



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6/7/17 TIME 11:35
SERVED BY [Signature]
RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 13, 2017 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 13, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

AMENDED

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 23, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road .

Case #H-17-038A. 715½ Manhattan Avenue.

Case #H-17-039B. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-16-074. 4 Placita Rafaela

Case #H-04-076. 201 Old Santa Fe Trail.

Case #H-17-039A. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-17-031A. 125 Quintana Street Unit 3.

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

1. Case #H-17-038B. 715½ Manhattan Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin, agent for Jack Reese, owner, proposes to replace windows, re-roof, replace a rotted roof structure, re-stucco, install two windows on the west elevation, and refurbish windows on primary elevations. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
2. Case #H-13-100. 603 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct a 278 sq. ft. carport to a height of 9'4", to replace a street-facing coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall between pilasters, and to install vehicle and pedestrian gates at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Carrie Rowland, owner, proposes to raise the parapet on a primary elevation from 12'7" to 14'1" and install a garage door on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to increase height on a primary elevation and to increase the height of a yardwall on the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(9) and (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)) and to change the character of a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
4. Case #H-17-042. 616 C Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. JNS Services, agent for Deborah Gold, owner, proposes to construct a 134 sq. ft. addition to a height of 11' on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
5. Case #H-17-043. 336 Camino Cerrito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Jacqueline Hartley, owner requests primary elevation designation on a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
6. Case #H-17-045. 122 Lorenzo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jeff Seres, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 156 sq. ft. portal to a height of 12'9", install a window, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

7. Case #H-17-046A. 512 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, agent for George Wright and Grace Watkins, owners, requests to downgrade the historic status of a significant structure to contributing with designation of primary elevations, if applicable. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
8. Case #H-17-027B. 340 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Hughes, agent for, Roberta Franzheim, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including replacing windows on a primary elevation, a non-historic door, historic windows, and garage doors and a yardwall. Exceptions are requested to not replace historic material in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)) and to close an existing opening (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
9. Case #H-17-040. 610 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jack Robinson, agent for Paula Huchison and Peter Gonzalez, owners, proposes to increase the height of a yardwall from the maximum allowable height of 5'3" to 5'11". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
10. Case #H-17-041. 324 West Houghton Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Albert Romero, agent for Vicente Romero, owner, propose to construct a 72" high fence where the maximum allowable height is 58". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
11. Case #H-17-044. 209 Ambrosio Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin agent for Steven Truner, owner, proposes to construct a 120 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 8'10", and a 5' high yardwall with wrought iron gates at a non-contributing residential property. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
12. Case #H-17-047. 329½ Otero Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent for BioWizard Properties LLC, owner, proposes to increase the height of a non-contributing residential structure from 13'8" to 14'8" high where the maximum allowable height is 16'1", construct a 38 sq. ft. portal, relocate a window and a door, replace windows, re-stucco, and re-roof. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

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. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at (505) 955-6521 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 5/25/17 TIME 10:35

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 13, 2017 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 13, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 23, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road .

Case #H-17-038A. 715½ Manhattan Avenue.

Case #H-17-039B. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-17-031B. 125 Quintana Street Unit 3.

Case #H-04-076. 201 Old Santa Fe Trail.

Case #H-17-039A. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-17-031A. 125 Quintana Street Unit 3.

Case #H-16-074. 4 Placita Rafaela

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

1. Case #H-17-038B. 715½ Manhattan Avenue. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin, agent for Jack Reese, owner, proposes to replace windows, re-roof, replace a rotted roof structure, re-stucco, install two windows on the west elevation, and refurbish windows on primary elevations. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
2. Case #H-13-100. 603 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct a 278 sq. ft. carport to a height of 9'4", to replace a street-facing coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall between pilasters, and to install vehicle and pedestrian gates at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Carrie Rowland, owner, proposes to raise the parapet on a primary elevation from 12'7" to 14'1" and install a garage door on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to increase height on a primary elevation and to increase the height of a yardwall on the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) and to change the character of a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
4. Case #H-17-042. 616 C Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. JNS Services, agent for Deborah Gold, owner, proposes to construct a 134 sq. ft. addition to a height of 11' on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
5. Case #H-17-043. 336 Camino Cerrito. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Jacqueline Hartley, owner requests primary elevation designation on a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
6. Case #H-17-045. 122 Lorenzo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jeff Seres, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 156 sq. ft. portal to a height of 12'9", install a window, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

7. Case #H-17-046. 512 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, agent for George Wright and Grace Watkins, owners, requests to downgrade the historic status of a significant structure to contributing with designation of primary elevations, if applicable. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
8. Case #H-17-027B. 340 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Hughes, agent for, Roberta Franzheim, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including replacing windows on a primary elevation, a non-historic door, historic windows, and garage doors and a yardwall. Exceptions are requested to remove historic material and not replace in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)) and to close an existing opening (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
9. Case #H-17-040. 610 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jack Robinson, agent for Paula Huchison and Peter Gonzalez, owners, proposes to increase the height of a yardwall from the maximum allowable height of 5'3" to 5'11". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
10. Case #H-17-041. 324 West Houghton Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Albert Romero, agent for Vicente Romero, owner, propose to construct a 72" high fence where the maximum allowable height is 58". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
11. Case #H-17-044. 209 Ambrosio Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin agent for Steven Truner, owner, proposes to construct a 120 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 8'10", and a 3' high yardwall with wrought iron gates at a non-contributing residential property. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
12. Case #H-17-047. 329½ Otero Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent for Bio Wizard Properties LLC, owner, proposes to increase the height of a non-contributing residential structure from 13'8" to 14'8" high where the maximum allowable height is 16'1", construct a 168 sq.ft. portal, relocate a window and a door, replace windows, re-stucco, and re-roof. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

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. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at (505) 955-6521 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

June 13, 2017

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
D. Approval of Minutes May 23, 2017	Approved as amended	2
E. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2-3
F. Business from the Floor	Comments	3
G. Communications	None	3
H. Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-17-038B.</u> 715½ Manhattan Avenue	Approved as submitted	3-5
2. <u>Case #H-13-100.</u> 603 Garcia Street	Approved as presented	5-7
3. <u>Case #H-16-097B.</u> 914 Canyon Road	Approved as submitted	7-18
4. <u>Case #H-17-042.</u> 616 C Canyon Road	Approved with conditions	18-20
5. <u>Case #H-17-043.</u> 336 Camino Cerrito	Primary designations made	20-22
6. <u>Case #H-17-045.</u> 122 Lorenzo Street	Approved with conditions	22-24
7. <u>Case #H-17-046A.</u> 512 Agua Fria Street	Designated Contributing	24-27
8. <u>Case #H-17-027B.</u> 340 Delgado Street	Approved with conditions	27-35
9. <u>Case #H-17-040.</u> 610 Garcia Street	Approved as submitted	35-39
10. <u>Case #H-17-041.</u> 324 West Houghton Street	Approved with conditions	39-44
11. <u>Case #H-17-044.</u> 209 Ambrosio Street	Approved	44-45
12. <u>Case #H-17-047.</u> 329½ Otero Street	Approved as presented	45-47
I. Matters from the Board	Comments	47
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:18 p.m.	48

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

June 13, 2017

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. Edmund Boniface

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Ms. Meghan Bayer
Mr. William Powell
Mr. Buddy Roybal

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Nicole Ramirez Thomas, Senior Planner
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

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the agenda as published. Member Boniface seconded

the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 23, 2017

Chair Rios requested two changes to the minutes:

On page 26, 10th paragraph after "probably", it should say, "built by the people who lived there and is representative of its time and place."

On page 35, 10th paragraph, delete "ask to."

Ms. Gheen requested a change on page 9, 5th paragraph, line 3 it should say, "Rather than do that, while we certainly can get into this discussion now, another option is to simply hear the application."

Member Katz moved to approve the minutes of May 23, 2017 as amended. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road.

Case #H-04-076. 201 Old Santa Fe Trail.

Case #H-17-038A. 715½ Manhattan Avenue.

Case #H-17-039A. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-17-039B. 457 Camino de las Animas.

Case #H-17-031A. 125 Quintana Street Unit 3.

Case #H-16-074. 4 Placita Rafaela

There were no changes requested for any of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. [A copy of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1.]

Member Boniface moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the above cases as presented. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Stephanie Beninato, P. O. Box 1601, said he brought this matter at 616½ Galisteo to the Board's attention before but nothing has happened there. The property is owned by Mary Armijo Clifford, who got a permit in 2011 and has not made much progress on it. A brother died 18 months ago. Now, not even tarps are on it and a window was removed with 2x4s holding the frame in place. Ms. Armijo Clifford has not much interest in doing anything. There was no probate and no declaratory judgment. Her brother may have died without a will but there is a pickup that could be sold for money to fix it. It is demolition by neglect. The neighbors have complained to her about the condition of this 1890's structure.

She said there was a case that Ms. Ramirez Thomas was staff for but Mr. Roybal immediately asked Mr. Rasch a question about the case instead of Ms. Thomas. A little sexism is going on there and she wanted to bring it to the Board's consciousness. The Staff member handling the case should get the questions and if they don't have the answer to consult with the attorney or other staff member.

There was no other business from the floor.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

H. ACTION ITEMS

Chair Rios announced to the public that anyone disagreeing with a decision of this Board has up to fifteen days after the Finding of Fact and Conclusions of Law for it are approved by the Board to file an appeal with the Governing Body.

1. **Case #H-17-038B. 715½ Manhattan Avenue.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin, agent for Jack Reese, owner, proposes to replace windows, re-roof, replace a rotted roof structure, re-stucco, install two windows on the west elevation, and refurbish windows on primary elevations. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

715 ½ is a vernacular style residential structure currently designated as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The residence is 1550 square feet and is constructed of concrete block and stucco. The historic status of the property was upgraded from noncontributing to contributing on May 23rd, 2017. The south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) were designated as primary. The primary elevation includes the attached garage and excludes the portal. The current parapet height is 11'-2". The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following items.

- 1) Replace all windows on non-primary elevations with single lite Jeld-Wen metal clad wood casement

windows in "Chestnut Bronze."

- 2) Addition of two horizontally oriented windows to the west elevation.
- 3) Re-stucco the home in cementitious El Rey "Suede."
- 4) Re-roof with rafter replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked if the windows will meet the 30" rule.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said that rule doesn't apply in this district.

Member Biedscheid asked if the Chestnut Brown color matches the historic windows.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is a very dark brown.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Marc Naktin, 1305 Luján Street, was sworn. He had nothing to add to staff report.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface asked if he is touching the windows on the primary elevation.

Mr. Naktin said they planned to just paint them.

Chair Rios asked if they are refurbishing the garage door.

Mr. Naktin agreed. The door is very plain and they are just restoring it. He described it as one that flips up.

Member Biedscheid recalled they submitted a glass front door last time.

Mr. Naktin said they will maintain the existing front door.

Member Biedscheid asked if the new replacement windows would be inset at all.

Mr. Naktin agreed. They will be stuccoed in with a bullnose.

Member Biedscheid asked if he considered divided lite windows for the new windows to harmonize with the existing windows that all have divided lites with the exception of the plate glass window in the front.

Mr. Naktin said they will just keep undivided lites.

Public Comment

There were no public comments and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-17-038B at 715½ Manhattan Avenue, to follow the recommendation of Staff and approve the application as submitted. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-13-100. 603 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct a 278 sq. ft. carport to a height of 9'4", to replace a street-facing coyote fence with a stuccoed yardwall between pilasters, and to install vehicle and pedestrian gates at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

603 Garcia Street is a single-family residential structure that was constructed in a vernacular manner at approximately 1930. The building had moderate alterations including the addition of two rooms at the rear and it appears that a brick coping on the parapets has been stuccoed over. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On November 26, 2013, the HDRB approved an application to remodel the property, including the construction of a coyote fence with stuccoed pilasters along the north lotline on Johnson Lane.

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

1. A 278 square foot carport will be constructed to a height of 9' 4" at the Garcia Street frontage on the west side of the residence. The carport will be constructed with wood in a simplified manner.
2. The existing north lotline coyote fence will be removed and replaced with stuccoed yardwall between the existing pilasters with the addition of two more pilasters to the west and an interior planter.

3. The existing coyote fence, stuccoed yardwall, and pedestrian gate that separate the parking area from the remainder of the property will be redesigned. Stuccoed yardwalls will isolate the carport from the yard to the east and south. A sliding three-leaf vertical wood slat vehicle gate and a single-leaf vertical wood slat pedestrian gate along with a small window in the south wall will break up the wall's massing. An interior planter and a single-leaf vertical wood slat pedestrian gate will be installed around the carport sides. The yardwall will continue along the south lotline.
4. Finishes include El Rey "Sand" stucco, "Dark Brown" metal trim on carport, and "Dark Brown" stain on wooden gates.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Tom Easterson-Bond, 23A Arroyo Griego, was sworn. He said the primary driver for what the clients want to do is to prevent parking by the public in the front of their gates. They have a posted a sign and will put it on that gate that opens with a carport behind it.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface asked Mr. Easterson-Bond to describe the vertical slat wood fence and gate.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said the gate would have patinated brown steel trim with 4-6" vertical slats with that thin trim around it.

Member Boniface asked if it would be the same for the pedestrian gate.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said it would.

Member Katz asked if the metal will be on the inside or the outside.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said the metal is an angle piece and the thin angle will be outside - just a thin metal edge.

Member Katz asked if there would be space between the slats.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said no. He hoped to do a tongue and groove gate.

Member Katz asked for its height.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said the gate will be 5' high. None of it will be above the allowed height, rather, it will be six inches below the maximum.

Public Comment

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO. Box 1601 was sworn. She thought the applicant's explanation is helpful but the design is very uninviting. She guessed that was the whole point. The street is open and low for most of it. There is a difference between a wall and a fence. A fence has light coming through and this wall is solid so no light gets through it. They are changing from a fence to a wall.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-13-100 at 603 Garcia Street, to follow staff's recommendation and approve the application as presented. Member Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-16-097B. 914 Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Carrie Rowland, owner, proposes to raise the parapet on a primary elevation from 12'7" to 14'1" and install a garage door on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. Exceptions are requested to increase height on a primary elevation and to increase the height of a yardwall on the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(9) and (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)) and to change the character of a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

914 Canyon Road is Spanish Pueblo Revival style residential structure which is designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The home was built as a single-family residence in the Pueblo Revival style by 1928 according to a city directory and appears to have served as a duplex and triplex over the course of its history as is indicated in a directory from the 1950s. After 1960 the house became a single-family residence. Between the time of the initial construction of the building and the final construction episodes in 1967, the house appears to have had several additions. By 1967 the footprint of

the house including the garage and second floor apartment is as it is seen today.

In 2007 the Board heard a case for this house and it is noted in the case file that the windows on the house were changed in the 1970s and the 1980s. The 2007 case was a request for replacement of the windows on the north and west elevations with no window dimension changes. The windows on the south and east elevations of the home appear to have been replaced sometime in the late 1990s or early 2000s. Given the size and style of the windows it is likely that windows on the south and east elevations required opening dimension changes.

Elements of the home that contribute to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District are predominately associated with the north elevation. The proximity of the property to the street front is characteristic of the homes along Canyon Road. The wall design and stairs at the front of the house offer unique character within the district, and while the windows have changed on the north elevation, the sense of massing that is characteristic of Santa Fe Style is still present. The north elevation of the property as indicated on the façade map is what was designated as primary in 2016.

For reference the Findings of Fact and conclusions of law have been provided.

The applicant proposes the following items.

- 1) Raise the parapet on the north elevation by 18". The height of the parapet would change from 12'-7" to 14'-1". An exception is requested to alter the character of a primary elevation by increasing the height of the parapet (14-5.2(D)(9)). The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
- 2) Raise the yard wall by 3" on the east and north elevations of the second story landing. An exception is requested to alter the character of a primary elevation by changing the wall height (14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
- 3) Add doors to the existing garage. An exception is requested to alter the character of a primary elevation by changing an architectural feature or space 14-5.2(D)(1)(a). The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
- 4) Replace existing windows with the previously proposed "Cascade Blue" window color. The applicant has found that at one time the trim on the remaining historic windows was blue and has provided a photo for the Board's consideration.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts

(1) General

(a) The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and

spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited

(9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing and Floor Stepbacks

The height, pitch, scale, and massing of any structure in an historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted within this chapter.

EXCEPTION RESPONSES

Exception #1

Raise the parapet on a portion of a primary façade

The existing ceiling in the living and dining rooms is exposed beams with a bearing height of 7'-8". We propose to remove the existing roof in order to install adequate insulation, raise the bearing height to 8'-6" and build functional parapets. With the additional 18" these parapets will be 4'-6" below the existing highest parapets of the house at the second story at the east. The existing parapet of the entry hall, that is the street front façade, will remain unchanged. This proposed change does not increase the overall height of the building.

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

Buildings with a variety of parapet heights are characteristic of the district. The parapet we are raising adds to the variety of parapet heights on this building. Because the raised parapet is 7 feet behind the street front façade, it is minimally visible from the street.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The applicant's request is consistent with the district standards.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

The existing ceiling heights of 7'-8" are minimal and cramped. It would prevent a hardship to the applicant if these ceilings are allowed to be raised.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The low ceiling height may result in a hardship.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

Raising parapets on these rooms allows us to add adequate insulation and a little more head height inside without a significant change to the character of this primary façade. This sort of design option provides significant benefit to the resident and is in keeping with the spirit of the design standards.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response as the applicant has not presented a range of design options. Staff does agree however that the proposed parapet height increase will have little impact on the visual aspects of the primary elevation.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure

involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

The special condition peculiar to this structure is the height of the ceiling which is substandard at 7'-8" and the parapets are 3" higher than the roof. The other structures in the streetscape are extremely varied but it is safe to assume ceiling heights are standard minimum of 8' or more.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. An 8'-0" ceiling height is standard.

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

The ceiling heights are part of the historic structure. The applicant purchased this residence last year and this special condition is not a result of any action by the applicant.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The ceilings heights were part of the house prior to the applicant's purchase.

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

Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1) reads:

General Purpose

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the city and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and development of the city, it is deemed essential by the governing body that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve property values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and preservation of historical areas and buildings;

(b) The continued construction of buildings in the historic styles; and

(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

The proposed additional height on this parapet enhances the appearance of this residence adding to variety of parapet heights. The 18" additional height is a reasonable and minimal height change that allows for adequate ceiling height, insulation and parapets. With this proposed change, the outward appearance will be at least as harmonious as is the present condition. The negative impact of this change to the purpose of the historic code is minimal if it is negative at all.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The parapet height will change the primary elevation very

little and is harmonious with the district and streetscape.

Exception #2

Add 3" to the wall around the second floor landing including a primary façade

Do not damage the character of the district;

This tiny change in the height of the wall will be imperceptible and will not change proportions or relationships between the numerous wall heights on this street facing elevation.

Staff response: Staff agrees. Three inches is a small height increase and will not damage the character of the district.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

The existing wall serves as a railing for this second floor landing and is 33" above the floor. Adding 3" to this wall brings it up to code minimum 36". It would be a hardship and a liability for the applicant to have a railing that does not meet code.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. A liability on the part of the applicant would present them with a hardship.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

It is very important that the historic preservation process in the city allows residents to make modifications for safety and code compliance while seeking to maintain the historical character of the various features of the building and the building as a whole. This small change achieves that.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response as it does not address a full range of design options. However, the Board was presented with the design option of a wrought iron railing in a previous hearing.

Exception #3

Add doors to the garage on a primary façade

There is no evidence of hinges or hardware for doors on the garage. We propose to install existing antique wood doors (see attached photo). The doors will be stripped and stained medium brown.

(I) Do not damage the character of the district;

Garages typically have doors. The antique doors we propose to install have an historical quality and will be beneficial to the character of the district.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The door style is not disharmonious with the district.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare;

The garage will primarily be used for storage. It would be a hardship to the applicant if this space could not be secured with doors.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The garage doors would secure the applicant's storage items and may prevent a hardship to the applicant.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

Reasonable and visually pleasing modifications such as adding these doors to the garage, while slightly changing the character of this primary façade, should be allowed. It is a benefit to the applicant and a contribution to the streetscape.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response because the applicant did not provide a full range of design options.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not find that the exception criteria have been met but the Board may find that upon further testimony from the applicant the application complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

She provided the design of the garage doors which did not get into the packet.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios understood the applicant wants to raise the parapet on the north, primary façade by one and a half feet.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed.

Chair Rios asked if it is all of the north façade or a portion of it.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is a small portion of it. She indicated it on the displayed site plan.

Member Biedscheid asked if it is known that the garage had doors in the past.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there is no indication or evidence of that.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Karl Sommer, P.O. Box 2476, was sworn. He first shared a binder of photos with the Board. He said the Board had a pointed legal question that Member Katz raised, dealing with a long standing part of the ordinance. "I want to impress on you that I am here with the family owning it and Mr. McDonald. This is to be their family home as they downsize and have a tight time frame. They have to move out in less than ten months and don't want to have to move twice. They want clarity on all legal issues. So, you know who they are. They bought this for their family home and want to make it functional and safe and preserve the character-defining features of this unique, impressive property that has been neglected in the past and not sensitively remodeled."

The elements Ms. Ramirez Thomas talked about he reviewed. The Rowlands now live at 904 Santander Lane. This is the 4th generation of their family there. They redid it completely and it is one of the best remodels in the district.

Their desires are completely compatible with the requirements of the ordinance and the design standards of this Board. The property is Contributing as of 2016.

Mr. Sommer showed the front elevation of the garage which he said was not a defining characteristic of this façade, but more like a missing tooth in the streetscape. In the HCPI report, all the comments about this property, the defining characteristics are the lines created by the walls, how they wrap around, the undulation of the parapet, the windows and the light. That is why this property should be contributing.

Their purpose is to make it their family home. It is not safe and people could hide in there at night or park in there and they can't utilize it in any meaningful way. In closing it, with the gates designed, actually fills in and enhances the streetscape. The whole purpose of the garage doors is to make it the same and harmonize with all else in the streetscape.

The parapet today is a roll over, and not really a parapet at all. The ceiling is substandard at 7' 8" and there is no room to raise the ceiling without raising the parapet.

The Rowlands did a guest house to be the most energy efficient in the district through insulation and compliant solar panels. In order to insulate this roof with standard ceiling height requires space for it.

This is about making the house functional for them to live there the rest of their lives. And they want to keep it sensitive to the regulations without damaging its character. It is a very small portion and not the front façade that undulates.

In the record, when the primary façades were designated, they talked about the street-facing elevations. This one is not. The designation in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, show the primary has façades behind it.

We believe we have met the criteria, but Staff felt #3 had not been met. He believed Staff were

interpreting it differently that he did. That criterion is to strengthen the heterogeneous character by providing a range of options to make the property livable. Staff have interpreted that to mean the applicant gets to show up with a variety of options for designs. But he believed granting the exception would strengthen the heterogeneous character of the district by providing the applicant with a range of design options so that the property could become livable. When you apply it like that, this application meets the criterion. But even if you agree with Staff, there is no other option available. There is nothing else that can be done except to raise the parapet. They can't lower or raise the ceiling without that.

The other exception is to raise the wall height 3" to be code compliant. The Board was clear last month regarding the railings that they interfered with that primary façade. We heard you and did away with the railing and need the 3" for safety and the change is imperceptible.

The last issue they had, and the reason he was hired, is the primary window on that façade. The window cannot be widened or raised. In the past, windows were made larger by lowering the sill. Member Katz said it would be removal of historic material. He agreed.

Mr. Rowland went out to make sure the window was historic and verified that. Right below the sill is adobe. So, it would be removal of historic material. That needs to be made clear in the ordinance. So, if the Board denies it on that basis, we understand. It is historic material below that window.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified that a changed window dimension is not part of this proposal. There is no proposal to lower the sill.

Chair Rios agreed. It is a muntin pattern change.

Chair Rios asked if the raised part of the parapet is part of the primary façade.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is as shown in the packet. It is a very small wall. But it is part of the primary and even if not, would still require an exception.

Mr. Will McDonald, 488 Arroyo Tenorio, was sworn. Regarding that façade, it is proposed to raise it as shown on the floor plan. At the last meeting, the Board approved raising parapets at the back. For the same reason, we wanted to do this part and that got pushed to this meeting because it needed an exception. The Board was clear about preserving the fine qualities of that façade as it exists today with the yard walls and parapets and we are looking at solving the problems of railings and such while preserving those qualities.

Mr. McDonald showed the door design for the garage doors. They looked at several other styles of doors. The aluminum design, the Rowlands felt was too ugly. So, they decided to use these doors (shown) and he was not sure how to make them open. It won't be used for parking but for storage and it does fit the character of the district. These doors came from Caparelli who is also working on the railings.

It is unclear in the elevation; however, the long railing is not on top of the wall but attached to the wall where the windows are. It does exist now but is below the standard of code.

Mr. McDonald showed a picture of the proposed wrought iron railing.

Regarding the parapet, he pointed out that when you view the house, you are looking up at it where Canyon Road rises above the river. It is seven feet back from the primary façade so largely invisible. It will provide for the ceiling to be raised and insulated and have solar panels hidden from view.

He believed those changes all meet the Board's concerns about the qualities of this house.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Katz asked about the railing. There is a long piece and then a short piece going back the other direction. He asked where the short piece would be located.

Mr. McDonald said that would be on the wall because, with that little stairway of five steps, they wouldn't be able to get it on the other inside wall. He could try to see if it is possible on the inside of the front wall.

Chair Rios asked if that is for safety reasons.

Mr. McDonald agree. It could probably be grandfathered in but, by Code, it is required.

Member Boniface said to Ms. Ramirez Thomas that it seems every time someone fails to meet criteria, it is #3. People either fail to understand what that means or fail to provide a full range of design options. He questioned how they could provide that for just filling in a garage door. The way he read it, this is for addition of a garage door, not the design of it.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said the door addition would change the style of the primary elevation.

Member Boniface asked if one design option would be to infill with stucco.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed. And for whatever is proposed, the applicant must demonstrate why that meets code requirements.

Mr. Rasch said for one design option, they could discuss the setback of the door for a shadow line so there are options.

Mr. McDonald said on the question of the railing, he pointed out the front wall that stops where the stairs begin so it would either be free standing or on the wall at this side.

Mr. Sommer pointed out that the survey on page 15 was done in 1963. In 1962, no apartment or garage was there. That was added at a later time.

Chair Rios asked if the garage doors will be stained.

Mr. McDonald said they would have a clear stain.

Ms. Carrie Rowland was sworn. She explained that they purchased the doors at Hands Over America.

They are a little rough now and wouldn't hold up to weather so they would keep the look and just seal them to preserve them. They would need to have a frame, which would be minimal. It would be a shame to change them very much.

Chair Rios said the true color of the windows is blue and asked about the proposed color.

Mr. McDonald said it is Cascade Blue by Marvin.

Member Biedscheid asked if the color in the photo is the original color or nonhistoric.

Mr. McDonald said it appears to be the original color. The historic window shown is on the west second story and all of those second-story windows are historic except for the clerestory windows.

Member Biedscheid asked if they are applying paint to the historic windows.

Mr. McDonald said the colors are evident in the photo. The white and the blue seems pretty stable.

Member Biedscheid asked if she remembered the doors are all stained natural.

Mr. McDonald second story door is white.

Ms. Rowland said she would prefer wood color on the doors and not blue. That is negotiable and would that would go well with the garage doors. All of the doors have about 30 coats of paint and currently are white.

Member Biedscheid shared Member Katz's concern about the short railing and Mr. McDonald mentioned a possible free standing railing.

Mr. McDonald said there could be a free-standing railing along the north side, closest to the street. There could be just one stile coming up and a rail being attached to the wall as a simple wrought iron railing, which would be the least obtrusive.

Chair Rios asked about the length of it.

Mr. McDonald said about 3 feet or maybe even 30".

Member Boniface didn't have a problem with that being attached or as drawn. It provides continuity with other hand rail. Having posts would not fit as well.

Member Boniface thought the criteria is met with the testimony. The addition of 3", is already a design option he proposed at the May 23 meeting and the Board didn't like that. This is unobtrusive. He loved the analogy of that broken tooth. That opening is out of place. What are the options - the door is the door?

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought this rendition is much better than before. The garage doors would fit in well with the streetscape. She didn't really like the railing and thought it could be grandfathered in. This is the first she heard about solar there. A ceiling at 7' is substandard. It makes sense to raise the parapet to get that normal height. The whole question of design options is a problem. The Board looks at it as the applicant is talking about other options that are not as good and gives reasons why they don't work.

There were no other speakers and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Biedscheid told Ms. Ramirez Thomas she didn't think the 30" rule was met.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is met.

Chair Rios said the blue sample looked different than the blue color in the photograph.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it was not intended to match that blue but more to demonstrate colors other than white has been looked at. It is a little dustier than slate blue and more subdued.

Member Katz asked what the color blue has to do with tonight's proceedings.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said at the May 23 hearing, the discussion was that the older windows appeared to be white. Her response was that it appeared they were painted white. The applicant decided to scrape to find other colors. Blue happened to be revealed underneath. So, there was another color at some other time. They have not always been white. The blue is not inconsistent with what happened to the house over time.

Member Katz explained that in the paperwork, there were three items to consider and window color was not one of them. So, he didn't understand.

Mr. McDonald said Member Biedscheid asked if there was evidence of other colors on the windows or trim and that led him to look for that and to report what was found.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified that there were four items and #4 was that color. It was in the applicant's letter.

Chair Rios agreed.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-16-097B at 914 Canyon Road, to approve the application as submitted, for all four points and also finding that the criteria for granting an exception have been met. They considered the alternatives for raising the parapet because there is no room to redo the roof, and the criteria for the 3" exception is de minimis. And finally, the garage doors would be a vast improvement. He also thought the free-standing railing would be more intrusive. Member

Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 4. Case #H-17-042. 616 C Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. JNS Services, agent for Deborah Gold, owner, proposes to construct a 134 sq. ft. addition to a height of 11' on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

616 C Canyon Road is a residential structure built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. It is designated as noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The existing structure is 462 square feet. A case for remodel was heard by the Board in 2001 and changed the exterior of the building significantly in that doors and windows were removed and added on exposed elevations. A comparison of the photos in the 1993 Historic Building Inventory form and current photos demonstrate the changes the building has undergone. The HBI form states that the cottage (616 C) lacks sufficient detail to be dated.

The applicant proposes to remodel the structure with the following items.

- 1) Addition of 134 square feet to the west elevation of the property. The addition will be built to 11 feet in height which is the height of the existing structure.
- 2) Addition of a window and a door to the north elevation.
- 3) Windows and doors will be white clad wood non-divided lite. The windows do not exceed the 30 inch lite standard required in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District however the single lite on the proposed doors do and an exception was not requested. They provided a small drawing showing divided lites (Exhibit)
- 4) Stucco will be cementitious El Rey "La Luz."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for All H Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside with the condition that the applicant use divided lite doors or comes back to the Board to request an exception.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Eilani Gerstner, P. O. Box 32851 was sworn. She described this project as very small and the owner needs just a little bit more living space.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-17-042 at 616 C Canyon Road, to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the revised drawing be submitted to Staff for review and approval. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Case #H-17-043. 336 Camino Cerrito.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Jacqueline Hartley, owner requests primary elevation designation on a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

336 Camino Cerrito is a Territorial Revival and Spanish Pueblo style house which is designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is estimated to have been built sometime after 1920. The applicant is requesting a designation of primary elevation(s) in advance of a request for remodel.

The 1984 Historic Building Inventory form indicated that the house had a flat roof with brick parapets and a shed roof over the porch. The house currently retains little of the Territorial Revival character as it has undergone many changes in the last 30+ years. All windows have been replaced with aluminum clad windows. A porch formerly existed at the southeast corner of the house but it has been enclosed. Another porch, thought to be a historic porch, on the north elevation has also been enclosed. The house has also been added to several times as is noted in the varying wall thicknesses throughout the house.

The historic elements of the property that contribute to the district include the yard wall with stone foundation, an opening for a gate on the north elevation where stairs are once thought to have existed, and

window-like openings in the wall. The area where the massing seems to have been retained it on the north elevation. All other elevations of the house have been altered or added to and likely occurred after 1987.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the north elevation of the house and yardwall be designated as the primary elevation (façade 1). She extended it a little for #2 as well that also retains the character and thought it was the original wall. (P 16 of packet)

Questions to Staff

Staff provided a poorly focused 1960 aerial of the property site. Member Boniface asked for directions in the photo. Ms. Ramirez Thomas showed north direction on the photo and pointed out Cristo Rey and Camino Cerritos and showed where the wall appears to be original. The house has undergone significant changes and the wall is flush with the house. It has Santa Fe style massing.

Member Boniface asked if she meant on the north wall of the house.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fé Trail, was sworn. He went to the 1984 survey sheet in the packet that showed the house and the footprint of the house and compared it with his floorplan to point out all the additions. On the site plan (on page 50) north is up. So, it appears there is still a wall there but Ms. Ramirez Thomas's point is that there is still a straight portion left on the east façade. In 1987, they cut off that section and put in a parking lot. The only façade that appears to have character defining features is the north façade and that part of the wall. He brought the drawings from 1990 when it came to the Board before.

Chair Rios wondered why it still has Contributing status, given those additions. She understood his client wanted to keep the Contributing status.

Mr. Enfield said she didn't. But he explained that it would cost her \$2,000 to prove it is not historic. She is only planning to do a small addition on the south façade. He agreed that the north elevation and portion of the east wall is historic and the gate to nowhere. Maybe there was a wood stair there at one time.

He said the owner interviewed the previous owners about work done on it earlier. She has a façade map and she is willing to accept that #1 and #2 are primary façades.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) agreed with the Staff recommendations on those two façades. There were many additions but those two are characteristic and hoped the Board would find it worthy of preserving.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Biedscheid asked Ms. Ramirez Thomas, on face #2, what part is primary.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas referred to the map on page 15, where it says #2. There were little faces but she extended it over to the lines. However, in looking at the north, it was at the little jog where the historic lot line, where the stonework ends.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-17-043 at 336 Camino Cerrito, to accept the recommendation of Staff and designate the north elevation, labeled as #1, and the northeasterly portion of the wall, labeled as #2, as the primary façades. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H-17-045. 122 Lorenzo Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jeff Seres, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 156 sq. ft. portal to a height of 12'9", install a window, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

122 Lorenzo Road is a Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence and is designated as noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is 1771 square feet.

The applicant requests to remodel the property with the following items.

- 1) Construct a 156 square foot portal on the west elevation. The portal will be constructed of 8 x 8 post beams and will have decorative corbels and a parapet. It will be 12'-9" in height where the existing height of the house is 15'-0".
- 2) Construct a banco under the proposed portal. The banco will be 18" in height and will be stuccoed to match the exterior of the house.

- 3) Add a window to the south elevation. The window will be a metal clad window in "Green."
- 4) Stucco the residence in cementitious El Rey "Buckskin."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for All H Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Jeff Seres, P. O. Box 9308, was sworn. He indicated this application is a continuation of work he has done since he owned it in 1995.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios said what is proposed is an improvement, especially the porch instead of the pitched roof and now he is stuccoing. Mr. Seres agreed.

Member Boniface referred to page 7 and asked if the window is going into the little hole of adobe.

Mr. Seres agreed. He said it was previously a window there. That was stuccoed over and he pulled off the stucco and found the window frame and it is over a new kitchen sink so he proposed to replace it as casement.

Member Boniface noted on the top drawing, there is a hint of a window, peeking over the wall but disappears on the proposed elevation below it. He asked if he would get rid of it.

Mr. Seres said no. He apologized that he forgot to draw that window.

Chair Rios asked if there would be anything on the roof.

Mr. Seres said no.

Member Boniface asked about stain on the portal.

Mr. Seres said he would apply a darker brown stain.

Member Boniface asked about a sample of the green color.

Mr. Seres said he would match the existing green.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-045 at 122 Lorenzo Street, to approve the application as submitted and recommended with a condition that the applicant bring the wood stain color for Staff review and approval. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-17-046A. 512 Agua Fria Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, agent for George Wright and Grace Watkins, owners, requests to downgrade the historic status of a significant structure to contributing with designation of primary elevations, if applicable. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

512 Agua Fria Street is a vernacular style residential structure and Spanish Pueblo Revival style shed which currently have a "significant" historic status within the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The applicant is requesting to downgrade the historic status of the structures on the property to "contributing". The applicant has provided a Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) form and other information for the Board's consideration.

According to historic maps the original portion of the home, which constitutes the rectangular east-west portion of the home which fronts Agua Fria Street, was constructed by 1912. Sometime between 1921 and 1930 the house south elevation of the house was added onto. After 1948 the south side of the house was added onto again, giving the building its current configuration. No dates are known for the additions after 1948 but the current footprint is thought to have been in place by 1958. A free standing shed was also added to the property sometime between 1948 and 1969.

The author of the HCPI form characterizes the original building (pre-1930) as Late Territorial style and notes that it is constructed of adobe and has white wood facia along the exterior walls. After 1930 the house was converted to a duplex when the first addition was added to the south side of the original house (post-1930). The addition is characterized as a bungalow style because of its "low pitched roof and

exposed rafters and brackets at the overhanging eaves" (pg. 3 of the architectural historian's report/HcPI). The second addition to the home (pre-1958) is characterized as Spanish Pueblo revival due to its adobe construction, rounded parapets, and a wood lintel element is noted over one of the windows.

The windows and doors are mostly divided lite with the wood elements painted white. The architectural historian suggests that many of the windows and doors were cobbled together. All windows appear to be historic material with some being in better shape than others.

The shed matches the second addition (1948-1958) in its Spanish Pueblo Revival style. It is constructed of adobe and has rounded parapets. It is known to have been constructed prior to 1969 base on aerial photographs.

The wall along the Agua Fria Street frontage appears to be the oldest wall or fence on the property. The fence along the west side of the property was added sometime after 1948 based on plat information showing property line changes. The chain link fence on the east side of the property belongs to the neighboring property. This fence attaches to a section of adobe wall at the southeast corner of the property. Both the chain link and adobe fence segment are considered to be late additions to the property perimeter.

RELEVANT CODE CITATION

14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts

(Ord. No. 2004-26)

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

- (a) Each *structure* to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical *development*, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other *buildings*, shall not be undertaken;
- (b) Changes to *structures* that have acquired historic *significance* in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most *structures* change over time;
- (c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a *structure* be preserved; and
- (d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic *property* and its environment would be unimpaired.

DEFINITIONS

SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE

A *structure* located in a historic district that is approximately fifty years old or older, and that embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction. For a *structure* to be designated as

significant, it must retain a high level of historic integrity. A *structure* may be designated as significant:

(A) for its association with events or persons that are important on a local, regional, national or global level;
or

(B) if it is listed on or is eligible to be listed on the State Register of Cultural Properties or the National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the main residential structure and shed be downgraded from Significant to Contributing per 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts and that north elevation of the main house (façade 1), east elevation of the original house (façade 2), and the north elevation (shed façade 2) of the shed be designated at primary elevations. Staff also recommends that the north property line yard wall (street front) be designated as contributing.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked Staff if there is any explanation why this house was made Significant.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there is none at all. The vernacular build on the property has not contributed to any integrity so she had no idea.

Member Biedscheid noted that in the 1996 survey, it shows the property listed on both registers. And the recent survey says no but in Section 5 in our packet, it says this property is listed.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it was identified in the Santa Fe Historic District which is the terminology of the national register listing.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Dolores Vigil, P. O. Box 1835, was sworn. She said they reviewed the Staff report and provided a historian's report done by Ms. Rebecca Bellum, who is present. Ms. Vigil provided an illustration of the different additions that were added through the years.

Ms. Rebecca Bellum was sworn. She said that in 1996 it was shown as an individual listed property but was incorrect. It was listed as in contributing but not individually listed. She thought it was a misunderstanding of what that historic designation meant.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface asked if that was what she meant in the last sentence that it could be considered contributing.

Ms. Bellum agreed.

Chair Rios asked if she agreed with downgrade this property to Contributing.

Ms. Bellum agreed. She researched everything that was available and studied the house extensively and so no reason that it should be listed as Significant.

Public Comment

Mr. Jerry Richardson, 703 Don Felix, was sworn. He said he is a resident of area and President of the Guadalupe Historic Neighborhood Association but not speaking for them. He was in support of the downgrade to Contributing. He didn't think it meets the definition. It has been significantly altered and no famous people lived there. He didn't know how they arrived at that Significant designation but thought the inspector at the time had a bias toward preservation. The owners are very much in support of historic preservation and would have a bit more flexibility in that effort with a downgrade.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Biedscheid said in her opinion, the house appears to be quite deteriorated. She asked if the opinion might be different if it was not deteriorated.

Ms. Bellum said it would not, based on the additions that bring in different styles.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-17-046A at 512 Agua Fria Street, to follow the Staff recommendation to downgrade the house and shed from Significant to Contributing and that north elevation of the main house (façade 1), east elevation of the original house (façade 2), and the north elevation (shed façade 2) of the shed be designated at primary elevations; primary includes the gate and yardwall. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 8. Case #H-17-027B. 340 Delgado Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Hughes, agent for, Roberta Franzheim, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residential structure including replacing windows on a primary elevation, a non-historic door, historic windows, and garage doors and a yardwall. Exceptions are requested to not replace historic material in-kind (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)) and to close an existing opening (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

340 Delgado Street is a 2,238 square foot Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family home within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The home was constructed sometime between 1935 and 1945. A detached two-car garage is located to the north of the house and a yard wall and gate front Delgado Street. The back portal, at the west elevation, was enclosed at some time and the enclosure appears to be non-historic based on the materials used and the windows on the enclosure. Adjacent to the enclosed portal is a greenhouse addition which also appears to be non-historic. Other than these two additions the house is intact and retains its original windows.

The defining characteristics of the property include the portal that encompasses the front of the home which has tapered log posts, key-notched beams, and corbels. In addition, the footprint of the home appears to be intact with the exception of the patio enclosure and the greenhouse addition. The overall massing of the home has been retained as there appear to have been few door and window changes. The garage structure appears to be the original to the home and retains its footprint and possibly the original doors. On March 28, 2017, the Board designated all of the east elevation of the home including the portal and the façades under the portal and the south elevation of the residence as primary. In addition, the east elevation of the detached garage and the north and east elevations of the yard wall as primary.

The applicant proposes the following eleven items.

- 1) Reconstruct and repair the east elevation of the garage. The applicant requests an exception to change the style of the garage doors to one 16'-0" wide by 7'-0" high door where the design is currently two divided doors. An exception is requested to change to remove historic material and not replace in-kind (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(I)). The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
- 2) Reconstruct the yard wall in-kind. The yard wall lacks structural integrity and cannot be repaired. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the wall, with arches and gates, in-kind. No exception is required to replace the wall in-kind.
- 3) Replace a non-historic door under the portal on the south facing façade of the east elevation. The door dimensions will remain the same. This is door #2 in the door and window evaluation schedule. No exception is required.
- 4) Replace windows on the south, west, and north elevations of the residence. All windows and the historic door on the east elevation (primary) will be refinished.
 - An exception to replace windows on the south (primary) elevation is requested. Window dimensions would remain the same. The window evaluation has determined the windows on the south elevation to be beyond repair. The applicant requests to not replace the windows in-kind (14-5.2(5)(a)(I)) as metal clad wood windows are proposed. The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
 - In addition, the applicant requests an increase in the window size of the window on the south elevation at the west corner in order to meet egress in the bedroom. The header height and width of the window would remain the same. No exception is required.
 - Remove the small window on the south elevation, which is window Q in the window evaluation provided by the applicant. An exception is requested to close an existing opening (14-5.2(5)(a)(iii)).

The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.

- Replacement windows will be divided light, wood clad units that will match the color of the stucco. A specific color was not provided.

- 5) Re-finish the concrete driveway.
- 6) Remove greenhouse on the west elevation.
- 7) Add a flagstone patio to the area where the greenhouse currently exists.
- 8) Coat the entire house in 2" of spray foam.
- 9) Remove rooftop HVAC equipment.
- 10) Reroof the house. The applicant proposes either a foam roof or a torch-down roof. Rebuild the canals in-kind and lined with copper. The location of the canals will not change.
- 11) Re-stucco in cementitious El Rey "Adobe."

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts

(5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

- (a) For all façades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary façades of contributing structures:

- (i) Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double pane glass may be used. No opening shall be widened or narrowed.

- (iii) No existing opening shall be closed.

EXCEPTION RESPONSES

Remove 2 garage doors and replace with one large door:

1 Do not damage character of district:

Response: Permitting us to make this change will not damage the character of the district as there are numerous residences within the district which have one large garage door, of which I have provided some examples.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response, however is uncertain that the single unit garage doors

referenced by the applicant are found on contributing structures.

2 Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

Response: If applicant is not permitted permission to make change they will be unable to use the garage for parking vehicles and if they attempt to park vehicles within the garage they risk possible injury as there will not be enough room to maneuver and exit the vehicles. If they are forced to park outside the garage they risk injury during the winter months due to snow and ice.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The garage is unusable for most modern cars and this may present a hardship to the applicant.

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

Response: We have provided options A, B and the third option which is as shown on the east elevation with vertical planking. Permitting the change in the door would allow the owner to use the garage as designed and result in fewer cars parked in the driveway or on the street, thus benefitting the character of the neighborhood.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The applicant has considered several design options.

Removal and replacement of windows on the southern elevation with wood clad units:

1 Do not damage character of district

Response: The removal and replacement of windows will not affect the character of the district since we are using traditional divided light windows and similar windows are prevalent in the area. As windows are clad and require less maintenance they don't have an adverse effect on the neighbors. In fact, clad windows look better for many years than wooden or metal windows which are poorly maintained. This elevation is not visible from the street and since windows are the same color as the stucco one would have to be within ten feet to discern whether windows are in fact clad or wood.

Staff response: Staff agrees that clad windows are prevalent in the district.

2 Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

Response: The bedroom on the southeast corner of the residence does not meet egress requirements. The owner has young children that will reside in this bedroom. Clearly safety is of the utmost importance. The character of the building will be much less affected changing the window on the southern elevation as opposed to the east (street) elevation.

Staff response: Staff does not feel that the applicant has addressed the criterion for replacement of

wood windows for clad in regard to hardship.

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

Response: Obviously if the safety of children doesn't take precedent over removing historic material these owners cannot choose to reside in the historic district. Furthermore, this elevation is nearly invisible from the street. Lastly, if you are opposed to the use of clad, replacing in kind with all wood windows would still be advantageous to the owner.

Staff response: Staff does not feel that the applicant has addressed the criterion. The criterion requests an answer for a full range of design options. Only one has been presented here but in the applicants, letter he presents the option of replacement of wood for wood on the south elevation windows as an alternate design option.

Remove window within closet

1 Do not damage character of district

Response: This window is not visible from the street and does not contribute to the character either of the residence or of the district.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this response as visibility and streetscape are not addressed in this criterion.

2 Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public

Response: The window is centered on the standard closet rod height which minimizes useful storage in a house with few closets. Clothes are also exposed to harmful UV rays.

Staff response: Staff agrees that the sun may be damaging to the applicants clothing.

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

Response: Allowing applicant to remove the window will provide more storage which is necessary for modern family living.

Staff response: Staff does not find that the applicant has provided a full range of design option.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the exception criteria have been met for the replacement of the garage doors and that the

applicant is working to create a design for the doors that respects the doors they are requesting to replace. Staff does not find that the exception criteria have been met to replace historic windows not in-kind and to close an opening but the Board may find upon further testimony that the application complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

Questions to Staff

Member Biedscheid asked for clarification that four exceptions are being requested.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there are three exceptions but there was no bedroom egress exception requested.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Thomas Hughes, 1409 Hickox, was sworn. He had nothing to add to the Staff report and stood for questions.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios explained that Ms. Ramirez Thomas doesn't agree with replacing windows not in-kind and close a window.

Mr. Hughes said all of them are on the south elevation and not visible from the street or perhaps one on the southeast. He was trying to represent the owner who wanted the same divided lites but clad to minimize maintenance and give longevity and improved energy efficiency. She is not opposed to in-kind but since they are not visible, there would be no impact on anyone else.

Chair Rios asked why the walls are not structurally sound.

Mr. Hughes said they have a shallow footing with only rubble for a foundation. The part needing replacement is only held up by the tree. It is pentile and stuccoed and we propose to rebuild them in block with the same arches. It wasn't well built and needs to be rebuilt but look unchanged.

Chair Rios asked about the pedestrian gate.

Mr. Hughes said it would be the same style and match the existing yellow color. She bought this home because it is a charming house and she just wants to bring it back.

Chair Rios asked why he is proposing a one-door garage.

Mr. Hughes said it was so it can be usable. Right now, the inside dimension is about 17' and the two doors don't give room to exit the vehicle with doors on the sides. It is a one car garage and with one door, she can safely enter and exit. Without doing that, no one would be able to use the garage so there would

be more cars in front parked on the street.

Chair Rios asked what color the door would be.

Mr. Hughes said it would be the same yellow color as the gate.

Member Boniface said in the photo, if the center post was removed, would anything strengthen the beam - it must be on the inside.

Mr. Hughes agreed. That façade is structurally unsound and needs to be rebuilt.

Member Boniface understood but you can't change the opening size.

Member Biedscheid asked if 16' is the size of a two-car garage door.

Mr. Hughes agreed. But they are just working with the existing opening.

Member Biedscheid wondered if a smaller door would be better.

Mr. Rasch cautioned that it would then require an exception.

Member Biedscheid said having it look like a post is there makes it appear to be a two-door opening.

Mr. Hughes said yes. He meant to simulate a post.

Member Boniface said option B looks like it is trying to mimic the existing door.

Mr. Hughes agreed. Option A just had some glazing in the top. B is probably closest to existing.

Member Biedscheid asked, on the south façade, which is primary, why the windows are not but be replaced in-kind.

Mr. Hughes said it was just to minimize wood exposure. It would not be seen by the street and would require extra maintenance if it was replaced in-kind.

Member Biedscheid asked if the light pattern is changing as well.

Mr. Hughes said it was changed only on the one for egress. The only other one is to eliminate the small square window which is in a closet and is not practical. You'd have to be on the property to see that one. So, no one would be affected.

Member Biedscheid asked Ms. Ramirez Thomas if she said no exception was requested for that window.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said the header height and width would remain the same. Lowering the sill height would not require an exception.

Member Biedscheid understood but it came up in a previous case.

Mr. Rasch commented that it had not come up in the past. That is in two places in the Code and both are in Section D. On primary elevations, windows cannot be raised or widened. But it is silent for lowering the sill and Member Katz brought up the removal of historic material. If you want to require exception, we need to be consistent throughout.

Member Boniface asked if the yellow door requires an exception. He thought they were limited to certain colors.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the Downtown standards has no standard on color. The Westside District prohibits "an arresting color." He thought that meant traditional colors were okay.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) found it interesting the discussion about massing of garage door. It is hot item, especially if painted yellow. She thought it would be nicer smaller but on a primary exception and the egress window needs to be the same width.

And the odd little window is okay if it is in a closet. That would bring light in and yet maintains the look on the outside façade.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public hearing portion was closed.

Member Biedscheid asked if he had considered just finishing the closet wall on the inside.

Mr. Hughes said he had. But it really is not visible. The owner is the only one who would see it.

Member Biedscheid asked if the exception to close the existing opening meant they could cover that window.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it was not in the letter. It would just be a change in protocol how to respond to the exception criteria. And the sill can be lowered.

Member Biedscheid thought the small closet window should stay and egress should maintain the present width. She asked if that would require a redesign.

Chair Rios said no.

Mr. Rasch recommended they allow the window to be dry-walled on the interior as an option.

Mr. Hughes appreciated that.

Action of the Board

Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-17-027B at. 340 Delgado Street, to approve the application with conditions that:

1. That the exception criteria are met using Option B;
2. That the yard wall in-kind replacement is approved, including the rebuilding of the pedestrian gate;
3. That the portal is approved;
4. That the proposal be approved as submitted on the north and on the south;
5. That the exception to enclose the small window is denied with failure to meet criterion #1 and an option to drywall the interior is approved;
6. That the egress on the south elevation must maintain the width of the opening at 3' 9";
7. That items 5 through 11 are approved as submitted.

Member Katz asked about cladding on the south windows.

8. Member Biedscheid said the windows should be replaced in-kind with wood.

Member Boniface seconded the motion and asked for an amendment - that on the garage door to mimic the center post that the faux column be stained and not painted to match exposed lintel. Member Biedscheid accepted the amendment as friendly.

9. Member Biedscheid said revised drawings of the south façade must be submitted to Staff before submitting for a permit. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Hughes thought that staining the faux post might be more noticeable.

Member Biedscheid said that is a decision of the Board.

Member Boniface agreed.

9. **Case #H-17-040. 610 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jack Robinson, agent for Paula Huchison and Peter Gonzalez, owners, proposes to increase the height of a yardwall from the maximum allowable height of 5'3" to 5'11". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

610 Garcia Street is a single-family residence built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style in 1910. The house is noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. No remodel to the house is proposed. The applicant is requesting an increase in the wall height of the yard wall.

- 1) The applicant proposes to change the wall by increasing its height from 5'-3" to 5'-11" where the

maximum allowable wall and fence height is 5'-3". The applicant requests an exception to exceed the maximum allowable wall height (14-5.2(D)(9)). The exception responses are provided at the end of this email.

- 2) Stucco will be cementitious El Rey "Buckskin."

RELEVANT CODE CITATION

14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts

- (9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing and Floor Stepbacks

The height, pitch, *scale*, and massing of any *structure* in an historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted within this chapter.

EXCEPTION RESPONSES

Does not damage the character of the streetscape: The additional height would not damage the character of the district. There are existing 6'-0" high yard walls on the west side of Garcia St. directly across from the property at 610 Garcia St.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The wall, while it will exceed the streetscape average, will increase in height by less than one foot.

Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare: The 5'-3" yard wall height is a hardship to the applicant in that a wall of this height is not tall enough to prevent the applicant's dog from escaping the yard or to prevent other animals from jumping over the fence and entering the yard. Also, the applicant feels unsafe due to the fact that the sidewalk on Garcia St. adjoins this wall and it is easy for anyone using this sidewalk to look over the 5'-3" wall into her property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response in that feeling a lack of safety in one's home would create a hardship.

Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design option to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts: The applicant is aware that the Historic Preservation Division Office averages yard wall heights within 600' of the property in order to determine the allowable height for the property. The applicant feels this calculation method does not offer her the same "design options" that were available to other properties in the immediate vicinity. Directly across Garcia St. the adjacent properties have 6'-0" tall walls that are approximately 60' in length in the north and south directions.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response. A full range of design options were not

provided.

Are due to special circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape: The grade at this lot is at 7002.0. The grade along the west side of the property steps down from 7002 to 6997. The wall maintains a height of 5'-3" above this grade. The height of the wall in relation to the grade of the property begins at 4'-6", steps down to 3'-4" and finally steps down to 2'-3". Due to this special condition and the differences in height from the property grade to the grade west of the property the client feels that a higher wall is required.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The streetscape side of the wall is at 5'-3" while the interior yard wall heights are lower due to the grade.

Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant: These conditions are not the result of actions taken by the applicant. The yard walls were built prior to the construction of the residence at 610 Garcia St.

Staff response: Staff agrees that the wall heights may have been built prior to the construction of the residence and the wall height does not meet the current needs of the applicant.

Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 15-5.2(A)(1): The applicant feels that a minimal increase of 8" in height would provide the least negative impact to the aesthetic of the historical area while providing the applicant with a practical solution to the differences in heights along the west side of the property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The esthetic of the wall will remain the same.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that not all of the exception criteria have been met but the Board may find the exception has been met after further testimony from the applicant, and that the application complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for All H Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside. It is 2010 construction.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Doug McDowell, 1317 B Cerro Gordo Road, was sworn. He pointed out that Garcia Street slopes down and it stays level as it goes across so the grade is exactly the same as the outside but 3' higher at the other end. The wall is proposed to be raised for privacy. They do have people who walk up to the wall and can look right in at night so she would like more privacy and they also have a dog that jumps out.

He said he understood the code and 5' 3" is probably average but across street, there are walls at six feet with no stepping, whereas, this is required stepping. Coyote doesn't seem like the right option or they could have done coyote inside the wall. But the new wall would not give a feeling of being walled in. An 8" rise is in harmony with the streetscape. It will look nice when done.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Rios asked if the wall edge is rounded or straight.

Mr. McDowell said it is rounded.

Member Boniface was unclear what will happen when it meets the northwest corner? Does it return or just stop?

Mr. McDowell said it curves around and steps up to the coyote fence.

Member Boniface asked how far the 8" goes around on the east.

Mr. McDowell said the coyote is more than 8" and goes all the way across.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-17-040 at 610 Garcia Street, to make a finding that the exception criteria have been met; that they have considered other options for raising the wall and their choice is more attractive and moved to grant the application. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. McDowell gave praise to Ms. Ramirez Thomas for her reports.

- 10. Case #H-17-041. 324 West Houghton Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Albert Romero, agent for Vicente Romero, owner, propose to construct a 72" high fence where the maximum allowable height is 58". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

324 West Houghton Street is a single-family residence built in the Territorial Revival style and is contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The home is made of stucco and adobe, has brick coping, and some wood double hung windows. The house is estimated to have been constructed by 1928 but maybe as early as 1912. The applicant was given a violation notice because of the addition of wood planks to the yard wall, the addition of a gate, and the color the fence was painted.

The height of the wall is approximately 50" and the applicant is asking to increase the height of the fence to 72". The original yard wall is constructed of pumice, rebar, and is stuccoed white. To the best of the applicant's memory the wall was built by their father in 1974.

The applicant requests the following.

- 1) Increase the height of the yard wall using wood planks. The height of the original wall is 50" and the applicant wishes to increase the height of the wall to 72" where the maximum allowable wall and fence height is 58". Staff notes that the wall exceeds 72" inches on the north elevation of the yard area. To exceed 72" would require a variance by the Board of Adjustment. The applicant requests an exception to exceed the maximum allowable height (14-5.2(D)(9)). The exception responses are provided at the end of this memo.
- 2) Addition of a 72" gate at the south yard wall elevation.
- 2) Paint the wood planks a pastel "Lilac" color. A color sample has been provided.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

14-5.2(D)(9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing and Floor Stepbacks

The height, pitch, scale, and massing of any structure in an historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted within this chapter.

EXCEPTION RESPONSES

- (i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape. *The fence heights we propose already exist in several closely neighboring properties on W. Houghton St. as cited below.*

Staff response: Staff agrees that there are fences and yard walls in the streetscape that meet or exceed the maximum allowable height.

- (ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare. *We have described how our hardships of lack of privacy, security, and enjoyment opportunities for our only usable yard/patio area are maximally addressed by the highest fence heights allowed by city zoning for this neighborhood.*

Staff response: Staff agrees that there is no other area on the property to seek outside space and this presents a hardship.

- (iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic District. *We argue that our proposed wood gates/fences/extensions and the pastel lilac color are in character with the unique heterogeneous character of the City and of our particular neighborhood. The proposed height and color are in line with the diversity that already exists in the neighborhood streetscape, as documented below.*

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this response as a full range of design options were not addressed.

- (iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are particular to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape. *If anyone along our streetscape has a legitimate reason to secure a height exception toward the maximum zonal height allowed, it is the owners of 324 W. Houghton because of the property's unique and extreme lack of buffer area from the street and lack of any other alternatives for outside yard/patio space.*

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The configuration of the streets and lot in this part of the Don Gaspar Area Historic District create special circumstances and conditions that home owners are required to work with.

- (v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant. *The described hardships we seek relief from clearly arise from the house/property/street geometry and not the result of our (the applicants) actions. These geometries were set in the 1920's as far as we can tell, when the City either condemned or negotiated for the street right-of-way through the lot, bisecting it and intruding very closely on the existing structure, which at that time was a grocery store owned by our Great Grandfather.*

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response. The position of the house in proximity to the street is not the result of the applicant. In addition, this property was inherited so the applicant made no conscious purchase of the property with these challenges but has rather inherited the challenges along with the property.

- (vi) Provides the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in section 14-5.2(A)(1). *We argue again that the additions of the proposed wood gates/fences/extensions are in character with the unique heterogeneous character of the City and the diversity of existing gate/fence structures in our particular neighborhood, examples of which are presented below.*

Staff response: Staff agrees that there are a variety of fence styles in this streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not find that all of the exception criteria have been met but the Board may find they have been upon further testimony from the applicant and that the application complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked if the project has been completed.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it has.

Chair Rios asked what the color of the window frames is.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is blue.

Chair Rios said they are adding Lilac and asked if that is an approved color.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there are no specific colors for this district.

Mr. Rasch read that section from the code.

Chair Rios said there is a step down where the wall attaches to the fence and asked if that is acceptable.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is too high for a step. The highest a wall can go is 72". In looking at the drawing, on page 18 - they don't propose the steps that exist currently. It looks like they intend to level it at 72".

Member Boniface reasoned that the lavender color is okay unless you consider it arresting.

Mr. Rasch asked if it is harmonious to the streetscape.

Member Katz was confused on the exception and criteria. The exception is just for height - not materials or colors. So, he wondered what design options there would be since it is height only.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas reasoned that it would be height options. One option would be no change at all. Another at the maximum allowable height. A third would be to go to the maximum allowable.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Vicente Romero was sworn. He said that in the request, we did get away from the added wood height extension and stayed under the six feet high. This is the only yard this residence has. There is no back or side yard. It is now four "above allowable but people can ride by on a bike and easily see in. There is a window going right into the bathroom and the window is open in the summer and those taking shower could be looked upon. This is the only part for privacy so we wanted to go to the maximum eight to make this small space functional. The color was picked as a Santa Fe color. We felt it would be acceptable. We are not extremely wedded to that color and could have white or off white. A couple of houses up, there is a gate painted fire engine red and there are many other colors - teal, aqua, etc. A wall across the street is over 7 feet. I listed 8-10 of those, that are a stone's throw away. So, we feel it is in character with the streetscape there.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface said it was unclear to him whether this application is about keeping the fence height right on the street or higher. He asked how high it is currently.

Mr. Romero said the gate is about 70" high and they are requesting 72".

Member Boniface said with coyote, the Board always asks that the structure for it be on the inside. But

this sketch shows the infrastructure on the outside.

Mr. Romero said that escaped him and he would put it on the inside.

Chair Rios asked if he would be willing to paint the wall the same color as the house.

Mr. Romero said he could if absolutely required but really liked the color we chose.

Member Biedscheid said a purple fence is totally out of character.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-041 at 324 West Houghton Street, this case, to approve this project and find the exception criteria are met with the options discussed. He moved to approve on the condition that it will be built with the planks to the exterior of the courtyard space and horizontal elements on the interior; Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 11. Case #H-17-044. 209 Ambrosio Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Marc Naktin agent for Steven Turner, owner, proposes to construct a 120 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 8'10", and a 5' high yardwall with wrought iron gates at a non-contributing residential property. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

209 Ambrosio Street is a 1,124 square foot vernacular style single family residence constructed in the 1930s. The structure's historic status was designated as noncontributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District in 1997 when a previous remodel was proposed. The current homeowner is not requesting a remodel to the home but is requesting to fix a violation for building a pergola without a permit and is requesting some additional changes to the property.

The applicant proposes the following three items.

- 1) Construct a 130 square foot pergola to a height of 8'-10" which is the height of existing residence. The pergola is built of 8" round posts and 2" x 2" members across the top. The pergola is located on the north side of the house in the backyard.

- 2) Construct a stucco wall on the south streetscape side of the property. The wall would replace an existing coyote fence and is proposed to be built to a height of 5'-0" where the maximum allowable wall height is 5'-6". The wall would be constructed of CMU block and stuccoed with cementitious El Rey stucco in "Desert Rose." The wall will have two steps in it and curve at the driveway area.
- 3) Installation of two wrought iron gates that measure 3' in width and 5' in height. One gate is proposed to be installed on the north elevation of the proposed yard wall. The other gate is proposed to be installed, along with a stuccoed CMU wall segment, between the north elevation of the house and the fence on the north property line, at the back of the driveway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for All H Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing and 14-5.2(I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Naktin (previously sworn) said most of the wall will be 3' and just at the gate will it be 5' high.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface didn't understand it.

Mr. Naktin explained that they are following traffic laws which means the rest of the wall is only 3' high.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-17-044 at 209 Ambrosio Street, to approve the application as submitted. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

12. **Case #H-17-047. 329½ Otero Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent for BioWizard Properties LLC, owner, proposes to increase the height of a non-contributing residential structure from 13'8" to 14'8" high where the maximum allowable height is 16'1", construct a 38 sq. ft. portal, relocate a window and a door, replace windows, re-stucco, and re-roof. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff Report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

329 ½ Otero Street is Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence and is designated as noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is 1333 square feet and has a 567.5 square foot attached guesthouse. The applicant was given a notice of violation for unpermitted work and they are now requesting approval for their remodel.

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

- 1) Perform a re-roof and parapet repair. The height of the parapet prior to the work that was begun was 13'-8" but the applicant is requesting the parapet height be increased to 14'-8" where the maximum allowable height is 16'-1". The parapet remodel requires addition of new canales.
- 2) Replace windows with Anderson metal clad wood windows in "Watercolor Blue."
- 3) Relocate one door and one window on the northwest elevation under the proposed portal.
- 3) Addition of a 114 square foot portal to the south/southeast elevation.
- 4) Addition of a 38 square foot portal to the north/northwest elevation.
- 5) Re-stucco the house in cementitious El Rey "Sandalwood."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for All H Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked what part is already completed.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is mid stride. The owner was given a stop order on reconstruction of the parapets. The reroof was underway. A reroof permit was issued and they realized the parapet was rotted and tried to remedy it without going back for another permit. There is more work to do.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Veronica Angriman, 198 Quintana Street, was sworn. She said what they are doing inside is changing ceilings with exposed vigas in the bedroom and kitchen. They asked for the permit for the roof and during that, realized it lacked insulation and was rotting and they needed to change the parapet. We decided to ask for a permit for the portal and change the windows and wanted to match the kitchen window.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

There were no comments from the public regarding this case and the public hearing portion was closed.

Action of the Board

Member Katz moved in Case #H-17-047 at 329½ Otero Street, to approve as submitted. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Member Katz reminded the Board that he had asked for a subcommittee to work with the County and was told it could not be done because not noticed. It should have been on this agenda.

Mr. Rasch said it will be on the June 27 agenda and the Board can elect three or fewer members for that committee.

J. ADJOURNMENT


The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Approved by:



Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.

Historic Districts Review Board
June 13, 2017

EXHIBIT 1

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case #H-17-039B

Address – 457 Camino de las Animas

Agent's Name – James Horn

Owner/Applicant's Name – John Hansen

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on May 23, 2017.

457 Camino de las Animas is a single-family residence built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style and Territorial Revival style. The estimated date of construction is 1920s according to the existing inventory form, though the applicant has found through their research that the house was built between 1941 and 1948.

The residence is 1,613 square feet and is designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house, at the time of the 1984 Inventory, was characterized by wall dominated elevations, corbels at the portal, protruding vigas, and double hung windows with surrounds and pediments, and pediments exist around the doors. The current look of the house is slightly modified in that the porch has undergone some modifications and no longer retains the corbels or protruding vigas as is seen on the HBI form photo. Otherwise, all other character is retained. The main part of the house and a small addition on the north existed by 1958 and was unchanged until sometime after 1976. After 1976, another addition took place on the north elevation of the house.

Staff requested a designation of primary elevations at the immediately prior hearing and the Board designated the south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) including the portal as primary. The Applicant proposed to remodel the property with the following 11 items:

1) Add a 180 square-foot pergola to 11’-6” in height. The pergola will be constructed of tube steel posts, a steel header beam, and rectangular steel beams and “latillas.” A concrete step and slab are proposed underneath the pergola.

2) Remodel the existing yardwall to set it back 12’-0” from the existing street front (south) property line. The wall will be reconstructed to a maximum height of 4’-6” where the maximum allowable height is 5’-6”. The yardwall portion along the east side of the property will be raised to 4’-6”.

3) Construct a 6’0” coyote fence along the west property line, starting at 12 feet from the lot line.

4) Add a driveway gate. The gate will be steel and have a sliding mechanism. It is proposed to be 4’-0” in height.

5) Restore windows on the south elevation. A window evaluation (p. 11 of staff report) was conducted and it was recommended that the south elevation windows could be repaired.

6) Replace the windows on the east and west elevations.

7) Infill the existing non-historic windows and add a door to the north elevation.

8) Wood trim will be painted Dunn Edwards “White Heat.”

9) Re-stucco the house and yardwall with El Rey cementitious “La Morena.”

10) Add gravel to the front yard. The gravel will be “Santa Fe Brown.”

11) Add a wall sconce on the north elevation of the building under the pergola. No design was included in the staff memo.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Zoning staff determined that the Application meets underlying zoning standards.
3. Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.
4. The project is subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing (of any structure);
 - X Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards; and
 - X Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures
5. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Downtown and Eastside Historic District (Section 14-5.2(E))
6. An Exception Request was not applicable to this Application.
7. Under Sections 14-2.6(C), 14-2.7(C)(2), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-d & f) and 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a) and Section 14-5.2(D) the Board has authority to review, approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant's proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards.
8. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), the Board has the authority to approve an application for alteration or new construction on the condition that changes relating to exterior appearance recommended by the Board be made in the proposed work, and no permit is to issue until new exhibits, satisfactory to the Board, have been submitted.
9. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.
10. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable design standards for Board approval as herein described have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board voted 4 to 2 to approve the Application as recommended by Staff, with the condition that the existing 4'6" yardwall in Item 2 shall not be moved, however an additional yardwall at 5'6" may be constructed as presented.

**IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.**

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case # H-17-038A

Address – 715 ½ Manhattan Avenue

Agent's Name – Marc Natkin

Owner/Applicant's Name – Jack Reese

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on May 23, 2017.

715 ½ is a vernacular style residential structure currently designated as noncontributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The existing inventory is from 1985, and at that time the structure was listed as having a post-1945 construction date, making it less than 50 years old at the time of the inventory. The house is now more than 50 years old and staff requested an evaluation of the status of the structure in advance of the application to remodel the property.

The 1960 and 1967 aerial photographs indicate that the footprint of the property is relatively the same as it today. The only addition to the footprint appears to be a portal to the south elevation which was added after 1967. The character defining features of the home are its simple massing which has been retained as the windows and most doors on the property are historic. The windows are wood double-hung 3/1 and 4/4 lite. The front door appears to have been replaced, though the opening seems unchanged. The one car garage is attached to the house on the west and to the yardwall on the east. The garage door is on the south elevation at the driveway and there is a door on the north elevation that enters the backyard. The roof has areas where there is a parapet and other areas are a shed roof with a slight pitch and overhang.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended the historic status of the house be upgraded from noncontributing to contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District per SFCC 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts, and that the south elevation of the structure, including the garage and excluding the portal, be designated as primary (façades 1, 2, and 3).
3. The project is, without limitation, subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing.
4. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 X Westside Guadalupe Historic District (Section 14-5.2(I)).
5. Under Section 14-12.1, the definition of a “contributing structure” is “a structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design

qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.”

6. Code 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-c) gives the Board authority to review and approve "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing" status designations
7. The Board, in response to the application, finds the structure:
 X meets the Section 14-12.1 criterion for “contributing” as provided in the presentation and Staff Report.
8. The structure is more than 50 years old.
9. The structure’s integrity remains and the structure helps to establish and maintain the character of the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.
10. The structure’s historic footprint is relatively unchanged, its historic simple massing has been retained, and the windows and most doors are historic.
11. The structure’s architectural style is characteristic of the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.
12. The information contained in the Application and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board granted the Applicant’s request to review historic status and voted 4 to 3 to:
 X Upgrade the status of the structure from non-contributing to contributing and to designate the south elevation, including the garage but excluding the portal, as the primary elevation.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case #H-16-074

Address – 4 Placita Rafaela

Agent's Name – Chateau Construction

Owner/Applicant's Name – Mary Sanchez

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board ("Board") for hearing on May 23, 2017.

4 Placita Rafaela is a single-family residential structure listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District with its east façade consisting of three elevations and the portal designated as primary. On September 22, 2016, the Board granted approval to remodel the property including an exception to infill the portal on the front elevation.

At the May 23, 2017 hearing, the Applicant proposed to amend the previous approval by constructing a coyote fence along the street frontage to a height of 6' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 9". An exception was requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (14-5.2(D)(9)) and the required exception criteria were in staff's report. At the north end of the fence, it will jog to the west to meet the portal. This section will have a 42" wide latilla pedestrian gate. The fence elevation drawing did not show irregular latilla heights, although at the hearing, the Applicant's agent testified that irregular latilla heights are intended.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Zoning staff determined that the Application meets underlying zoning standards.
3. Staff Recommendation: Staff found that the exception request to exceed the maximum allowable fence height has been met and recommended approval of this Application in that it complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District with the condition that the fence shall have irregular tops.
4. The project is subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing (of any structure);
 - X Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards; and
 - X Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures
5. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Downtown and Eastside Historic District (Section 14-5.2(E))
6. An Exception Request to exceed maximum allowable fence height was applicable to this Application:
 - X Exception criteria were met, as recommended by staff.
7. At the hearing, the Applicant's agent testified that the Applicant intends to have irregular latilla tops.

8. Under Sections 14-2.6(C), 14-2.7(C)(2), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-d & f) and 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a) and Section 14-5.2(D) the Board has authority to review, approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant's proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards.
9. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), the Board has the authority to approve an application for alteration or new construction on the condition that changes relating to exterior appearance recommended by the Board be made in the proposed work, and no permit is to issue until new exhibits, satisfactory to the Board, have been submitted.
10. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.
11. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable design standards for Board approval as herein described have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board approved the Application as recommended by Staff with the condition that latillas with irregular tops be used.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case #H-04-076

Address – 201 Old Santa Fe Trail

Agent's Name – Eric Enflied

Owner/Applicant's Name – Teme LLC

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on May 23, 2017.

201 Old Santa Fe Trail is a vacant 0.4352 acre parcel in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The maximum allowable height is 21’ 11”. On September 13, 2016, the Board denied a height exception request (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) for a four-story structure which, on appeal, the Governing Body remanded back to the Board for final action. On March 14, 2016, the Applicant presented its minor modifications to the design, which the Board postponed action pending redesign. On April 25, 2017, the Applicant presented additional minor modifications to the Board which then conditionally approved the application pending redesign of the southwest and northwest corners.

At the hearing on May 23, 2017, the Applicant presented additional minor modifications which addressed the Board’s conditions, namely widening of the ground-floor portal at the southwest corner; modifying the stepbacks on the second and third floors at the northwest corner. The current proposal also modifies the east façade at the rear of the building.

The proposal before the Board on May 23, 2017 is a 30,988 square-foot (previously 30,821 and 25,536), four-story structure (13,247 square-foot footprint) designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with room block massing, floor stepbacks, rounded edges, exposed wooden headers and carved corbels at portals. Finishes will be cementitious stucco in "Buckskin", trim color "Mist Blue", a "Medium Walnut" wood stain, and a shale brick “Kiamichi” stone veneer base.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Zoning staff determined that the Application meets underlying zoning standards.
3. Staff Recommendation: Staff found that the height exception criteria were met and recommended approval of the application in that it complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.
4. The property is located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District (Section 14-5.2(E)) and is subject to the related sections of the Code.
5. The 1996 Height Ordinance applies to this Application.
6. Historic Preservation Division (HPD) staff calculated the allowable height for a building on the Property as 21 feet 11 inches (the “Allowable Height”).

7. At the April 25, 2017 hearing, the Board conditioned approval of the application on moving the southwest corner of the ground floor, specifically the diagonal wall and the south façade will under the portal, back and away from the Loretto Chapel to match the depth of the ground floor portal on the west side, and to further step back the second and third stories on the northwest corner.
8. The proposed building at this May 23, 2017 hearing, is responsive to and meets the Board's conditions.
9. As the 1996 Height Ordinance Applies to the Application, any height exceeding the Allowable Height requires an exception.
10. An Exception Request for greater height was made with the Application, requiring the Applicant to "conclusively demonstrate" that the requested exception complies with all six criteria listed in Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c) of the Code, before the exception can be granted.
11. The Board finds that all exception criteria for height have been met.
12. First, the Exception Request does not damage the character of the streetscape in that the proposed building height harmonizes with the architectural style and the three tall structures on the north and south sides of this lot on the east side of Old Santa Fe Trail;
13. The streetscape's character is significantly impacted by the Loretto Chapel and La Fonda Hotel, due to their significant status in accordance with Subsection 14-5.2(C) and their endurance as iconic historic tourist attractions.
14. The Exception Request is required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public in that a height limit of less than two stories on the third largest lot in the applicable streetscape in the heart of downtown Santa Fe would create a hardship to not build over two stories, as the Board had found in the previous hearing.
15. The Exception Request strengthens the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts, in that the Applicant provided numerous design options in height, architectural style, and specific massing details; the proposed design is the best one presented that includes a mixed-use purpose.
16. The need for the Exception Request is 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 in that this is the last vacant lot in the applicable streetscape which therefore presents difficulty in achieving harmony with the disharmonious streetscape of tall and short buildings and large and small lot sizes.
17. The need for the Exception Request is due to special conditions and circumstances not a result of the actions of the Applicant in that the care required to respect the adjacent historically significant structures on both lot sides (La Fonda Hotel and Loretto Chapel) provides additional challenges, so as to not impose upon their importance in downtown Santa Fe.
18. The presented design with the exception requests provides the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1) in that the proposed building complies with the purpose of the historic districts overlay zoning code by its traditional design and by its harmonious massing to the historically significant Spanish-Pueblo Revival style of La Fonda Hotel.
19. Under Sections 14-2.6(C), 14-2.7(C)(2), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-d & f) and 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a) and Section 14-5.2(D) the Board has authority to review,

- approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant's proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards.
20. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), the Board has the authority to approve an application for alteration or new construction on the condition that changes relating to exterior appearance recommended by the Board be made in the proposed work, and no permit is to issue until new exhibits, satisfactory to the Board, have been submitted.
 21. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.
 22. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable design standards for Board approval as herein described have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board voted 5 to 1 to approve the Application as recommended by Staff.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case # H-17-031A

Address – 125 Quintana Street Unit 3

Agent's Name – Jonah Stanford

Owner/Applicant's Name – Laura Einstein

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board ("Board") for hearing on May 23, 2017.

125 Quintana St. Unit 3 is a single-family residence that is part of the Elena Quintana Compound that was constructed during the first half of the 20th century in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style. Historic windows have been replaced and the 1985 building inventory states that the inset portal woodwork has also been replaced. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Staff requested a primary elevation designation. Staff opined that since the west elevation offers the only public view of the structure and the windows and portal woodwork are not historic, the remaining character-defining features are the massing.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended that all elevations on the west façade of the property be designated as primary, excluding the windows and the portal woodwork, in compliance with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures.
3. The project is, without limitation, subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing (of any structure);
 - X Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards; and
 - X Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts
4. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Westside-Guadalupe Historic District (Section 14-5.2(I))
5. Under Section 14-12.1, the definition of a "contributing structure" is "a structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains."
6. Code 14-5.2(C)(2)(a – c) gives the Board authority to review and approve "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing" status designations

7. All elevations on the west façade of the property, excluding the windows and the portal
woodwork are the principal elevations of the structure with features that define the
character of the structure's architecture in that the public view of the structure, its
windows and portal woodwork contributes to the streetscape and the district.
8. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence
establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the
Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board granted staff's request to review historic status and voted to designate as
primary all elevations on the west façade of the property, excluding the windows and
the portal woodwork.

**IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.**

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case # H-17-039A

Address – 457 Camino de las Animas

Agent's Name – John Hansen

Owner/Applicant's Name – James Horn

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on May 23, 2017.

457 Camino de las Animas is a single-family residence built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style and Territorial Revival style. The estimated date of construction is 1920s according to the current inventory form, though the applicant has found through their research that the house was built between 1941 and 1948. The residence is 1,613 square feet and is designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house, at the time of the 1984 Inventory, was characterized by wall dominated elevations, corbels at the portal, protruding vigas, and double hung windows with surrounds and pediments, and pediments exist around the doors. The current look of the house is slightly modified in that the portal has undergone some modifications and no longer retains the corbels or protruding vigas as is noted on the HBI form photo. Otherwise, all other character has been retained.

The Applicant's aerial photos show that the main part of the house and a small addition on the north existed by 1958 and was unchanged until sometime after 1976. After 1976, another addition took place on the north elevation of the house. Staff requested a designation of primary elevations.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended the south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) including the portal, be designated as the primary elevation.
3. The project is, without limitation, subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing (of any structure);
 - X Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards; and
 - X Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts
4. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Downtown and Eastside Historic District (Section 14-5.2(E))
5. Under Section 14-12.1, the definition of a “contributing structure” is “a structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design

qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.”

6. Code 14-5.2(C)(2)(a – c) gives the Board authority to review and approve "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing" status designations.
7. The south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) including the portal is the principal elevation of the structure has features that define the character of the structure’s architecture.
8. The south elevation exemplifies Territorial style architecture with its double-hung wood windows with surrounds and pediments and the pediments around a door.
9. The south elevation exemplifies Pueblo Revival style architecture with its wall-domination, massing, portal at the front of the house.
10. The structure’s footprint last changed in 1976.
11. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board granted staff’s request to assign primary elevations and voted to designate the south elevation (façades 1, 2, and 3) including the portal as the principal elevation.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Assistant City Attorney

Date:

City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case #H-16-097B

Address – 914 Canyon Road

Agent's Name – Will McDonald

Owner/Applicant's Name – Carrie Rowland

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on May 23, 2017.

914 Canyon Road is a residential structure designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The home was built as a single-family residence in the Pueblo Revival style by 1928 according to a city directory. The home appears to have served as a duplex and triplex over the course of its history as indicated in a directory from the 1950s. After 1960, the house became a single-family residence. Between the time of the building's initial construction and the final construction episodes in 1967, the house appears to have had several additions. By 1967, the footprint of the house including the garage and second floor apartment is as it is today.

The current HCPI form indicates that changes in windows over time have also changed the massing of the structure. While the window openings have changed through time, the configuration and style of the home have been maintained. Details of the home's style include its general configuration and footprint and the retention of the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, and the retention of the footprint of the building since 1967.

The Board heard a case for this house in 2007, and it is noted in the case file that the windows on the house were changed in the 1970s and the 1980s. The 2007 case was a request for replacement of the windows on the north and west elevations with no window dimension changes. The windows on the south and east elevations of the home appear to have been replaced in the late 1990s or early 2000s. Given the size and style of the windows, it is likely that windows on the south and east elevations required opening dimension changes.

Elements of the home that contribute to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District are predominately associated with the home's north elevation. The proximity of the property to the street front is characteristic of homes along Canyon Rd. The wall design and stairs at the front of the house offer unique character within the district, and while windows have changed on the north elevation, the sense of massing characteristic of Santa Fe Style exists. The property's north elevation as indicated on the façade map (staff report p. 27) was designated primary in 2016.

The Applicant proposed the following 8 items:

- 1) Raise ceiling height of rooms on the first floor with the exception of the living room, dining room, and main entry hall. The parapet height will increase by 18” but no parapet height increase will occur along the primary elevation and the increase in parapet height will not result in an overall height increase that would exceed the highest portion of the building.
- 2) Remove the room located to the south of the family room.
- 3) Enclose the portals on the south elevation.
- 4) Replace windows and doors. Window and door changes on the north (primary) elevation will not change in opening dimension, but will be placed lower. Window and door

changes on non-primary elevations are proposed to change in size and dimension as indicated in the drawings provided by the Applicant.

- 5) Add steel railings with filigree to the north elevation exterior stairs.
- 6) Install steel sconces to the north elevation.
- 7) Re-stucco the property in cementitious El Rey "Buckskin."
- 8) Windows and doors will be changed from its present white to Marvin clad wood "Cascade Blue," a sample of which was passed out at the hearing.
- 9) Exposed wood will be stained "dark brown."

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. After conducting public hearings and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:
2. Zoning staff determined that the Application meets underlying zoning standards.
3. Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended approval of this Application in that it complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.
4. The project is subject to requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing (of any structure);
 - X Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards; and
 - X Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures.
5. The property is located in the following district and subject to the related sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
 - X Downtown and Eastside Historic District (Section 14-5.2(E))
6. An Exception Request was not applicable to this Application.
7. At the hearing, the Applicant's agent testified that the existing window trim is white.
8. The proposed railing on the exterior stairs does not harmonize with the streetscape.
9. Under Sections 14-2.6(C), 14-2.7(C)(2), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-d & f) and 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a) and Section 14-5.2(D) the Board has authority to review, approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant's proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards.
10. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), the Board has the authority to approve an application for alteration or new construction on the condition that changes relating to exterior appearance recommended by the Board be made in the proposed work, and no permit is to issue until new exhibits, satisfactory to the Board, have been submitted.
11. The information contained in the Application, and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review have been met.
12. The information contained in the Application and provided in testimony and evidence establishes that all applicable design standards for Board approval as herein described have been met.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the Application.
2. The Board voted to approve the Application with the following exceptions and conditions:
 - a. The railing proposed in Item 5 on the yardwall exterior is denied, however a proposal to raise and/or reconfigure the existing railing on wall of the residence may go to staff for approval;
 - b. Opening dimensions on the north elevation shall not be changed or moved;
 - c. The trim color proposed in Item 8 shall instead be white and shall be taken to staff for approval; and
 - d. windows on the north elevation shall be brought to staff for approval.
 - e. The Board voted to deny the blue color in Item 8, and instead required a white color to go to staff for approval.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 13th DAY OF JUNE 2017, THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Chairperson

Date:

FILED:

Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

Date: