



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 8-6-08 TIME 8:25

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

AMENDED

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER**
- B. ROLL CALL**
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - July 8, 2008
 - July 22, 2008
- E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**
- F. COMMUNICATIONS**
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**
 - 1. Santa Fe Plaza. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements to include light poles, benches, hardscaping, and landscaping. (Chip Lilienthal)
 - 2. Informational Study Session for the proposal by the State of New Mexico General Services Department, Property Control Division to construct a four-story 207,723 square-foot parking garage to a maximum height of 35' 10" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 8" located at 420 Galisteo Street between Don Gaspar Avenue, Galisteo Street, Paseo de Peralta, West Manhattan Avenue, and South Capitol Street in the City of Santa Fe Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural details will be discussed. (David Rasch)
- I. OLD BUSINESS**
- J. NEW BUSINESS**
 - 1. Case #H-08-022. 1590 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, Inc., agent for Parks Custom Builders, proposes to construct an approximately 3,793 sq. ft. single family residence and attached garage to the maximum allowable height of 15'6", to construct yardwalls to a height of 5' to 7'5" high where the maximum allowable height is 6', and to construct a 4' high mechanical vehicular gate. (Marissa Barrett)
 - 2. Case #H-08-078. 842 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andy Ortiz, owner/agent, proposes to enclose an approximately 220 sq. ft. carport to a height of 11' where the existing is 12'4" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

3. Case #H-08-081 246 Casados Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Robin Leith, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by replacing two windows with a French door with sidelights and construct a patio with a fireplace, fountain, wall, and banco. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-08-082. 50 E. San Francisco Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Romer Rose Co., proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building with applied cornice, pilasters, and a display case at the side entrance. (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-08-085. 212 Anita Street. Don Gaspar Area. Kevin Gilles, owner/agent, proposes to construct an approximately 2,005 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 16'6" where the maximum allowable height is 16'7", construct a freestanding approximately 294 sq. ft. accessory building to a height of 11'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'3", construct coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6', construct a stuccoed yardwall, pedestrian and vehicular gates to a height of 4', relocate wire fence, and install hardscaping on a vacant lot. (Marissa Barrett)
6. Case #H-08-079. 822 ½ Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Ric Brenner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by constructing a 20 sq. ft. portal on a non-contributing elevation, installing of storm windows, and constructing yardwalls to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height is 6'. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-084. 311 Pino Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kevin Van Slooten, agent for Stephanie Benson, proposes to construct a 250 sq. ft. addition to a height of 18' where the maximum allowable height is 16'. A height exception is requested to construct a second story addition on a contributing residence (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-083. 635 W. San Francisco Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Douglas Maahs, agent for Rich Huang and Lois Miller, proposes to remove and reconstruct an approximately 69 sq. ft. non-statused shed to match the existing height of 10'7" and to construct yardwall to a height of 4' to 4'8" where the maximum allowable height is 6' on a contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
9. Case #H-08-086. 793 Camino Del Poniente. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. William Peterson, owner/agent, proposes to construct approximately 96 sq. ft. storage shed to a height of 8'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'10", to restucco a contributing building, and construct a coyote fence to a maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Chapter 14 Rewrite Discussion

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 August 12, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, August 12, 2008.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
August 12, 2008

| ITEM | ACTION TAKEN | PAGE(S) |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Approval of Agenda | Approved as amended | 1-2 |
| Approval of Minutes: | | |
| July 8, 2008 | Approved as amended | 2 |
| July 22, 2008 | Approved as amended | |
| Approval of Findings and Conclusions | None | 2 |
| Communications | Discussion | 2 |
| Business from the Floor | Beninato, Discussion | 2-3 |
| Administrative Matters | | |
| 1. Santa Fe Plaza | Discussion | 3-5 |
| 2. State Parking Garage | Postponed | 5-6 |
| Old Business | None | 6 |
| New Business | | |
| 1. <u>Case #H 08-022</u> 1590 Canyon Road | Approved with conditions | 6-10 |
| 2. <u>Case #H 08-078</u> 842 Agua Fria | Approved with conditions | 10-11 |
| 3. <u>Case #H 08-081</u> 246 Casados Street | Approved as recommended | 11-13 |
| 4. <u>Case #H 08-082</u> 50 E. San Francisco Street | Approved with Conditions | 13-14 |
| 5. <u>Case #H 08-085</u> 212 Anita Street | Approved with Conditions | 14-20 |
| 6. <u>Case #H 08-079</u> 822½ Canyon Road | Approved as Submitted | 20-22 |
| 7. <u>Case #H 08-084</u> 311 Pino Road | Postponed for more information | 22-26 |
| 8. <u>Case #H 08-083</u> 635 W. San Francisco Street | Approved with Conditions | 26-28 |
| 9. <u>Case #H 08-086</u> 793 Camino Del Poniente | Approved with Conditions | 28-30 |
| Matters from the Board | | |
| 1. Chapter 14 Rewrite | Discussion and assignments | 30-33 |
| Adjournment | Adjourned at 8:37 p.m. | 33 |

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

August 12, 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. Dan Featheringill
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker
Mr. Jake Barrow

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Robert Frost

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Historic Planner
Ms. Kelley Brennan, City associate Attorney
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
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 the second Administrative Matter, regarding the parking garage, had been postponed to Sept 9th.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 8, 2008

Ms. Walker noted that on page 3, at the bottom, under Business From the Floor, where Ms. Bane read a letter regarding the Manderfield case; it had been a request for designation. She also noted that on page 9, on the Sheridan case, close to the bottom, it should read "she thought they would have earth-colored" not just "colored".

Ms. Walker moved to approve the July 8 Minutes as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

July 22, 2008

Ms. Rios noted that on page 3, it should read Ms. Rios, not Mr. Rios.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve the July 22 minutes as amended. Ms. Rios seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

None.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, of 604 ½ Galisteo Street was sworn in. She said she was aggrieved by the City Planning Department's approval and denial at 610 Galisteo Street. She clarified that this was a new matter, and had occurred on July 18, and on July 31. She said Mr. Rasch had approved some alterations of the

conditions of the HDRB's approval. The skylights were not low-profile and she had found that the definition of low-profile skylights meant they did not inhibit the roofline, and were flat to the roof. She noted that 8 or 10 of the ones that had been approved were above the parapet.

Ms. Beninato said Mr. Rasch had changed the condition so that the ones that would be visible from the street would be shielded, rather than lowered. She said she would rather have the ordinance enforced, and said did not think Mr. Rasch had the right to change the conditions as stated on the permit. She also pointed out that if the owner hadn't wanted to do what the approval required, he should have come back to the Board.

Ms. Beninato said she also had the problem with the approval of a six foot coyote fence near her existing yardwall. She said, in the Don Gaspar Historic District, the City was supposed to encourage solar. She said she had a passive solar energy system in place. She said there was an existing wall, which the owner had been going to plaster, but she said he had reneged on that decision, and had chosen to put a coyote fence there. She said he had backfilled against her adobe wall, and said the backfill was above her foundation, and he was on her property when he was backfilling. She noted that water was running on her wall, and was going to be disadvantaged because the fence would be nearly two feet higher than her wall. She said her wall was only about 12' long, and asked that the other wall be no higher than her existing wall at 5' 9". She said she did not really care about the rest.

Ms. Beninato said, since the 18th, Mr. Rasch had also approved changes to the demolition plan. She said they had to be approved by Board, not staff. She said the north and west walls of the garage, which the Board had approved to be demolished, would remain, and would be lowered down to six feet.

Ms. Beninato said she had been told by Ms. Brennan that the north wall would be made into a fence. She said she had not seen what it looked like because it had been covered by the house. She the space had been covered over. She said she had no idea what her house wall looked like, and was concerned that she would not be given the opportunity to plaster that wall or maintain it easily, and said there would be water going between the wall. She said she would ask for the opportunity to at least plaster her wall before the fence went up, because she would not ever have a chance to plaster it again

Ms. Beninato said she would like the Board to address the changes to the building and the demolition plan.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1. Santa Fe Plaza.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements to include light poles, benches, hardscaping, and landscaping. (Chip Lilienthal)

Mr. Lilienthal, with the City of Santa Fe Public Works Department, introduced Ms. Judy Kowalsky from the Landscape Architect Firm of Wilkinson and Miller. He explained the background of the case. He asked

if everyone had received the handout.

Ms. Walker said page 3 of the letter of transmittal talked about replacing trees.

Ms. Kowalsky explained which trees were replacements, and which were new.

Mr. Barrow asked if the SHPO would review the proposal.

Mr. Rasch said it would. He said Public Works had already worked with SHPO, and both agencies supported the change.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were any provisions for bicycle racks.

Ms. Kowalsky said there were none. She said they were trying to maintain an open environment, which was in keeping with national landmark status.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were any bike racks on the plaza.

Mr. Lilienthal said he believed there was one outside the Ore House.

Ms. Shapiro said there was not a bike rack in that location.

Mr. Lilienthal explained that, since bike racks were not part of the Historic Landscape Report, they would not be brought in. He said he would inform Mr. Rasch if there were any in the plans.

Ms. Shapiro said she thought having some near the plaza would be nice.

Ms. Rios asked what kind the new trees would be.

Ms. Kowalsky listed what they would be, and noted they were on the plant schedule.

Chair Woods said she thought the existing benches were great, and said that, after looking at the replacements, she thought they felt pretty pedestrian compared to the existing ones.

Ms. Kowalsky said the historic benches had been made of wooden planks, and said others had been added later which were very plain. She said the replacements were to be in keeping with the historic ones. She said they were the same benches that would be used at the Convention Center.

Chair Woods disagreed. She said it looked like something they would get at Sam's Club.

Ms. Walker said she didn't think standardization applied. She said the Plaza was unique.

Ms. Kowalsky said one other issue they had tried to address was the request of Parks Department that the existing benches were very hard to maintain. She said the metal was brittle and broke easily. She also noted that they had to be painted often and got crusty. She pointed out that the existing benches

were not historically significant.

Chair Woods said it was just how the Board felt.

Mr. Rasch suggested they could replace the wood with a better material.

Chair Woods asked about the color of the light fixtures.

Ms. Kowalsky said they would be the same green as the existing lights.

Chair Woods asked about the cigarette receptacles attached to the garbage cans.

Ms. Kowalsky the existing receptacles were messy and difficult to maintain. She said the proposed ones would be less intrusive visually.

Ms. Rios asked how many lights there were at that time, and if they would be replacing all of the existing lighting.

Ms. Kowalsky said there were seven bollard lights, and said those would be replaced.

Chair Woods thanked Ms. Kowalsky, and asked what they should do about the bench issue.

Ms. Kowalsky said it was up to the project manager. She said she would be happy to maintain the existing benches. She said they were replacing all the concrete. She said some of the benches were actually concreted in, and might be damaged when the concrete was removed. She said they were available locally, so they could replace any that were damaged.

Mr. Rasch said proper treatment could help them be extracted without damage.

Mr. Barrow asked how long the benches had been on the Plaza.

Ms. Kowalsky explained they had been on the Plaza since the 1970s.

Mr. Lilienthal said the benches had been a donation from the Downtown Kiwanis Club in the 1960s. He explained that they had metal that would chip. He said they had to sandblast them down before repainting them, and the boards always got warped and damaged. He said if the Board wished to keep the same benches, the City was fine with that, but said they did not see it as money worth spending.

Chair Woods suggested they could suggest a different bench design that would please both parties.

Mr. Lilienthal said he could research it and come back to the Board.

2. New Mexico Capital Parking Garage. Informational Study Session for the proposal by the State

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

This item was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

I. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to consider.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 08-022.** 1590 Canyon Road. Downtown & eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, Inc., agent for Parks Custom Builders, proposes to construct an approximately 3,793 square foot single family residence and attached garage to the maximum allowable height of 15' 6", to construct yardwalls to a height of 5' to 7' 5" high where the maximum allowable height is 6' and to construct 5' high mechanical vehicular gate. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The approximately 1 acre vacant lot located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District is proposed for construction of an approximately 2,695 square foot single family residence with 357 square feet of portals and an approximately 741 square foot attached garage, for a total roofed footprint of 3,793 square feet.

"The Territorial Revival style building will be to the maximum allowable height of 15' 6". The building will include true divided light doors and windows with wood surrounds painted off-white, carriage style garage doors painted off-white, and wood canals lined with galvanized metal. The portals will have square wood posts with decorative trim and a wood fascia with patinated copper flashing and dentil board.

All wood will be painted white.

"Seven skylights are indicated on the floor plan. The building will be stuccoed with an El Rey in a "Dark Adobe" color. Light fixtures will be down lights with a 75 watt bulb.

"Also proposed is the construction of a courtyard wall to a height ranging from 5' to 7' 8" on the northwest elevation. The wall will include a wood pedestrian gate and stuccoed entry surround to a height of 8'6". The maximum allowable height for courtyard walls is 6'. The entry way is considered an accent, and may be allowed to go higher than 6'.

"Lastly proposed is a 4' high mechanical vehicular gate and 5'-5'6" high coyote fence. The antique brown wrought iron sliding gate is setback approximately 80' from Canyon road, and 10' to 20' from the Driveway Utility Easement. The gate will attach to 24" by 24" rock pilasters. The coyote fence will run along the east property line along the existing driveway and is below the maximum allowable height of 6'. The coyote fence will have irregular latilla tops. A new base course driveway will also be constructed.

"This case was on the March 25, 2008 HDRB agenda, but was postponed by the owner. Ownership of the property has changed, and the same plans proposed in March are now coming before the Board for approval.

"Attached to this application is information from the adjacent neighbor regarding the sale history of this lot, and a covenant created at the time the lot was originally sold.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the yard walls do not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6', and that the skylights are not publicly visible. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for all H-Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Ms. Barrett noted that there were four handouts that were relevant to the case.

Chair Woods informed those present that the covenant was private, and added that Ms. Brennan had informed her that the City had no jurisdiction over private covenants, which needed to be followed up with the persons who had agreed on the covenants. She asked that it not be brought up. She added that a statement had been made by the owner that Chair Woods herself had made an offer to purchase the property. She said this was not true, and said she had never been interested in purchasing the property. She explained that she had once been asked to look at the property, as a contractor, for a former client. She said she had no knowledge as to whether or not that person had purchased the property at any time, or even if they had made an offer.

Ms. Rios asked if it was visible from Canyon Road.

Ms. Barrett said it was slightly visible from Canyon Road, and slightly visible from the driveway easement. She said the vehicular gate should not be publicly visible. She noted that the lot was set higher, and said there was a stone retaining wall, with a six foot high coyote fence on top of it.

Ms. Rios asked about the existing fence.

Ms. Barrett noted it was an irregular latilla coyote fence, and interior to that, there was a split rail fence.

Chair Woods asked if the project met the ordinance.

Ms. Barrett said it did. She noted there was one portion of the wall that, in the drawings, looked as though it was too tall, but said the applicant had assured her it would not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'.

Present and sworn were Ms. Dolores Vigil, of 206 McKenzie, Ste G-1, and Mr. Jay Parks.

Ms. Vigil confirmed that they would meet the wall height limits.

Mr. Barrow asked Ms. Barrett if the split rail fence had precedence on Canyon Road.

Ms. Barrett explained that the split rail fence was not on the street, but along the drive. She said there were lots of walls and fences on the Road.

Mr. Barrow asked if it was appropriate.

Ms. Barrett agreed it was.

Ms. Rios said she believed the split rail added to the character of the property, and the area in general.

Mr. Barrow agreed. He spoke to the gate as well, saying it appeared to have vertical steel posts like a prison cell. He said he did appreciate that it was open, however. He asked if the applicant had any further impression about it. He asked what their motivation had been for that style of gate.

Mr. Parks said their thought had been to make it rather invisible, or nondescript. He said it would be a rusted or brown color.

Mr. Barrow asked how far apart the verticals were.

Mr. Parks said they were six inches apart.

Mr. Barrow asked if they could be flexible with that space.

Mr. Parks said they could, and explained that it would be custom built.

Mr. Barrow said he would encourage them to space the verticals further apart.

Chair Woods noted there was already a coyote fence on the left side, and said the Board liked the split rail. She said having a coyote fence there would create a tunnel.

Mr. Parks said he understood.

Chair Woods asked if they were going to keep the trees.

Mr. Parks said the Spruce had to stay, and said the ones in back would not be touched.

Chair Woods asked if any members of the public wished to speak regarding this case. She asked them again to please not mention the private covenants.

Present and sworn was Mr. Forest Rutherford, who was speaking on behalf of Margaret Pierson, the owner of the lot behind the one in question. He said his understanding was that the driveway wall would still be six feet. He said that at one point, they had been informed that the entire estate would be surrounded by a rock wall.

Chair Woods said that was between Ms. Pierson and the owner, and was not something the Board would require.

Mr. Rutherford asked if it had been established that the driveway wall would not exceed the maximum allowable height.

Chair Woods said the Board had not voted yet, so it was not final.

Mr. Rutherford said it would be disturbing if the back wall was at a height of 7'6". He said the owner had planted trees along the lot line, in the design of leaving it as a natural design along that part of Canyon Road. He added that anything that would lessen the tunnel effect would be good, because of drainage concerns. He said he also appreciated the Board's concern about the gate.

Mr. Robert T. Coughlin, of 1571 Canyon Road, was sworn in. He thanked the Board for their sensitivity to the rural nature of Canyon Road. He said the split rail fence did add to the texture of their neighborhood. He noted that all the other electric gates in the neighborhood were wood, not metal. He said he appreciated that the applicants were sensitive to the six foot limit.

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

Mr. Parks said the easement was a private road easement. He said they turned off of it onto their home. He said they had not been allowed access to Canyon Road. He said he had tried to design something that was sensitive to the area. He said he thought the rock wall in front was charming, and said it would not be touched. He said they were trying to keep the openness. He said they could come up with a separate design for a wood gate to match the design of the house.

Chair Woods said it would be good if they could redesign the gate, and not have the walls higher than six feet.

Ms. Barrett said no coyote fence had been proposed above six feet, and said there was nothing along the road.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the el Rey stucco was cementitious.

Mr. Parks said they could use cementitious stucco if that was the wish of the Board.

Mr. Featheringill noted that El Rey did make an elastomeric stucco.

Mr. Parks said they did not intend to use the elastomeric type stucco.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case# H-08-022 with the following conditions:

- 1. That the stucco be El Rey, and cementitious,**
- 2. That the skylights be not visible,**
- 3. That the split rail fence remain on all existing elevations,**
- 4. That there be no changes to the existing rock wall in the front,**
- 5. That the vehicular gate be redesigned as a wooden gate, and brought back to the Board for approval.**

Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion.

Ms. Shapiro asked for the additional conditions that the applicants save as many trees as possible, and that the wall at the courtyard not be above six feet.

Ms. Rios agreed to the additional conditions.

Mr. Barrow asked that the motion include the condition that gate be as transparent as possible.

Ms. Rios agreed to that additional condition as well.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

2. **Case #H 08-078.** 842 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andy Ortiz, owner/agent, proposes to enclose an approximately 200 square foot carport to a height of 11' where the existing is 12' 4" on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style commercial building located at 842 Agua Fria has a construction date of P45 listed on the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties inventory (HCPI) as well as the letters NC recommending that the building is non-contributing. A May 2008 HCPI completed by a City and State approved surveyor provides updated information on the building.

"The surveyor found that structure is present on the lot in 1951 but with a different footprint. An estimated date of construction provided on the updated survey suggests that the building was built between 1945-1950. The following alterations are also outlined in the new survey which included additions to the south half of the building, reconstruction of the north elevation portal and west elevation carport, and complete window and door replacement. The information provided by the new HCPI verifies that the status of the building is non-contributing as indicated on the Official Map.

"The applicant proposes to enclose the approximately 220 square foot carport on the west elevation. The enclosed carport height will remain the existing height of 11' where the maximum allowable height is 12' 4".

"A new 6 panel solid wood door will be installed on the south elevation and will be finished with a natural stain. The existing door on the west elevation, under the carport, will be relocated to the north elevation of the addition. The two windows on the east elevation are indicated on the elevation plans as aluminum clad double hung windows to match the existing color but the proposal letter indicated the windows will be vinyl in the color white. The addition will be stuccoed to match the existing color and texture.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that window material is clarified. 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."

Present and sworn was Mr. Andy Ortiz who said he had nothing to add and would stand for questions.

Ms. Rios asked what type windows he was proposing.

Mr. Ortiz said they would match the existing windows on the building.

Ms. Shapiro asked what type of stucco would be used.

Mr. Ortiz said it was cream color El Rey and had never been painted.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-078 as recommended by staff and the windows as clarified. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 08-081.** 246 Casados Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Robin Leith, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by replacing two windows with a French door with sidelights and construct a patio with a fireplace, fountain, wall and banco. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"246 Casados Street is a single-family residence that was constructed before 1940 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. Non-historic alterations include replacement of historic windows and massing changes. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

"A stop work order was given for construction without a permit and now the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following two items.

"1. Two long, narrow windows on the rear, non-visible elevation will be removed and replaced with 8-light French doors with 4-light side lights in a larger opening.

"2. A courtyard will be created at the rear of the vacant side yard.

"An outdoor fireplace that is 11' high will be flanked by stuccoed yardwalls that are 5' high and connected to the south elevation of the residence. A 1'6" high stuccoed planter will be constructed to the south of the fireplace, also functioning as a banco. Flagstone caps will be installed on the yardwalls, planter, and the fireplace hearth and mantle. A 3' wide pedestrian gate will be installed in the yardwall, no details were submitted.

"A stuccoed planter that is 3' high will be constructed along the rear yardwall, also functioning as a banco. A 1' 6" high stuccoed fountain will be centered in front of the planter. Flagstone caps will be installed on the planter and the fountain.

"The courtyard area will be surfaced with flagstone.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District."

Present and sworn was Peter Prandoni. He clarified that there would be no pedestrian gate, just an opening.

Ms. Walker asked, when they had begun building the fireplace, if they had made sure they were not building on an easement.

Mr. Prandoni said he did not know. He said he understood they had called the City and had been told they did not need a permit for a flagstone patio and a planter. He said he had only recently become involved in the project.

Mr. Barrow said there was nothing in the drawings about the fountain. He asked where it was.

Mr. Rasch said it was on the back wall.

Mr. Barrow asked if there was a drawing of that elevation.

Mr. Rasch directed Mr. Barrow to page seven.

Mr. Barrow asked how much of the fountain and fireplace would be visible.

Mr. Prandoni said a steel panel, from a gate, obscured them, except the chimney for the fireplace.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-081 per staff recommendations. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H 08-082.** 50 E. San Francisco Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Romer Rose Co., proposes to remodel a non-contributing commercial building with applied cornice, pilasters, and a display case at the side entrance. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"50 East San Francisco Street is a commercial building that was constructed in 1878 with an addition

in 1912 in the Territorial style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the side elevation on Don Gaspar Avenue. The applied pilasters and cornice surrounding a pedestrian door and display case and trim that surrounds a small window will be removed. New applied pilasters and cornice that matches the front of the building will be installed to surround a larger space. Within the space a second display case will be incorporated with the existing window to somewhat match the existing case. Finishes will match existing conditions. Signs are proposed that must be approved by Historic Preservation staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said he had brought a section of the cornice detail. He said it was to mirror the one on the San Francisco side. He said the columns would be fluted, and it would have a copper drip edge, exactly like the front entrance. He said they had decided on a display case that could be opened from the outside.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would have any precast or composite materials.

Mr. Enfield said it would all be wood.

Ms. Rios asked how much taller it would be than the existing structure.

Mr. Enfield said it would be about a foot to 16" taller.

Mr. Barrow said they had provided a historic picture of the streetscape, which was interesting to look at that. He said, at one time in 1939, there had been five buildings along the street, and said this was the second. He said what had happened was that it had been made into one building. He said their solution was to follow that line of thinking, and mirror the side with the front to make it a part of that concept of making the two buildings one. He said he didn't know when it had been done, but said he felt they were losing the historic nature of the building. He said he understood the problem with the ad hoc entrance.

Mr. Enfield said, regarding the physical history, it probably had been two separate structures that had been stuccoed over. He said he knew there was a large storefront on it, but said he couldn't say when it had been morphed into one. He said the photograph had been provided to the board many years prior. He said they just had to acknowledge that it had been altered tremendously. He said it would have been nice to let everyone know the story behind it, but said he thought the story was gone.

Chair Woods said that each of the three openings had different muntins and different sized panes.

Mr. Enfield said the door was existing, and said the two windows were existing so that left the display case. He said he was trying to salvage the existing window.

Chair Woods said the different sizes didn't make sense to her.

Mr. Enfield said he would try to match it. He said he would replace the lower window if that was the wish of the Board, and would try to get the muntin patterns to be more similar.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro moved for approval of Case #H 08-082 with the condition that the window muntin pattern match that of the existing window. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Barrow, who voted against.

5. Case #H 08-085. 212 Anita Street. Don Gaspar Area. Kevin Gilles, owner/agent, proposes to

construct an approximately 2,005 square foot single-family residence to a height of 16' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 7", construct a freestanding approximately 294 square foot accessory building to a height of 11' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 3", construct coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6', construct a stuccoed yardwall, pedestrian and vehicular gates to a height of 4', relocate wire fence, and install hardscaping on a vacant lot.
(Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"212 Anita Street is an approximately 6,785 square foot vacant lot located in the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 1,844 square foot single family residence with an approximately 161 square foot portal on the north street facing elevation for a total footprint of 2,005 square feet. The single family residence will be Spanish Pueblo Revival in style and will be to a height of 16' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 7". The building has stepped massing with the highest portion setback from Anita Street to conceal solar panels. The master bedroom will include a rounded exterior wall but will not be publicly visible.

"The building will include Semco wood clad casement windows in the color "sage green" and will have upper divided lights. The portals will include wood round posts, carved corbels, exposed headers, and protruding viga ends. Overhangs supported by vigas will be located on all elevations over doors and windows to provide protection. All wood will have a natural redwood finish. Solar panels and two skylights are proposed for the building and will be concealed by the parapet.

"The application also proposes construction of an approximately 294 square foot accessory building

with an approximately 24 square foot portal on the west elevation and an approximately 56 square foot open carport on the north elevation. The Spanish Pueblo Revival style building will be to a height of 11; 6: where the maximum allowable height is 15' 3". The windows and portal details will match those on the main residence.

"Both building will be stuccoed using Sto Powerflex in "San Antonio". Exterior light fixtures will be shielded patinated copper fixtures.

"The applicant also proposes the following wall, fence and hardscaping.

"Relocate the wire fence that runs along the north street facing elevation to the west property line. Construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' along the southwestern portion of the west property line and along the east property line.

"Construct a CMU stuccoed wall and rounded wood pedestrian and vehicular gates along the north street facing elevation to not exceed a height of 4'. Pilasters will be located on each side of the gates. Gates will have a natural redwood finish. The wall meets the wall and fence guidelines and will be stuccoed with El Rey "Adobe" which is slightly darker than the stucco proposed for the buildings.

"Recycled irregular concrete will be used for the driveway surface at the northeast corner of the property. The concrete will be permeable and will be stained to "emulate native sandstone coloring". Proposed patios and walkways will be permeable brick.

"A 6' 8" x 4' 8" therapy pool is proposed for the southwest corner of the property. A stuccoed CMU wall is proposed along the west side of the pool along the west property line for a length of 24'. The wall will be stepped at a height of 5' and will include 1' of coyote latilla above for a total height of 6' (maximum allowable height). An arched entry surround and pedestrian gate is proposed at the north end of the 24' long wall.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends that the application is approved on the condition that the solar panels are not publicly visible, that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff, and that brick paving color is clarified. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (H) General Design Standards for the Don Gaspar Area Historic District."

Ms. Rios said there were many homes with fences on east-west lines.

Ms. Barrett noted, from page 2, that the property to the east had a CMU wall. She said most of the properties had low walls.

Ms. Rios asked if the east elevation was harmonious with the existing streetscape.

Ms. Barrett said the rounded wall was not common, but said most of it was not visible.

Mr. Barrow asked if the lot coverage was harmonious with the neighborhood, and explained he also meant the space between buildings. He asked if the proposed changes would change the character.

Ms. Barrett said the footprint was on page six. She said there was another structure similar to the one being proposed.

Mr. Barrow asked if, along the streetscape, they had found vehicular gates on any other lots.

Ms. Barrett said no evidence of any had been provided in the packet.

Present and sworn were Karen and Kevin Gillies, of 2300 West Alameda.

Ms. Gillies said they would be representing themselves, and said they wanted to tell the Board about themselves and their intentions. She said they loved the South Capitol District, both the architecture and the location. She said they had been lucky to find a vacant lot, and said they wanted the energy efficient home, and wanted to live there a long time. She said they had received a warm welcome from the neighbors. She said they had shared their plans with others in the neighborhood, and had received a

supportive and encouraging response to it.

Ms. Gillies explained that they would be renting the house next door in order to be part of the neighborhood much sooner. She said they were trying to fit in with the homes that had been there for 75 years. She said they wanted it to be harmonious. She said her husband Kevin had designed it, and said he would explain his strategy with the design.

Mr. Gillies said the house was deeply personal for them, with patterns from their lives reflected in the exterior form. He said there was an eastern elevation with fences on it. He said there were dashed lines from the sidewalk locations. He said the highest point was a very small percentage of the total fence, and said the fence, generally, was not visible to pedestrians. He said the higher part wouldn't be very visible except in an oblique way.

He said they had spent a lot of time on the street. He said they had proposed brick, but said they would like to change that to native flagstone. He showed an example, and said it was buff colored. He said the height of the side wall matched the neighborhood, where there was quite a mix of board and batten and coyote fences. He said their intent was for the front yard to be semi-private with low walls. He said trash in the yard was said to be not a big issue in the neighborhood. He said they had been concerned that it not be too open. He said there was a lot behind them with a wall of 5 to 6 feet high. He said they would like privacy back there.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and previously sworn was Ms. Stefanie Beninato, who said she had a short time to review the proposal, because her access to public records had been limited. But she said it looked to be a good design. She said most of the windows on that street were double-hung, and noted the windows that had been proposed were casement. She suggested that perhaps those windows which faced the street could be double-hung.

Ms. Beninato said the other thing she wished to comment on was the accessory building. She said Sena was still pretty open, and said the drive didn't seem to be wide enough for two cars. She said the more parking there was on the street, the more problems there would be with traffic. She said if the accessory building were a guest house, then it could be a problem. She said other than that it was a nice design and she was very happy they were putting in multiple skylights. She said she thought the height of the solar devices was also good.

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

Mr. Barrow wanted to discuss the streetscape dimension of the facade. He asked how, when they looked around, the dimension of the street-facing facade compared with others.

Mr. Gillies said some of the older ones were narrower. He said there had been one to the northeast that was quite a bit longer, so said they were in the average.

Mr. Barrow said he preferred that the new be a little distinct, and so was fine with the windows.

Mr. Gillies said there were lots of casement windows, in addition to double hung. He said the casement windows had been proposed so as to address the new green code.

Ms. Walker asked how wide the drive was.

Mr. Gillies said the rest were ten feet, but said twelve feet was the minimum. He said they would have only one car, and would also have a bike rack.

Ms. Walker said she would not approve a vehicular gate there.

Ms. Shapiro asked what material they would use for the driveway.

Mr. Gillies said there was a lot of concrete on the property. He said they would rip it up, break it into smaller sections and reinstall it. He said the gravel lines between them would allow them to retain water.

Ms. Shapiro said she had anticipated that they would grind it up.

Mr. Gillies disagreed, saying they didn't want it to be sent to a landfill, but said they would be drying it.

Ms. Rios complimented them for their green designed house. She asked what the height of the front north wall was.

Mr. Gillies said the existing height was about 40". He said they would match that. He said it was about waist high.

Ms. Rios asked about the other walls.

Mr. Gillies said the east wall they would keep, or put up a plastered wall that stepped up. He said a coyote fence would be placed behind that, and said it started at the carport and ran to the back side on the southern half at six feet. He explained that, on the west side, it started further back. He said the first 12-16' was a continuation of the masonry wall, because they needed a little berm there. He said for the next 50' they would use the wire fence already on the property and start another coyote fence around the bedrooms and therapy pool.

Ms. Rios applauded the re-use of the wire fence.

Ms. Rios asked about the lot coverage.

Mr. Gillies said 35% to 40% was allowed. He said the house across the street was at max lot coverage.

Ms. Rios asked about the ceilings.

Mr. Gillies gave the heights of the ceilings, and said they were directly related to social structure.

Ms. Rios asked if the east elevation is the elevation to hide the solar.

Mr. Gillies agreed. He said it was set back, and not very visible. He said the solar panels would be behind the parapets, and said none of the panels would be visible.

Ms. Rios asked for the dimension from the top of windows to the parapet.

Mr. Gillies said it was 8', and said there would be protruding vigas above them.

Ms. Rios asked about the stucco.

Mr. Gillies said it would be a cementitious base product, but said it was elastomeric over the insulated

wrap. He said he thought the Peters Gallery used the same process. He said he had talked with them about the various stucco products.

Ms. Rios asked about the window colors.

Mr. Gillies said they had chosen a slightly different color, that they felt was warmer. He said it would be a light green.

Mr. Featheringill said there was a very large tree in the picture, which appeared to be coming out where the drive way would be.

Mr. Gillies agreed. He said they had called the Parks Department. He said the City was no longer responsible for it. He said they had spoken with their neighbor to the east, and she had told them about all the branches that were falling down in their yard. He said the tree was suffering from a lack of maintenance, and said the concrete was all lifted up, leaving no room for the roots. He said there was a significant liability because of the raised concrete. He said the tree was not expected to live much longer. He said they would be replanting six to eight street trees, probably Mountain Ash. He said they were sad about the tree, but he said they would use the top of the tree for bark mulch on the property.

Ms. Walker said the drawing of the east elevation was confusing. She said, on the highest mass, they had depicted three little windows.

Mr. Gillies agreed, saying they would be above a storage area. He said they were at same height as windows another elevation and said they were awning windows.

Chair Woods said she understood they had worked hard on the design, and said she hoped they would not take her criticism personally. She said on the tall portion of the east elevation was where their solar panels were. She said that section was so tall because it was also the highest ceiling height. She said she did not think that mass fit in because of its height and the forehead over the transoms. She said she also had a hard time reading what was below. She asked why they had not put the solar panels on a lower mass so they didn't shoot up so high. She said she did not think it fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Gillies said they were lower than many others in the neighborhood, and said they were less than the median. He said part of the reason for the higher ceiling in living room was to let more light in. He said they had stacked the ceilings as low as they could. He said if they tried to put it anywhere else, it would raise the parapets. He said they could have raised all the parapets, but said they had wanted to set back the massings.

Chair Woods said she wanted to reiterate that putting the solar panels on the highest mass was not the best idea. She said the old houses were wonderful old rectangles, and said they had circular walls. She said she didn't think it quite fit with their intention to blend into the streetscape.

Mr. Gillies said the circular walls were at the rear of the property, and not visible from any public way. He said it was a little more efficient to bend the wall, and said it kept the footprint smaller. He said no one would see the circular walls.

Chair Woods said they had one on the front.

Mr. Gillies said it was under the portal. He said it would be only marginally visible, and would be completely shadowed by the portal.

Mr. Barrow said he appreciated the amount of work they had put into the design. He said their willingness to forego the gate changed things. He asked if they thought a pedestrian gate would make sense.

Mr. Gillies said both gates could go.

Mr. Barrow said he thought the angled portion worked.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were triangular windows on the east elevation below the awning windows.

Mr. Gillies disagreed, and said the windows were quite short for storage. He said the drawing just showed them open.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-085 per staff recommendations, and with the deletion of the two gates, with the conditions that the applicant return to staff with the color of the cement, and that staff approve the lining of the canales. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow asked for the additional condition that the stucco be flat in relation to the neighborhood, and not overly undulating, and that the sandstone be substituted for the brick.

Ms. Walker agreed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H 08-079.** 822½ Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Ric Bremner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by constructing a 20 square foot portal on a non-contributing elevation, installing of storm windows, and constructing yardwalls to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height is 6'. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

822 ½ Canyon Road is a single family residence that was constructed with adobe in the 19th century in the Territorial style. A large addition with connecting hallway was constructed recently in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The north elevation may be considered as primary.

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

"1. A 20 square foot portal will be constructed on the west elevation that attached to the front of the non-historic connection hallway. The portal roof is supported by the adjacent projecting walls and consists of a minimal structure of wood and painted metal with a flat roof and no parapet or pitched slope.

"Since the former addition already exceeds 50% of the historic footprint, an exception to 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) is required and the exception criteria responses are attached.

"2. Storm windows will be installed that will be painted to match the trim color.

"3. Stuccoed yardwalls will be constructed near the west and south lotlines and a courtyard wall will be moved to expand the courtyard. The walls will be 3' to 5' high where the maximum allowable height is 6'. A wooden pedestrian gate will be installed in the courtyard wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of the exception request unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Chair Woods asked if the portal would change the historic status of the structure.

Mr. Rasch said he didn't think it would.

Present and sworn was Mr. Chris Purvis, 227 E. Palace Avenue #W-1. He said he had nothing to add to staff's report.

Ms. Walker asked, regarding the west elevation, if the pedestrian gate showed after the first wall.

Mr. Purvis said that was correct.

Ms. Walker asked how high the gate would be.

Mr. Purvis said it would be the same height as the wall: 66". He said there was another gate to the right that lined up with the wall.

Mr. Barrow said the north elevation was the streetscape, and asked if they were building on top of the existing wall there.

Mr. Purvis said he had shown the dotted lines to show the new and the old.

Mr. Barrow asked staff, when they had a contributing building, if they set that back.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He said he had considered north to be the primary elevation. He said there was already an existing wall there, so on the west side, it did not intensify it.

Mr. Purvis said there was, at that time, just a small joint between the walls. He said they would that so they would not touch each other.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods noted that the criteria responses were on page 12.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 08-079 per the submittal and acknowledging that the responses to the required criteria were met as stated on page 12 of the application. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H 08-084.** 311 Pino Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kevin Van Slooten, agent for Stephanie Benson, proposes to construct a 250 square foot addition to a height of 18' where the maximum allowable height is 16'. A height exception is requested to construct a second story addition on a contributing residence (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"311 Pino Road is a single-family residence, known as the Frank Sandoval House, which was

constructed before 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building has common walls on both the east and west elevations with other residential structures so that the existing second story loft reads as stepped massing. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The south elevation may be considered as primary.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building by expanding the second-story loft space for a 250 square foot additional bedroom over the existing footprint. The second-story height will be increased from 15' 6" to 18' where the maximum allowable height is 16'. A height exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(9), and the exception criteria response are attached.

"The addition will feature a small single-light window in the stairway on the south elevation, 4-light paired casement windows in the second-story bedroom and three small single-light windows on the ground floor of the west elevation, replacement of paired 4-light casement windows with 8-light French doors on

the north elevation, and no fenestration on the east elevation.

"The addition will be stepped back from the north elevation and the ground-floor parapet will be increased for a roof deck. A balustrade rail will be centered on the north parapet.

"Materials, finishes, and exterior light fixtures were not submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of the height exception request unless a positive finding of fact is established for the additional bedroom, second-story massing. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Mr. Rasch added that he had received a written letter, which he wanted to be entered into the record.

Present and sworn was Mr. Kevin Van Slooten, of 57 Camino Peralta, and Ms. Stephanie Benson.

Mr. Van Slooten said he would stand for questions. He said they had gone through a zoning adjustment about six months prior and had gotten approval.

Mr. Rasch said that the Board of Adjustment granted a variance to not be stepped back from the east elevation. He said it would be stepped back on the north elevation.

Mr. Van Slooten agreed that was correct.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Valentina Griego, of 313 Pino, who said she was present to protest the project. She said she had lived in the same residence since 1953. She said they had always had problems with the middle house. She said her father had sold the house because they could not do anything to

improve it. She said the daughter had said they were going to stay there but had sold it as soon as her mother died.

She said Ms. Benson wanted to make a bigger thing out of it. She said her side of the house was where they had remodeled and made a mess of it. She said she was very disappointed. She shared pictures of it. One of the pictures had a tin shed, and she said Mr. C de Baca had said he was going to remove it, but instead it had been extended and remodeled. She said that was where they wanted to put on the second story.

Chair Woods asked what was under the tin shed.

Ms. Griego said it was the property marker. She said Mr. C de Baca had extended it to the property

line.

Chair Woods asked if it had been an approved change.

Mr. Rasch explained about the second story going over the shed.

Ms. Rios said to Mr. Rasch that the house had been built in 1938, and so was 80 years old. She said the area was very cramped. She asked him to describe it to the Board.

Mr. Rasch said Pino Road and the alley behind it, adjacent to Kaune's, was rural in character and very dense. He said there were lots of common walls and smaller houses. He said two-story structures were not common, but said there might have been others in the height calculation. He said the three existing buildings were all about 16' high, but said the remainder was about 12'-13'. He said the building on the corner and across the street were 15' and 14', so it was between 17' and 12'.

Chair Woods asked if the proposed changes would allow the building to maintain its historic status.

Mr. Rasch said it was truly a borderline contributing structure, because of window replacement and the awnings that were not historic. He said, however, that the addition would not affect the primary elevation much.

Chair Woods said the structure was more Territorial in style, whereas the addition was Pueblo in style.

Mr. Rasch said the east elevation had a lot more of a rounded, Pueblo look. He said it was just the front that was not Pueblo.

Mr. Barrow asked about the ceiling heights in the two story section.

Mr. Van Slooten said the ceiling height would be 8 feet. He said, overall, it was about 18' off grade.

Mr. Barrow asked for the ceiling height of the first floor.

Mr. Van Slooten said it was a sloped or shed ceiling at that time. He said they would go above that. He said they were not adding on to the original part of the house.

Mr. Barrow asked what the ceiling height of the first floor was in their plan.

Mr. Van Slooten said the main room was 9' to about 11' at the back of the kitchen at that time. He said the shed was about 7' 3", which was quite low. He said it was 18' long from the steel door to the casement behind. He said at the alley, the shed was about 7' and goes up to about 8'.

Mr. Barrow said, in the proposed new construction, there were a first floor and a second floor. He explained that he wanted to know what the first floor ceiling height in that area would be when it was finished.

Mr. Van Slooten said it would actually be a stairwell, and was 7' 3" at that time.

Mr. Barrow asked for the height of the hallway leading into the downstairs bathroom.

Mr. Van Slooten said it was 7' 6" up to 8'. He said it was a preliminary design. He said they did not want to invest too much there.

Chair Woods explained that they would use the existing ceiling structure, and would build on top of that. She said she thought they could just take off the ceiling and redo it. She said they were not on solid ground. She said she was trying to help them save some money. She said they could also save height by doing that.

Mr. Van Slooten noted that the addition was a stick frame.

Chair Woods asked if they would keep the same walls.

Mr. Van Slooten agreed. He said he could not say that there was a shed on the property because it had a bathroom and plumbing. He said he was a little confused about his client's neighbor's concerns.

Ms. Benson said they would be re-stuccoing that side, and said it would look a lot better than it did at that time. She said she had bought the property because it was a place to work and close her child's school. She said she had not been planning to stucco unless she had to, but said she would if she could be allowed to do the addition.

Ms. Walker asked if the shed encroached on Ms. Griego's property.

Ms. Griego said that both the bedroom that had been built in the late 1950s and the shed encroached on her property.

Chair Woods said, for the permit, they would have to pull out the plat. She said staff could give them direction on who to talk to about it.

Ms. Griego said she hated to go her back yard because of the way it looked.

Ms. Rios asked if she opposed the second story.

Ms. Griego said she did, because there were no others in that historic neighborhood on Pino Road.

She said she felt it was not in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood. She said the alley belonged to her dad's property, the first house's property.

Ms. Walker said she was confused about why it had certain language if the Board of Adjustment had approved it.

Mr. Rasch explained that the case had been brought forward by Ms. Tamara Baer.

Ms. Brennan said they had reviewed the staff report before rendering a decision.

Ms. Shapiro asked how tall the ceiling was in the loft.

Mr. Van Slooten said it was 6' 8", and was just a sleeping area. He said it was quite small.

Mr. Barrow said the code for ceiling height was 7' 6". He said he thought they could get their design a lot closer to code.

Chair Woods discussed the issue of the 18' height limit, and what they could do if they felt it was not enough. She said the Board could postpone the case so they could come back with their math.

Mr. Van Slooten said he felt he could produce it for 18' maximum.

Mr. Featheringill said they needed the proper drawings, because it did not show floor heights and what they would do between the floors. He said a building section would work.

Mr. Featheringill moved to postpone Case #H 08-084 until the applicants could provide the Board with proper documents. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H 08-083.** 635 W. San Francisco Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Douglas Maahs, agent for Rich Huang and Lois Miller, proposes to remove and reconstruct an approximately 69 square foot non-statused shed to match the existing height of 10' 7" and to construct yardwall to a height of 4' to 4' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 6' on a contributing property (Marissa Barrett)

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

Background and Summary:

"The Territorial style multi family residence located at 635 W. San Francisco Street was built by 1930. A shed is also located on the property which appears on the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory but not on the 1996 HCPI. The Official map lists the main residence as Contributing to the Westside-

Guadalupe Historic District and does not list a historic status for the shed.

"On October 10, 2006 the Board approved remodeling of the main residence to include removal of non-historic additions, construction of new additions, and window and door alterations. The Board also approved minor remodeling of the associated shed which was to be converted to a bath.

"The work approved in 2006 has been completed on the main residence, but funding was not available to complete the approved shed remodel and the permit has expired. The shed section of the building is currently a wood on dirt 2" by 4" framed structure with no insulation. A letter from the Division Director of Inspections and Enforcement states that the area of the shed to be removed and rebuild is not in compliance with minimum code requirements.

"The applicant now comes before the Board for approval to remodel the shed which will include the removal and reconstruction of approximately 69 square feet to match the existing height of 10' 7". The shed will be rebuilt at the exact dimension on a monolithic foundation and 2"x6" insulated, frame walls.

"The remodel will also include the repair of the existing window and the rotted door jambs will be reconstructed. The building will be stuccoed with cementitious stucco in a mustard color which was approved in 2006.

"In March 2008 the owner of the property was issued a stop work order for the removal of a non-historic fence and construction of a CMU stuccoed wall without HDRB approval of a building permit. The owner stopped work immediately and contacted City staff.

"The applicant also proposes to remove the non-historic, approximately 5' high wood fence with a bamboo fence located behind it for a total height over 7' where the maximum allowable height is 6' and construct a CMU stuccoed wall and pedestrian gate to a height of 4' to 4' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 6'. The wall will be stuccoed to match the building, and will have a brick cap, details for the gate were not submitted. Also, a 1.5" high, 12' long planter will be constructed in front of the new wall.

Staff Recommendations:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the gate material and design is approved by staff before a building permit application is submitted. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Design Standards for Contributing Structures, Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for all H-Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Douglas Maahs, 1105 Tecolote, who clarified that the planter was 1' 5" high.

He added that the current CMU wall under construction at the time of the stop work order was currently

at a height of about 56" minus the one layer above the yellow sign in the photo. The client requested because of security issues that they be allowed to have the 56" height but would concede to 48" if required. The gate would not be arched.

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Barrett if she agreed with the wall height.

Ms. Barrett said she had not measured but probably. The 48" was for visibility to the structure.

Ms. Shapiro wondered how it could be 56" if it was eight blocks high.

Mr. Maahs said it would be 7 blocks high.

Ms. Shapiro asked about brick coping at the top of the wall.

Mr. Maahs said they would go for 48" including the brick coping.

Mr. Barrow pointed out that walls did not increase security and Neighborhood Watch was the recommended alternative.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Barrett clarified that there was question on the yellow window trim. What they submitted in 2006 was a terra cotta brown so the yellow and blue was not approved.

Mr. Maahs said there was a historic building down the street - a bed and breakfast that used this exact color which is how we arrived at it in 2006 and 2007.

Ms. Barrett said there was no evidence the Board did not approve what was submitted.

Ms. Rios thought this Board would not approve Terra Cotta Brown.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-083 with conditions

1. That the wall be reduced to 48" high including the brick cap,
2. That the gate also be at 48" high made of wood.

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

9. **Case #H 08-086.** 793 Camino del Poniente. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. William Peterson, owner/agent, proposes to construct approximately 96 square foot storage shed to a height of 8' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 10", to restucco a contributing building, and construct a coyote fence to a maximum allowable height is 6'. (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 793 Camino del Poniente was constructed in 1948 and has received moderate alterations which include window replacement and an attached garage. The Official Map lists the building as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant was issued a stop work order in March 2008 for constructing a storage shed without HDRB approval or a building permit. The owner stopped work immediately and contacted City staff.

"The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 96 square foot movable storage shed to a height of 8' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 10". The shed will be Spanish Pueblo Revival style to complement the contributing building and will include a canale on the east elevation. The shed will be stuccoed using El Rey 'Adobe' and the door located on the south elevation will be painted to match the stucco color. The shed will be located at the northwest corner of the property.

"The applicant also proposes construction of a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 6'. The fence will run approximately 45' in length into the property at the northwestern section.

"Lastly proposed is the re-stucco of the single family residence and guest house to match the existing stucco type, color and texture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the coyote fence has irregular latilla tops and the drawings are submitted to staff before a permit application is submitted. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Ms. Barrett noted the cross section was shown in a handout.

Ms. Rios asked if part of the sky light was publicly visible.

Ms. Barrett agreed but explained that the parapet was not built yet because of stop work order.

Mr. Barrow asked if the only drawing was on page 15.

Ms. Barrett explained that page 15 got caught in the copier.

Present and sworn was Mr. William Peterson, 793 Camino Del Poniente, Santa Fe, who said he was

building the storage shed. He said he did not see anything about free standing sheds there and was unaware of the guidelines for sheds. Once he stopped he had done things properly.

Ms. Shapiro asked where the new latilla fencing would be on the property.

Mr. Peterson said it would be within the property, not on the property line.

Mr. Barrow asked him to define the door and address the corner style.

Mr. Peterson said the corners would be similar to house, slightly bullnosed. The parapet was at the height and if the Board wanted him to cover the skylight he would need to raise it 6-8 inches. The door would be a four panel wood door painted to match.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he had looked into another skylight.

Mr. Peterson said it was a standard domed skylight. He said he would be glad to raise the parapet and offered to meet with staff to correct the issue.

He shared a picture from the outside showing the addition and noted that right now it was 18"-24" below the existing so there was a step down for addition.

Mr. Rasch said the existing house was about 16'.

Mr. Peterson disagreed and said it was about 11' feet now.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 08-086 per staff recommendations and leave the option to the applicant to either find a lower skylight or increase the parapet no more than six inches and with the condition that the door match the rest of the house. Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow felt the preferred option would be a lower skylight.

Mr. Featheringill thought it would work either way.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Chapter 14 Rewrite Discussion

Chair Woods said the rewrite had begun and the Board had about two months to complete it. She proposed that they take it in chunks and decide which chunk for next week and have one person lead the Board through it. They just needed to get a better handle on it.

Ms. Walker said she managed to read it. On the issue of overlay trumping the zoning, height was the most crucial element. She asked if it could say the overlay always trumps except for height where the more restrictive would prevail.

Ms. Brennan said she could not say yes or no but probably yes, that could be a suggestion.

Ms. Walker said she would vote for more restrictive on height.

Mr. Rasch asked the Board to decide and come up with scenarios on it.

Ms. Heldmeyer shared what she wanted to see and offered a few general issues. The last time they tried to do this they tried to fix problems on things that were wrong or contradictory. The other part was really making policy and deciding if there were things to carry into the future. They went from a style code to a real preservation code and that was good but there have been changes that were bad.

Some of the issues:

1. Determine what was possible to be done with staff approval. That part never got to Council. If there could be agreement among the board what staff could do, that would be an advantage for applicants and for the Board.
2. The question on how to deal with landmark buildings has come up a lot in recent years. The Board should decide what constitutes a landmark. There are problems with how landmark buildings are treated in the code. It was assumed they would be the same as significant buildings but current code doesn't say that.
3. Exceptions and variances - Determine what needed to go to Council. The one thing Ms. Walker pointed out was height and that could be handled by the Board.

She said this new code tries to address the issue of demolition by neglect. This was primarily an inspection staff issue. But she asked who was responsible for catching neglect early.

The Code needed to be clear about new construction in historic districts and the question about preservation in the light of energy changes in building codes. Where codes collide, which takes precedent. She advised the Board to not just look at preservation parts of the code.

Chair Woods thanked her and hoped she would stay on it with the Board.

Mr. Barrow commented that the Board was very concerned with the R-5 zoning and could not figure out how to address it. It was still a problem.

Ms. Heldmeyer agreed that needed to be addressed. She said RAC zoning was a black hole. It had been treated as if it were RM-1 so on Canyon Road one could have 21 units 3 stories high.

Chair Woods requested the proposed code on a cd. That way the Board could have the presenter use a laptop and the Board could make changes as they went.

Mr. Rasch explained there were three in the packet including the rewrite in 2004. The Board created a task force in 2005 to deal with 9 issues that apparently were resolved. The third item was the questionnaire that the work group was sending to groups for response.

Beyond that he agreed with Ms. Heldmeyer: There were overarching things they needed to agree on before chunks were reviewed. The first was to determine what they were doing. The directive was clean up and not adding new principles or new material.

She asked if it would be merely clean up or if it was time to create a better ordinance. Staff had some hot issues where they were legally stuck like 50% additions; wall and fence heights; etc.

Mr. Rasch said he saw 14 items and that would be two per board member. She also wanted to correct the questionnaire. Jessica was the attorney assigned to this and the Board's main contact. He asked that they deal with the questionnaire sooner than later.

The Clarion draft had eleven headings then the items from 2005 made 12 of the issues; the questionnaire was 13 and the 14th was the staff issues not otherwise considered.

Chair Woods asked what besides the questionnaire they should consider for next time.

Mr. Rasch proposed dealing with the 9 discussion items from 2005.

Chair Woods agreed and asked for volunteer leaders.

Ms. Walker was suggested and assigned the issues for the next meeting...

Chair Woods said if a member could not be present, he or she had a responsibility to convey opinions to the discussion leader. She asked staff to send the schedule of topics out by email. He agreed to do so.

Mr. Rasch also agreed to put the schedule on the web.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer