constructed between 1945 and 1947 in the Territorial Revival style. An approximately 260 square foot addition was constructed on the rear, west elevation of the primary structure in the late 1950s. The only non-historic alteration appears to be the substantial infill and loss of historic windows and door on the east entry porch. Character defining features include the front recessed entry, the dentilated brick coping on the parapets of both structures, and the historic 6-over-6 wood double-hung windows. The primary structure and the free-standing garage are listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The north, east, and east portion of the south elevations of the primary structure, excluding the front porch infill, are designated as primary elevations and the east elevation of the garage is designated as the primary elevation.

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

1. The rear addition from 1957 will be rebuilt. An exception is requested to remove historic materials, including walls, coping, and windows (14-5.2(D)(5)(a and b)) and the exception responses are at the end of this report. In addition, the rear portal will be rebuilt slightly larger than the original.
2. All windows will be removed and replaced with some non-primary elevation opening dimension changes. Window color will match existing conditions, but it was not submitted. A window assessment was not provided, to determine if the windows are beyond repair. An exception is requested to remove historic windows (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)) and the exception responses are at the end of this report.
3. The front entry porch will be somewhat restored by removal of the non-historic infill. The porch will be 5' deep instead of 8' deep.
4. The non-historic garage door will be replaced.
5. Windows in the garage will be rehabilitated.
6. The structures will be restuccoed with cementitious stucco in a color to match the existing condition, but the color was not submitted.
7. A 4' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed at the street frontage outside of the driveway and the pedestrian walkway. Stucco type and color was not submitted. The yardwall may not comply with the driveway visibility standard.
8. A 5' high wrought iron fence and pedestrian gate will be installed between the garage and the primary structure.

9. A 5' high coyote fence and pedestrian gate will be installed along the north lotline.

EXCEPTION TO REMOVE HISTORIC MATERIALS (14-5.2(D)(5)(a))

(I) Character of the district:

We plan to keep the design style the same, as shown in the proposal's elevation drawings. It's our understanding that the appearance from the street will be unchanged for the windows in the Primary elevations.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. Replacement windows do not have the same muntin profile as historic single-pane windows.

(ii) Prevent a hardship:

We are retired and living on a limited budget, so saving on energy and maintenance costs is important to us. The original windows are single-pane, but we want to upgrade to double panes, for both efficiency and comfort. We need windows that will open and close easily.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City:

This structure was built as a residence in a mixed neighborhood. It has been in our family since 1963, but was used commercially for most of that time. We intend to restore it to its original residential purpose, and to live there. This is in line with the City's aim of encouraging a mixture of residential and commercial use in the downtown area.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement. But, the applicant has not provided other options such as using state tax credits to repair and seal the historic windows or install storm windows to increase thermal capacity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to remove the historic walls and coping at the rear addition, recommends denial of the exception request to remove historic windows from primary elevations, and otherwise recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked on the rear addition which is historic and the north elevation is primary, with the demolition of that part, whether the applicant needs to have an engineer certify that it is falling

down or if Mike Purdy would report on that.

Mr. Rasch said Mr. Purdy would weigh in only if they are demolishing the entire structure because he is not a structural engineer. However, the Board can ask for an engineering report.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface understood but it is not required.

Mr. Rasch said he doesn't have the professional expertise for the extent of the structural damage.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said the applicant responded that the replacement windows don't have same profile as the historic windows.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the muntins are very narrow as you look at the window and the thermal panes have much more weight and a narrow muntin cannot hold that weight. There are local craftsmen who can rebuild the muntins to fit in the thermal pane. They are slightly wider but narrower than any replacement window muntins one can buy on the market today.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if that is strong enough to recommend denial of their exception request to remove these historic windows for replacement.

Mr. Rasch said that is not the only reason. There is no proof they are beyond repair.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Stefan Merdler, 918 Calle Arco, who said the Board got the report or the answers to the three questions regarding the windows. One thing he didn't address at the time is that this building is going to revert back to residential status. The original owner's son and his wife will reside there. Therefore, the windows to bedrooms must comply with egress code requirements. In this case, none of the bedroom windows now comply. They are short by 4" and in order for the façade to look as it currently does is to increase all of them higher by 4" to comply with code and to match the height of the egress windows.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Pro Tem Boniface reasoned that if he intended to have continuity with the windows he wanted to know which windows will be changed on primary elevations.

Mr. Merdler pointed them out with pointer. The Study may have to be to code also because it might be a bedroom. On the non-primary elevations, they have more latitude.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface clarified that the windows would be increased by lowering the sill and not raising the header and not changing the width.

Mr. Merdler agreed except for the master bedroom where they had to change the width.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said that was not clear in the application. The Board is allowed to give an exception to lower the sill as long as the head height and width do not change. The applicant has not asked for an exception to change the width of that window.

Mr. Rasch agreed but said the ones on the north are not egress windows. And on the master bedroom, the west window could be changed.

Member Powell asked which ordinance takes precedent.

Mr. Rasch didn't think the Board should ever violate the life safety code. But in this case, the egress window could be on the west elevation.

Member Powell said the north west addition of 1957 has issues. The applicant is proposing to demolish that portion and rebuild it in the same size.

Mr. Merdler agreed.

Member Powell pointed out that it is a beautiful coping on the parapet. He asked if the applicant would you use those same bricks in the plan.

Mr. Merdler agreed.

Member Powell asked if this would not change the footprint.

Mr. Merdler agreed except for the portal on the non-primary elevation. He added that Mr. Jim Hands reviewed it twice and recommended the north, west and south walls [of the addition] be taken down because it was settling and there were drainage issues.

Member Powell said his letter was not included in the packet.

Mr. Merdler had it with him and showed it to the Board. [Mr. Rasch kept the letter and promised to give it back after it was copied.

Member Biedscheid asked if he was proposing to cut the coping off the top and save it or recreate the coping.

Mr. Merdler said they would keep what was considered stable and recreate the coping in the same pattern where it was not stable.

He was willing to match the window width but needed approval from the clients that the window on the west could be an egress window. He then said the owner nodded in agreement.

Present and sworn was Mr. Albert Schultz, 1715 Amber Chase, Katy, Texas and owner of this property. He said the window on the west side is designed to be at the same height as the kitchen window which is over a counter. Having those two match was aesthetically a good feature so it will throw it off balance but he understood the Board's reasoning.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said it was more than reasoning. These are the laws the Board has to follow.

Mr. Merdler said they wanted uniformity as they now match. If we made it an egress window, then this other window would be an egress window. This is the guest bedroom.

Mr. Rasch said it is not labeled as a bedroom.

Mr. Merdler said historically, it was always a bedroom.

Mr. Rasch said both are historic windows in that room.

Member Powell said they just won't match perfectly.

Mr. Merdler said on the street façade they should match. It is adjacent to a parking lot.

Member Powell explained that historic windows used old growth wood. If maintained properly they can last a hundred years. They are high quality if you keep them up. There are some strategic decisions to make here. It is a very handsome building and he commended Mr. Merdler for doing the work.

Mr. Rasch said regarding egress standards, that in the past the Board has required breakout windows.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said the way the windows are drawn; they are double hung so only half of the window can be counted as egress area. Egress is also big enough to allow a fireman with breathing apparatus on his back to get in and out. Sometimes, he has used a manufacturer that makes casement windows with a larger muntin to give the impression of being a double hung window.

Mr. Merdler said they considered that but thought the Board would not approve that. He didn't bring it up because they didn't think it was a viable option.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if there would be any rooftop equipment or skylights.

Mr. Merdler said they would have skylights behind the parapet that were not publicly visible.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked for the stucco color.

Mr. Merdler said it would match the color now and windows will be white.

Mr. Merdler took the color chips to Chair Pro Tem Boniface.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said Buckskin is the proposed stucco color. He asked what the color and finish of garage door is.

Mr. Merdler said they will be white of metal but could be wood.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said they might have that go to staff.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked the color of the iron fence.

Mr. Merdler said it would be black.

Member Biedscheid asked the Board to consider requiring more information about the windows and a window assessment to determine which ones could be refurbished. On the stuccoed yard walls, they might need to be slightly lowered. She was not sure the proposed height would meet the drive-by visibility triangle standard and might need to be lower. She asked if his client would be amenable to lowering it.

Mr. Merdler said that street is a one-way north street. Currently, the neighbor to the south has a 4' yardwall and that is the chief obstruction; not what the applicant would build. The opening is 12'.

Member Biedscheid said it changes the primary façade on the east, cutting off the windows, and that is a beautiful façade so the Board needs to consider the wall's impact on the east façade.

Mr. Merdler asked if she was suggesting a height.

Member Biedscheid said having a lower wall or no wall in front of the house are options.

Mr. Merdler wanted to come to some agreement.

Mr. Rasch explained that the Zoning analyst did not refer this to Traffic so they did not assess this. The maximum in a visibility triangle is 3'.

Member Powell felt, with all the exceptions requested, that he didn't think all the homework is finished and it should be brought back. If that wasn't done, it might tie the applicant's hands to get what they ultimately want. So they might get more mileage to have it postponed and have it come back with more information.

Mr. Merdler asked if Member Biedscheid stipulated that some windows or all should be renovated.

Member Biedscheid clarified that she just wanted an assessment of the windows. It would be relevant information to help decide whether to remove a historic window or not.

Mr. Rasch added that the better condition windows could be relocated to a primary elevation.

Mr. Merdler said they could consider the casement window with faux alignment in the middle to suggest double hung or single hung. He asked if that would be an acceptable option if they maintained the width.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface said the motion would decide that. If it is to postpone to come back or to say they are acceptable. He thought to postpone for a window assessment and show the Board exactly what they want to do would be preferred. There is missing information right now. Member Powell is right that it would be to your benefit to go back and do that and bring it back.

Member Roybal suggested perhaps the Board could approve #1 and postpone the rest.

Mr. Rasch said the Board could do that.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Powell moved in Case #H-15-050B at 107 Cienega Street, to approve item #1 and that items 2-9 be brought back with more conclusive information. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Mr. Rasch informed the applicant that December 16 is the deadline for providing that information for the January 12th hearing.

Member Biedscheid asked for a friendly amendment specifically for a window assessment.

Member Powell accepted that as a friendly amendment and added the location of egress windows and any changes in widths as conditions.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H-15-090A, 610 Don Gaspar Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a significant residential property. (David Rasch)**

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

610 Don Gaspar Avenue is a single-family residential structure that was constructed by 1928 in the Bungalow style. A free-standing garage and a free-standing guest house are located to the west of the

residence. All three structures are listed as significant to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. A perimeter yardwall with pedestrian gates and vehicle gates was constructed at an unknown date in the 1960s. Alterations, repairs, and reconstructions have changed the original character of the yardwall. The structure has no historic designation.

The applicant requests a historic status review of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends non-contributing historic status for the perimeter yardwall and gates due to lack of historic integrity in compliance with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Historic Structures.

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if Mr. Rasch was separating the yardwall designation from the house designation.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It is separate.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface added that the house is significant. He asked Mr. Rasch to clarify for the public about what the difference is.

Mr. Rasch said it is one status among three - non-contributing, contributing or significant. All three structures on the property are significant. Contributing is historic but may have some alterations. Noncontributing allows more alterations and any elevations. He believed, although the wall maybe historic, it has been altered significantly over time from damage so he recommended a non-contributing status for this yard wall.

Member Roybal asked about its condition.

Mr. Rasch said it was listing from problems with its foundation and it could fall over.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fé Trail, who said they are trying to figure out the layers of history. John Murphey showed those in his report. We don't know if it originally had a brick cap or if it was added later. The flex reinforcement is a very new product. Right now it is a hazard. It is listing to the inside but he would maintain the original character in the next case. His client agrees to rebuild in kind with brick cap and brick columns. He completely agreed with Mr. Murphey and Mr. Rasch that it has lost its integrity.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Powell moved in Case #H-15-090A at 610 Don Gaspar Avenue to designate the wall as non-contributing as recommended by Staff. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Member Biedscheid asked if the status was for both the wall and the gate. Member Powell agreed.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 4. Case #H-15-090B. 610 Don Gaspar Avenue.** Eric Enfield, agent for Peter Komis, owner, proposes to demolish a yardwall and construct a 64" - 79" high yardwall where the maximum allowable height is 40" along Santa Fe Avenue and 51" along Don Gaspar Avenue on a significant residential property. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

610 Don Gaspar is a single-family residence with accessory structures in the Don Gaspar Area Historic District that are designated as historically significant. The perimeter yardwall and gates were reviewed for historic status in the previous hearing.

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

1. The yardwalls on both street frontages will be demolished from the street corner to the driveways on both streets and replaced in-kind. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height of 40" along Santa Fe Avenue and 51" along Don Gaspar Avenue. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Chapter 14-5.2(D)(9)) and the exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.
2. The existing yardwall along Santa Fe Avenue from the driveway west to the lotline will be restuccoed with Wester 1-Kote, color not provided.

3. The Don Gaspar Avenue metal vehicle gate will be mechanized by one of two options.
Option 1: The existing bileaf gate will be welded together and opening ion a sliding track behind the yardwall.
Option 2: The existing bileaf gate will be mechanized with swing arms.
4. Light fixtures will be installed on top of pilasters.
5. Speakers and cameras will be installed. Camera design and location was not provided.

EXCEPTION TO EXCEED MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE WALL HEIGHT (14-5.2(D)(9))

Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

Answer: We will not damage the character of the streetscape because the new wall we are building will match the height of the existing wall we are removing and match the historic details.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

Answer: We are concerned about an injury to the public welfare as this wall is presently failing and could fall at any moment on pedestrians walking on the public sidewalk.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing full range of design options to insure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts

Answer: By matching the historic details of the wall we will strengthen the historic and unique character of the city and allow the existing residents to continue to reside within the historic district.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

Answer: The reconstruction of the wall is due to the special condition that it is presently falling down and historically has been altered significantly. These conditions and circumstances are not applicable to other land and structures in the street scape as this wall is a unique part of the streetscape.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

Answer: The applicant purchased this house with the failing and altered wall in place and thus special conditions and circumstances are not the result of the actions of this applicant.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

Answer: Because the new wall will match the historic wall, this new wall construction will have the least negative impact.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to exceed the maximum allowable yardwall heights and otherwise recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface clarified that the applicant is not proposing to raise the proposed yardwall higher than the existing yardwall but the existing height is nonconforming in height at 4' so it probably was built before the height ordinance. So it is not increasing in height.

Mr. Rasch agreed; it is non-conforming in height.

Member Powell understood that the Santa Fe Avenue maximum height is 40" and Don Gaspar maximum is 50" but both are to maintain the existing heights.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It would be a 4" exception on Don Gaspar and a 14" exception on Santa Fe Avenue.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Eric Enfield (previously sworn) said the color, as shown on the drawings, is Fawn.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if the color is close to the existing color.

Mr. Enfield agreed. He said the speakers are recessed to the inside of the wall and detail shown in the packet. The security speakers are for Peter Komis' own security, considering what happened recently.

Member Powell thought this was pretty much rebuilding the existing wall.

Mr. Enfield agreed. They are rebuilding exactly as existing is now. The cap will be exposed brick. He said page 17 showed the way they thought it was originally.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface concluded that they are getting rid of the pediment.

Mr. Enfield agreed. That was added in the 1990's because it was falling down.

Member Roybal asked if the proposed lights match the style on the rest of the house.

Mr. Enfield said he couldn't answer that. It is a lantern style and black. He would submit the lighting detail to Mr. Rasch.

Member Bayer asked if the lights were on top of all pilasters.

Mr. Enfield agreed.

Member Powell asked if they didn't use sconces.

Mr. Enfield said some do but most of those are 7' to 8' tall. This isn't tall enough for sconces. Across the street is a B&B that has those lights on top.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface noted on the two options for the vehicle gate, it looks like they have chosen option 2 now. He asked why they wanted to change it.

Mr. Enfield couldn't answer the question.

Present and sworn was Mr. Peter Komis, 610 Don Gaspar

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked why he wanted to change the existing bileaf gate.

Mr. Komis explained that he would keep the existing gate but change the motor mechanism. This one doesn't work well and is very noisy and not as safe as it could be. So he would reuse the existing gate but the front iron gate he would need to reinforce with metal on the end to match both sides and make them look the same.

Mr. Komis said he has lived there since he was 2 years old and he tries to keep it all historic. He had to take the wall down and rebuild it and do everything he could to keep it as it was historically. Bishop Lamy may have planted the tree back there.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-15-090B at 610 Don Gaspar, to approve the application noting that the exception criteria have been met and including two conditions:

- 1. That the light design be taken to Staff for approval and**
- 2. That the camera design be taken to staff for approval.**

Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Case #H-15-103A. 222 McKenzie Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spencer House Real Estate, L. P., owner, requests primary elevation designation on a contributing commercial structure. (Donna Wynant)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

222 McKenzie is an 1,898 square foot commercial residential structure that was constructed by 1929 in a blend of Mediterranean and Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style. It is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The north façade is the principle façade of the building, facing McKenzie Street since it exhibits the majority of the character-defining features of the building. Such features include a Mediterranean tile roof and a front portal under half of the gable and a projecting fireplace mass on the front wall. A shed roof built after 1982 at the northeast corner is a nonhistoric addition and therefore not a part of the primary elevation.

The attached exhibit shows that portion of the north elevation, as Façades 1 and 2 to be designated the primary elevation, and does not include that section under the post '82 shed roof at the far northeast corner of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends designating façade #1 and #2 facing McKenzie Street as the primary elevation.

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked about the non-historic addition. Since there was no HCPI, he asked how the history of the shed roof was determined.

Mr. Rasch said the HCPI on page 4 doesn't state it and Staff took the applicant's word for it.

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked Mr. Rasch to point out, using the photo, which elevations are recommended as primary.

Mr. Rasch described them on the site plan.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Eric Enfield, (previously sworn) had nothing to add to the staff report but pointed out that all the windows on Chappelle Street have been replaced and it is a hodge podge except for the front windows and he was glad they survived. The house is sweet and he agreed with Staff recommendation that façade 1 and 2 be primary, excluding the porch addition.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Roybal moved in Case #H-15-103A at 222 McKenzie Street, to approve the application per Staff recommendation for #1 and #2 to be the primary elevation. Member Bayer seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H-15-103B. 222 McKenzie Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Spencer House Real Estate, L. P., owner, proposes to remodel a contributing commercial structure, including a 55 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height on a non-historic addition. (Donna Wynant)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

222 McKenzie is an 1,898 square foot single-family residential structure that was constructed by 1929 in a blend of Mediterranean and Spanish Pueblo Revival Style. It is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The primary elevations are designated in the previous case.

The applicant proposes to do the following:

1. A roof modification will be made to the post-1982 dining room addition at the northeast corner of the house. The roof will be raised 2'0".

Mr. Rasch noted that addition was not on the 1984 HCPI.

2. The utility room at the southwest corner of the house will be expanded an additional 55 square feet and will include a new overhang, concrete stoop and roof raised to 9'6".
3. Changes to the south elevation (Façade #4) will include new French doors, overhang and concrete landing.
4. Most of the windows will be replaced with divided light exterior windows.
5. Two new windows will be added to the east elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Down & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the historic primary elevation windows be retained.

Questions to Staff

Member Bayer asked if they are proposing new windows there.

Mr. Enfield said no.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Eric Enfield (previously sworn) had no further comments.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Bayer moved in Case #H-15-103B at 222 McKenzie Street, to approve the application as submitted consistent with staff recommendations Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-15-104. 538½ D Hillside Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Martinez, agent for Coyote Development Group, LLC, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure, including 66 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch)

This case was postponed by Staff under Approval of Agenda.

8. **Case #H-15-105A. 604 A Canon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Bernie Romero, agent for Nancy Lacy, owner, requests a historic status review for a non-contributing residential structure. (Donna Wynant)

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

604 A Canyon Road is a single family residential structure, which is Unit #1 in the Beaufort Condominiums. The 698 square foot residence was constructed by 1958 in a Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The southeast portal and northeast addition infilled approximately 149 square feet, sometime in the 1980's. These are non-historic additions onto the structure.

The additions do not appear to overwhelm the original structure, since their square footage of 149 square feet is approximately 17% of the original 847 square feet.

Though the addition of the portal at the southeast corner appears to be a character defining feature, it is not clear to staff whether or not this is enough to change its noncontributing status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff defers to the Board as to whether or not the addition overwhelms the >>>status shall be changed from non-contributing.

Questions to Staff

Chair Pro Tem Boniface asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Rasch said this really is a borderline case. He added that most of the character-defining features are non-historic. It is not located on a public way but since the driveway is not gated, technically, the public could go down that driveway without trespassing but it is very far off Canyon Road.

Member Biedscheid asked if it is known if the east windows are original.

Mr. Rasch clarified that what she asked was on the west façade and it has historic windows.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Bernie Romero, 11 Caminito Santana, who said the structure was built before 1958 and the addition was done sometime between 1981 and 1986 at the northwest corner and the portal was added at the same time.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Biedscheid said there was no HCPI so there was not much information. We don't have a lot to go on except the look from the street.

Member Bayer asked if there is a reason why there is no HCPI.

Mr. Rasch said it is up to the applicant to decide how much to spend. There are aeriels to show the massing.

Member Powell said it was a tough one since it does have historic fabric and the Board will review it again when changes are proposed. He asked if the picket fence is on the lot line.

Mr. Romero agreed. He added that the owner has not decided what she wants to do with the property.

Member Powell said a contributing status does help with property values.

Mr. Romero asked what façade would be primary if it was contributing.

Member Powell thought it would probably be the west façade excluding the addition. He added that owner could always ask for an exception.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Member Powell moved in Case #H-15-105A at 604 A Canon Road, to designate it Contributing with the west façade as primary, excluding the addition. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with Member Roybal dissenting.

9. **Case #H-15-083. 330 East Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. La Posada de Santa Fe, agent/owner, proposes to install an awning-covered walkway and construct a 96" high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 50" on a contributing commercial property. Two exceptions are requested to construct a structure not in Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2(E)) and to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5-2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)

This case was postponed by the applicant.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Member Roybal complimented our chairperson for the night for a great job.

Member Powell said he would not be present for the December 9th meeting.

Mr. Rasch said the next meeting after that would be on January 12.

J. ADJOURNMENT

Member Powell moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

[Signatures on the following page.]

Approved by:

Cecilia Rios
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

Carl G. Boaz
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.