



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 11-21-17 TIME 10:58am

SERVED BY McCutcheon

RECEIVED BY Carmelora

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 28, 2017 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1st FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 28, 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: November 14, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-038. 1369 Cerro Gordo.

Case #H-17-071B. 424 Arroyo Tenorio.

Case #H-17-081B. 110 Delgado Street Unit B.

Case #H-17-090. 1160 Camino de Cruz Blanca.

Case #H-17-092. 1661 Cerro Gordo Road.

Case #H-17-095A. 905 Camino Ranchitos.

Case #H-17-089. 1212 Canyon Road.

Case #H-17-019. 808 Canyon Road.

Case #H-17-083. 110 Delgado Street Unit A.

Case #H-17-085B. 3 Plaza Fatima.

Case #H-17-091A. 604 Alto Street.

Case #H-17-094A. 314 South Guadalupe Street.

Case #H-17-097A. 984 C Acequia Madre.

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

1. Case #H-17-078. 998 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Brown, agent for Lisa Koskovich, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 57", raise parapets, reconstruct an existing shed, and install a vehicle gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
2. Case #H-17-096. 616 East Alameda Street Unit F. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stewart Ewing, agent for Sky View Holdings, Inc., owner, proposes to demolish a non-historic shed, construct a 614 sq. ft. addition, and change doors and windows on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
3. Case #H-17-060. 115 Rodriguez Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sam Budoff and Margaret Beattie, agents/owners, propose to remodel a non-contributing studio by constructing a 67 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height from 9' to 11' and to resurface a retaining wall with stone veneer. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-17-066. 415 Camino Manzano. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Hoopes and Associates, agent for Douglas and Sarah Brown, owners, proposes to remodel three structures by removing 540 sq. ft. and adding 2114 sq. ft. of additions to a contributing residential structure, removing part of a contributing yardwall, and other alterations. Six exceptions are requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)), to exceed the 50% footprint standard and place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c and d)), and to change opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-17-098A. 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for non-statused residential structures. (David Rasch)

6. Case #H-17-098B. 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests demolition of the structures with yardwalls. (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-17-099. 235 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony Garcia, agent/owner requests designation of primary elevation(s) for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
8. Case #H-17-100. 118 East Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Cherry See Reames Architects, agent for Brianna Lewis, owner, requests historic status review with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
9. Case #H-16-078. 564 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Bransford Builders, agent for Roy and Linda New, owners, request to increase the height of a non-contributing accessory structure to 12'0" where the maximum allowable height is 14'9". (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 Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 11-9-2017 TIME 2:08 pm

SERVED BY [Signature]
RECEIVED BY Carmelma Spears

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 28, 2017 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1st FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 28, 2017 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 14, 2017
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-038. 1369 Cerro Gordo.

Case #H-17-071. 424 Arroyo Tenorio.

Case #H-17-081B. 110 Delgado Street Unit B.

Case #H-17-085. 3 Plaza Fatima.

Case #H-17-090. 1160 Camino de Cruz Blanca.

Case #H-17-092. 1661 Cerro Gordo Road.

Case #H-17-095. 905 Camino Ranchitos.

Case #H-17-019. 808 Canyon Road.

Case #H-17-083. 110 Delgado Street Unit A.

Case #H-17-057. 806 Don Gaspar Avenue.

Case #H-17-068. 434 and 434A Acequia Madre.

Case #H-17-089. 1212 Canyon Road.

Case #H-17-094. 314 South Guadalupe Street.

Case #H-17-097. 984 C Acequia Madre.

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

1. Case #H-17-078. 998 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Brown, agent for Lisa Koskovich, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct a 60" high yardwall where the maximum allowable height is 57", raise parapets, reconstruct an existing shed, and install a vehicle gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
2. Case #H-17-096. 616 East Alameda Street Unit F. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stewart Ewing, agent for Sky View Holdings, Inc., owner, proposes to demolish a non-historic shed, construct a 614 sq. ft. addition, and change doors and windows on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
3. Case #H-17-060. 115 Rodriguez Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sam Budoff and Margaret Beattie, agents/owners, propose to remodel a non-contributing studio by constructing a 67 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height from 9' to 11' and to resurface a retaining wall with stone veneer. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-17-066. 415 Camino Manzano, Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Hoopes and Associates, agent for Douglas and Sarah Brown, owners, proposes to remodel three structures by removing 540 sq. ft. and adding 2114 sq. ft. of additions to a contributing residential structure, removing part of a contributing yardwall, and other alterations. Six exceptions are requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)), to exceed the 50% footprint standard and place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c and d)), and to change opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-17-098. 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for non-statused residential structures and demolition the structures with yardwalls. (David Rasch)

6. Case #H-17-099. 235 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony Garcia, agent/owner requests designation of primary elevation(s) for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
7. Case #H-17-100. 118 East Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Cherry See Reames Architects, agent for Brianna Lewis, owner, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation designations, if applicable, for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)
8. Case #H-17-101. 53 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Silver, agent/owner proposes to remodel the storefronts and entries on a contributing non-residential structure. (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-16-078. 564 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Bransford Builders, agent for Roy and Linda New, owners, request to increase the height of a non-contributing accessory structure to 12'0" where the maximum allowable height is 14'9". (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 Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

November 28, 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 November 14, 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	Announcement	4
H. Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-17-078.</u>	Approved with conditions 998 Acequia Madre	3-7
2. <u>Case #H-17-096.</u>	Approved with conditions 616 East Alameda Street Unit F	7-10
3. <u>Case #H-17-060.</u>	Approved with conditions 115 Rodriguez Street	10-12
4. <u>Case #H-17-066.</u>	Postponed for further work 415 Camino Manzano	12-26
5. <u>Case #H-17-098A.</u>	Postponed for HCPI 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago	26-32
6. <u>Case #H-17-098B.</u>	Postponed 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago	32
7. <u>Case #H-17-099.</u>	Approved as recommended 235 Delgado Street	32-34
8. <u>Case #H-17-100.</u>	Approved as submitted 118 East Santa Fe Avenue	35-37
9. <u>Case #H-16-078.</u>	Approved with conditions 564 Garcia Street	37-39
I. Matters from the Board	Discussion	39
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:00 p.m.	39

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

November 28, 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, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair
Ms. Meghan Bayer
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. Edmund Boniface
Mr. William Powell
Mr. Buddy Roybal

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair

OTHERS PRESENT:

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

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department and available on the City of Santa Fe web site.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 14, 2017

Member Biedscheid requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 18, second to last line, "Member Biedscheid asked, if the Board were to determine that it should not be demolished, if it ~~could be offset somehow~~. per the code criteria, if the exception criteria asked that determination.

On page 34, 2nd paragraph should say, Member Biedscheid noticed the survey was dated 1991 and asked if Staff had requested a new survey to be done

On the same page, 4th paragraph, it should say, "Member Biedscheid said, instead of "it," insert, "the 1991 survey."

On the same page under Questions to the Applicant, in the 5th paragraph, "Member Biedscheid said the information is limited ~~the Board feels fairly safe on this~~ but it was built close to 50 years ago...

Member Roybal moved to approve the minutes of November 14, 2017 as amended. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and passed by voice vote with all voting in favor except Member Boniface abstained.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-16-038. 1369 Cerro Gordo.

Case #H-17-019. 808 Canyon Road.

Case #H-17-071B. 424 Arroyo Tenorio. Case #H-17-083. 110 Delgado Street Unit A.

Case #H-17-081B. 110 Delgado Street Unit B. Case #H-17-085B. 3 Plaza Fatima.

Case #H-17-090. 1160 Camino de Cruz Blanca. Case #H-17-091A. 604 Alto Street.

Case #H-17-092. 1661 Cerro Gordo Road.

Case #H-17-094A. 314 South Guadalupe Street.

Case #H-17-095A. 905 Camino Ranchitos.

Case #H-17-097A. 984 C Acequia Madre.

Case #H-17-089. 1212 Canyon Road.

There were no changes requested.

Vice-Chair Katz said one case from the last hearing is not ready yet.

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

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

H. ACTION ITEMS

Vice-Chair Katz announced that anyone disagreeing with the actions of the Board have the right to appeal the decision to the Governing Body within 15 days after the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law have been approved.

1. **Case #H-17-078. 998 Acequia Madre.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Brown, agent for Lisa Koskovich, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 57", raise parapets, reconstruct an existing shed, and install a vehicle gate on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

998 Acequia Madre is a Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family home and guesthouse located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is currently listed as noncontributing to the district and was built prior to 1940.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following 14 items.

Main House

- 1) Construct a 36" to 57" yard wall at the edge of the north property line where the maximum allowable height is 57". The wall will drop down at the stone pilasters. The applicant proposes a motorized vehicle gate at the wall that will be 52" in height.
- 2) Increase the parapet height at the northwest corner of the property from 11'-0" to 13'-6".
- 3) Add an entry portal, replace the entry door, and add a fireplace at the east elevation.

- 4) The existing courtyard wall will be modified by making the courtyard larger, and will remove the existing gate and add three wood shutters.
- 5) Level the east elevation parapet.
- 6) Replace existing windows and doors. The lites will be true divided light and wood clad.
- 7) Install an interior wood gate with an over the gate accent arch. The structure will be 7'-10".
- 8) Construct a coyote fence with irregular latilla tops to 5'-0" on the west property line.
- 9) Demolish the existing shed structure which is connected to the southeast corner of the building.

Guest House

- 10) Remove existing portal and construct a new portal with a galvalume metal roof.
- 11) Replace windows with wood clad, divided lite windows.

General

- 12) Wood elements will be stained.
- 13) Windows and doors will be Sierra Pacific "Patina Green."
- 14) Stucco will be 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 and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside.

Questions to Staff

Member Boniface noted that on sheet 23, a number of skylights were being removed, replaced and added but did not hear that in the summary. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it was in the Applicant's letter. It would be good to have testimony on it.

Member Bayer referred to page 20 in the packet and asked if that showed the yardwall for the main house.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed. She said her understanding was that there will be some stucco. And the rock wall, the Applicant can talk about whether it is a rock wall with no stucco.

Member Biedscheid asked on Item #1 if the new wall is to be constructed on top of the acequia wall or set back.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it is required to be set back six feet and the Acequia Madre Association needs to work with applicant. She thought it needed to be 7 feet back.

Member Biedscheid asked if the coyote fence is subject to the 57" height limitation.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said no.

Member Biedscheid asked, on item #9, demolition of the shed structure, why we are not considering the demolition standard.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained that it is a shed attached to the building, so it is like consideration of replacing windows, etc.

Mr. Rasch said it is considered a remodel because they are not demolishing the whole structure.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Tim Curry, 1415 W. Alameda, was sworn. He first responded to the questions asked. He said the property line is back about six feet from the acequia. The wall is all stone and will be set back from the acequia. His client contacted the Acequia Madre Association to set up a meeting with them.

He said the large skylights will be removed and flat low-profile skylights behind the parapet will be installed.

Questions to the Applicant

Vice-Chair Katz asked if the wall construction is of the design as it is depicted on page 20.

Mr. Mark Brown was sworn and said it is a combination of river rock and flagstone as depicted.

Vice-Chair Katz said to him, it looked a little busy and questioned that design being harmonious.

Mr. Brown said he was flexible but did not want it stuccoed. He thought the design was harmonious with the neighborhood. It is a rock wall with single layers of flagstone.

Member Biedscheid asked if the stone pilasters use the same material in pilaster form.

Member Powell asked something away from the microphone.

Mr. Brown said acequia stone is the Fort Marcy stone and some portions have been extended up directly above which would be of river rock. It is a combination but is very similar with native river rock. It is real rock.

Member Bayer asked if the picture was taken from the neighbor's property.

Mr. Rasch didn't know.

Mr. Brown said that photo was taken in Scottsdale Arizona.

Member Biedscheid asked about the color of the motorized vehicle gates. The description in the packet said they would be raw steel.

Mr. Brown said the gates will be steel and flat black at this point.

Member Boniface referred to page 23, and, looking at yard wall, asked what the purpose of the notch is.

Mr. Brown said it is for the visibility triangle.

Member Boniface said he understood why it was dropping to three feet but didn't not understand the purpose of the notch that is shown.

Mr. Brown explained that there is a large tree there and they need to allow the gates to go back for vehicle access from off the road.

Public Comment

Mr. John Eddy, 227 E Palace Suite B, was sworn. He said it is nice to see such an almost full complement of Board. He would like to see more discussion on the stone wall. He felt the flagstone went against the vernacular character of the very high-profile street and that wall is immediately above the acequia. He encouraged the Board to look at that carefully.

Member Powell said something that was inaudible.

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

Vice-Chair Katz shared Mr. Eddy's concern about the busyness of the wall and the flagstone in the wall. It is completely visible not only from Acequia Madre but also from Canyon Road. The river rock works very well but flagstone not so much.

Mr. Curry said they can eliminate the flagstone from the wall. The applicant wanted to mix it up a little. The photo doesn't show it clearly. But they can go with a solid field stone native - or river rock, whichever the Board prefers.

Action of the Board

Member Boniface said with the design of the stone wall, he liked the aesthetics of that design, but it is not appropriate for this location. It needed to be pulled back a little bit.

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-078 at 998 Acequia Madre, to approve the application as submitted with conditions:

- 1. That the skylights shall all be low profile;**
- 2. That there shall not be any rooftop visible from the street;**
- 3. That the stone wall shall be made out of river rock only.**

Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Member Biedscheid noted the acequia is lined with native stone there.

Member Boniface changed his motion to say either native stone or river rock but not both at the Applicant's choice.

Member Biedscheid requested a friendly amendment that the wall on the north property line be set back from the acequia according to the agreement with the Acequia Madre Association. Member Boniface agreed it was friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H-17-096. 616 East Alameda Street Unit F. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stewart Ewing, agent for Sky View Holdings, Inc., owner, proposes to demolish a non-historic shed, construct a 614 sq. ft. addition, and change doors and windows on a non-contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)**

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

616 East Alameda Unit F is a single-family residence located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style and was designated as noncontributing in 2012.

The applicant proposes the following 11 items for remodel of the home.

- 1) Removal of a non-permitted, non-historic shed at the south side of the property.
- 2) Addition of 405 square feet to the south elevation for a master suite.

- 3) Addition of 129 square feet to the northeast corner of the residence for a guest bathroom.
- 4) Replace two windows on the east elevation with two French doors.
- 5) Replace two small windows on the east elevation with one large window.
- 6) Replace one large window on the east elevation with a small window.
- 7) Replace an awning window on the north elevation with a roll out window.
- 8) Relocate the door on the south elevation to accommodate the small patio area that will be added at the southwest corner.
- 9) At the east elevation, removal of space from the front patio area for more parking and construction of a small patio with yard wall at the southwest corner of the home. The yard wall will be 3'-0" in height with accents that rise to roughly 4'-0".
- 10) Stucco will be cementitious El Rey "Adobe."
- 11) Windows and doors will be wood clad in the color "Blue" to match the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Questions to Staff

Vice-Chair Katz said on the addition replacing the shed, it looks like the windows are very close to the wall.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed that it does look closer than 3' so an exception would be required for that and Staff didn't catch that.

Vice-Chair Katz said they could either shrink the window or come back for an exception.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Stewart Ewing was sworn. He said in reference to the bay window, that they could extend the wall all the way to the corner and fatten up that corner part by the fireplace to give them almost 4'.

Vice-Chair Katz agreed that would solve it.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said they might have to shrink the window because it would be 3' on the other side.

Mr. Ewing pointed out that there is a door on the other side that was needed for access from the kitchen to the parking area.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas asked if shrinking the window would work.

Mr. Ewing said he could shrink it enough to give three feet on each side, or eliminate the window seat. He had nothing else to add.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant

Public Comment

Mr. Fred Lutgens, 717 E Alameda, Unit 6, was sworn. He said he and his wife lived directly across from the driveway and are the only year-round residents in that area. Everyone else is part time. They had no objections to this application but suggested that parking is a problem. It is a very narrow lane and the main parking is in front of the shed. The change of the plans means there would be no parking there because of a patio on the southwest corner of the house now would be in front, parallel to the house. So, the only place to turn around is the very end and that is minimal, so, the parking would somewhat infringe upon the lane. The easiest place to turn around on this street is on this property now.

He clarified that he was just pointing out the fact that the people who stay in this rental would have to go to the very end to turn around. It is just an observation - not a complaint.

Mr. Lutgens said they have a garage and actually keep a car in it. It is doable for them and we are glad to see the shed gone.

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

Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-096 at 616 East Alameda Street, Unit F, to follow staff recommendations and approve that application as presented with a condition that the bay window on the west elevation be in compliance with three-foot setback from the corner. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Katz added that the applicant bring the revised drawings to Staff for review and approval. Member Boniface agreed, and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-17-060. 115 Rodriguez Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sam Budoff and Margaret Beattie, agents/owners, propose to remodel a non-contributing studio by constructing a 67 sq. ft. addition and increasing the height from 9' to 11' and to resurface a retaining wall with stone veneer. (David Rasch)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

115 Rodriguez Street is a single-family residential structure that was constructed in a vernacular manner before 1958. In 1971, a corner portal was enclosed, wood windows were replaced with steel casements, and a free-standing studio was constructed. Both structures are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On July 25, 2017, the HDRB approved remodeling of the primary residence and associated yardwalls.

Now, the applicant requests to remodel the studio and associated yardwalls with the following five items.

1. The studio will be increased in height from 9' to 11', where the maximum allowable height is 15' 4". The existing character of the shed roof structure will be retained.
2. A 67 square foot addition will be constructed on the east elevation of the studio to match the proposed new height of the structure. The addition will feature a 2-over-2 window will be installed in the east elevation.
3. A 52 square foot portal will be constructed between the primary residence and the studio. The portal will feature a square post at the southwest corner and a flat wooden cornice to harmonize with the building roof eaves.
4. Windows and doors will meet the 30" standard and the 3' corner standard. A skylight will be installed in the bathroom. Finishes include El Rey cementitious stucco in "Sandalwood", wood trim will be painted white, and window sashes and doors will be stained turquoise.
5. A retaining wall will be surfaced with stone veneer and stucco to match other walls previously approved.

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

Member Bayer referred to item #4 regarding the trim for windows and doors being painted white, and remembered some discussion on trim colors. She asked if this is consistent with what was approved.

Mr. Rasch asked her to clarify that with the owner.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Samuel Budoff, 115 Rodriguez, was sworn. He said the colors will match the main house. It is the same thing with the last section of the retaining wall. We don't want to touch it but rebuild a long run connected to it in same style. The two levels would be of the same materials. The only reason we didn't make this part of first proposal is where the studio sits is within the five-foot setback and had to get neighbor's approval for it. We finally made contact with them and they were cooperative.

Vice-Chair Katz said this is a handsome improvement.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface assumed they were proposing a skylight over the bathroom in the house.

Mr. Budoff said it is not. It is in the casita over the small bathroom. It is a 1x4 flat glass. curb mounted and might be up six inches.

Member Boniface asked if there will be any mechanical equipment on the roof.

Mr. Budoff said there would be nothing on the roof.

Public Comment

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

Action of the Board

Member Roybal moved in Case #H-17-060 at 115 Rodriguez Street, to approve as staff recommended, items 1-5. Member Bayer seconded the motion.

Member Boniface asked for a friendly amendment that the skylight be low profile and no rooftop appurtenances. Member Roybal accepted that as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-17-066. 415 Camino Manzano.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Hoopes and Associates, agent for Douglas and Sarah Brown, owners, proposes to remodel three structures by removing 540 sq. ft. and adding 2114 sq. ft. of additions to a contributing residential structure, removing part of a contributing yardwall, and other alterations. Six exceptions are requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)), to exceed the 50% footprint standard and place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c and d)), and to change opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

415 Camino Manzano is a single-family residence that was originally constructed by 1912 in the Territorial style as two free-standing structures. In 1927-1930s another free-standing structure, known as the bunkhouse, was constructed and two additions were constructed on the primary structure, one of which connected the original two structures together. In 1976, another addition was constructed at the primary structure on the northeast corner. In 1978, an addition was constructed on the east side of the bunkhouse. In 1984, the bunkhouse was remodeled with a bay window and a portal on the south façade. In 1987, a red Pro Panel roof was installed. Finally, after 1993, a portal was constructed that connected the primary structure with its additions to the bunkhouse structure with its additions. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and elevations 1-6, 14, and 15 are designated as primary.

A free-standing two-story water tower was probably constructed in the first quarter of the 20th century. On or before 1967, the water tower was enclosed with adobe. At an unknown non-historic date this structure was converted into residential space and the portal was constructed. This structure is listed as contributing to the district and the south elevation is designated as primary.

A stuccoed adobe yardwall at the street frontage and along the driveway entry was constructed before 1968. The wall has an arched pedestrian entry with a historic wooden gate and a bench flanked by buttresses. This structure is listed as contributing to the district and the west and south elevations are designated as primary.

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

PRIMARY RESIDENCE

1. 540 square feet of the 1,237 non-historic square footage will be removed from the 2,956 historic square footage. The remaining addition allowance is just 781. Additions totaling 2,214 square feet will be constructed. An exception to exceed the 50% footprint standard is requested and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.
2. A portion of the new square footage proposes to enclose the existing non-historic portal on primary elevation #1. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.

3. An opening will be created on primary elevation #2 to install a door. An exception is requested to create an opening where one does not exist, and the required exception criteria responses are at the end of this report.
4. Two historic windows will be preserved and installed in an opening that will be raised 3" on primary elevation #3 or #4. An exception is requested to alter an opening on a primary elevation and the required exception criteria responses are at the ends of this report.
5. On the non-primary north and west elevations windows and doors will be altered.
6. The non-historic portal height will be increased, and the pitched roofs will be replaced with standing-seam metal in "Colonial Red" finish.
7. Finishes are described as the El Rey version of STO "Earthnut" and trim in "Brilliant White". However, staff is unable to find what this color looks like. Also, cementitious stucco is required for all the contributing structures.
8. A vehicle gate and trash enclosure are shown in drawing but not itemized with sizes, materials, and finishes in the proposal letter.

TOWER

9. A 100 square foot addition will be constructed on the non-historic portal. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint standard (14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required exception responses are at the end of this report.

YARDWALL

10. 15 linear feet of the historic yardwall will be removed from the driveway portion. An exception is requested to remove historic material (14-5.2(D)(1)(a)) and the required exception responses are at the end of this report.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

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

(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.

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

In any review of proposed additions or alterations to structures that have been declared significant or contributing in any historic district or a landmark in any part of the city, the following standards shall be met:

(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.

(2) Additions

(c) Additions are not permitted to primary façades.

(d) Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary façade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint, and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary façade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of structures instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion.

(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.

(ii) No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.

EXCEPTION TO EXCEED THE 50% FOOTPRINT STANDARD (HOUSE)

(i) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*; The rationale behind this is to keep the streetscape the same. By incorporating the garage into the mass of the house and building behind the garage the view from the street will not change. Of the 2911 square feet, 859 Santa Fe is the garage. This could be built as a separate structure on the property but this would change the view down the driveway.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that the attachment rather than free-standing structure

would preserve the streetscape.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; The owners wish this house to be one in which they can age in place. The renovated house has been designed to be accessible. By disconnecting the garage from the house, the house would not be as accessible.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that exterior access rather than interior access would present difficulties for impaired individuals.

(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; The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City.

Staff response: Staff finds that this criterion was not addressed.

(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*; this is a larger lot within this part of town. It can support a larger footprint structure. The proposed completed structure would cover 30% of the lot with no visible change in density from the street.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that underlying zoning allows for lot coverage on this larger lot. But, staff finds that the applicant did not address the relevant issue of other attached garages versus free-standing garages.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; this was the condition of the property when the current owners bought it.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. The desire to construct a garage is a result of the actions of the owners.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1). No apparent change in size from the street thereby not impacting the historic nature, economic impact nor tourist impact as stated in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION ON A PRIMARY ELEVATION (HOUSE)

(I) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*; The new wall in front of the primary façade is not visible from the street and/or follows the existing structure placement on the lot and allows an existing breezeway to be enclosed

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that the addition will not be publicly-visible.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; this allows the house to be used as one structure without going in and outside.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement regarding the future hardship of the owners if they become impaired.

(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; The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion.

(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*; this is not applicable to other structures in the landscape as it is comprised of 2 buildings under one roof.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; the condition of non historic structures sitting in front of historic façades was the condition of the property when the current owners bought the house.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1). This does not change the streetscape and therefore does not impact any of the condition is Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT AN OPENING ON A PRIMARY ELEVATION (HOUSE)

(i) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*; The insertion of this door is not visible from the street.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that the door will not be publicly visible.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; The door provides better access between the house and garden at the same elevation making this entrance a handicapped accessible entrance to the house. The existing doors on the south elevation are not HC accessible.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(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; The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion. Why did the applicant choose to make a new opening on a primary elevation, rather than widen an existing opening on another 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*; This condition is not applicable to other properties.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion. Additional information is needed regarding openings that lead into gardens.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; this is the condition of the house when the owner's bought it.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. The desire for another door near an existing door is a result of the actions of the owners.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1). This allows all visible elevations to remain the same while providing needed access thereby not impacting the historic nature, economic impact nor tourist impact as stated in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement. But, widening the existing opening is the least negative impact on the primary elevations.

EXCEPTION TO ALTER AN OPENING ON A PRIMARY ELEVATION (HOUSE)

(i) Do not damage the character of the district; There will be no discernable difference in the window appearance in the wall.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement. The historic window will be maintained.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; The raising of the window allows the kitchen cabinetry to meet the sill of the window thereby allowing the windows to be maintained easily.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(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. The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the *City*.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion.

EXCEPTION TO INSTALL NON-DIVIDED LITES (HOUSE)

(I) Do not damage the character of the district; The proposed windows cannot be seen from outside the property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement. But, the 30" divided lite rule applies to all windows not located under a 4' deep portal, not just those windows that are publicly-visible.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; Non-divided lite windows are allowed under portals that are 4' or more. For the enjoyment of their garden the owners are requesting this to allow the east garden façades to look unified. All façades on the east are not historic.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. Since divided-lite windows are required in this district, a better solution would be to have divided-lites on windows and doors that are located under a 4' deep portal to achieve a harmonious appearance.

(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. The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion.

EXCEPTION TO EXCEED THE 50% FOOTPRINT STANDARD (TOWER)

(I) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*; the existing portal structure attached to the water tower is structurally unstable and needs to be replaced. The additional area of the portal would not be visible from the street.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement only because the historic yardwall blocks visibility.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; replacing the portal will prevent potential injuries.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. Replacement of the existing portal is not the same as replacing the existing portal with a larger portal. The applicant did not address this criterion for why the portal must be larger.

(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; The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City. The increase in portal will allow this area to be used thereby providing activity on the streetside of the house, much more in keeping with the character of the property.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion.

(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*; no other water towers exist in this neighborhood.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion. The existence of the water tower is not the issue; it is the expansion of the non-historic portal.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; this was the condition of the property when the current owners bought the house.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. The desire to increase the square footage of the portal is a result of the actions of the applicant.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1). This will have no impact on the historic structures. Due to the existing Sequoia and wall this does not change the streetscape and therefore does not impact any of the condition is Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. Replacement in-kind is the least negative impact.

EXCEPTION TO REMOVE HISTORIC MATERIAL (YARDWALL)

(i) Do not damage the character of the *streetscape*; the driveway wall is currently runs 72' from the street to the gate. 57' of wall would remain along the driveway and all the wall along Manzano would remain thereby creating no change in the streetscape

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the *applicant* or an injury to the public welfare; as there is no parking along Manzano itself all parking must happen on the property. Currently the turn-around area is very tight. The removal of the wall allows the owners to have more car turning space within the gated area thereby lessening chances of accidents on the property.

Staff response: Staff disagrees with this statement. There is sufficient turning radius as required by code with the existing yardwall.

(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; The change will not impact the farmhouse character of this house and therefore will maintain the heterogeneous character of the City.

Staff response: Staff finds that the applicant did not address this criterion.

(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*; Other properties along Manzano do not have this walled driveway condition. Therefore this change is not applicable to other properties.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the *applicant*; this was the condition of the property when the current owners bought it.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1). As stated, 57' of wall along the driveway will still remain thereby not impacting the historic nature, economic impact nor tourist impact as stated in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that all seven of the requested exceptions have not been met. Now there are six with elimination of the divided light window in the courtyard.

Mr. Rasch commented on the site plan that show locations of the changes. The raising of windows is on the west elevation.

Questions to Staff

Member Biedscheid asked, on the primary elevation 1 and 2, what defining character was changed by the proposed design.

Mr. Rasch said they requested a door where there is no door now and the parapet on that east-facing area is blank now. That is where they propose to put a door.

Member Biedscheid asked if it just a portal that is covering the width. It looked like the wall was cutting off part of the façade.

Mr. Rasch said yes. The plan was to close off the passageway so there is an addition in front of primary elevation 1.

Member Biedscheid said in one of the responses to the exception criteria, the Applicant said non-historic additions had been put in front of primary, historic façades in the past.

Mr. Rasch agreed. Where those additions are, there were several changes in the past.

Member Biedscheid suggested in the way they responded to the exception criteria, there is an emphasis on maintaining the streetscape, but all the exception requests are about changing a primary façade which could change the status. So she asked him what the impact is to the streetscape and status.

Mr. Rasch said those are clearly distinct issues. Some of the changes are not publicly visible. For instance, the door at the kitchen on the east elevation is not visible from the street. Streetscape harmony and streetscape preservation is certainly different than preserving the architectural character of this building. That's why primary elevations don't have to be publicly visible. They just have to capture the character defining features of the building and preserve them. In this case, the preserving of historic status may have more weight than streetscape harmony.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Craig Hoopes, 333 Montezuma, was sworn

Mr. Douglas Brown, owner of 415 Camino Manzano, was sworn. He said they have owned the home for 12 years, one block away, and they want to preserve this historic farm house in the middle of Santa Fe but to modernize it. He believed this plan does those things. Adding that door at the kitchen would allow us to get right in from the driveway to the kitchen with groceries.

He said that in six weeks, he will be 80 years old and they have to be concerned about mobility. They planned for that with the handicapped door. The portal there has a mistake. They are asking for 42 square feet, not 142 square feet.

He said their idea was to preserve its farm nature. "We want to harvest the trees and socialize in the front yard and bring the house back to life and want to make it come out right for us and for you."

Mr. Hoopes said they wanted to bring everything forward at one time; not in pieces along the way. He thanked the Board and the audience for their indulgence because it is a complicated case. He didn't know if they should take each exception with a separate vote.

Vice-Chair Katz suggested a vote only at the end.

Mr. Hoopes clarified that the reason why Staff is not agreeing is mostly because of criterion #3 in staff comments. It is a problem question for everyone who tries to answer it. He hoped he could state the responses in a different way.

Mr. Rasch said the first exception is to the 50% rule.

Mr. Hoopes, pointing out details on the floor plan, said they propose to tear the greenhouse down and build a new garage and master suite. As they are aging, they are concerned to maintain and stay in this house. The master suite has been designed to be handicapped accessible and looked at the possibility of

making a new garage at the end of the driveway. But two things were important about keeping it within the mass of the house: 1 - to keep a similar streetscape looking down the driveway and to see the apricot trees. Given that is a farm house, that incorporating this into the farm house structure is a viable way of doing it. There are enough problems with several cars pulling into the driveway and being able to turn around. This is a most flexible turn-around plan. That was the main reason for exceeding 50% of the original footprint. There are areas such as this room (here) that is nonhistoric and had a portal that was enclosed after 1967 and became part of the house. It is counted as overage - and because it is considered nonhistoric, it is counted against the 50%.

Questions to the Applicant

Vice-Chair Katz thought it would make sense to ask questions after each exception.

Member Powell asked an inaudible question.

Mr. Rasch said the intent of the exception is to not overwhelm the structure with additions but to sensitively allow growth of the footprint to not lose its status.

Member Powell asked how large the garage is as drawn.

Mr. Hoopes said it is 800 square feet.

Member Powell said a standard two-car garage is about 500 square feet.

Mr. Hoopes said this is designed as a 25-foot square and it has a storage area and a mechanical room that is all part of what we call the garage.

Member Powell said it is a very nice garage, but it exceeds that norm by quite a bit.

Mr. Hoopes said this is where the greenhouse is now, so we are trying to maintain that line and preserve the feel of this property as you look down the driveway by tucking it in here. Most of that addition is not visible from the street and the view to the streetscape is important.

Mr. Brown said this is a 42 % of an acre lot and, as proposed, would cover only 30% of the lot.

Vice-Chair Katz believed the Applicant had heard it is not lot coverage but adding to the footprint over 50%.

Member Boniface felt like they answered criterion #3 - full range of design options to ensure people can reside in the historic districts. It doesn't require a full set of drawings for those options, but just to state why the garage would not be in keeping. He asked Mr. Hoopes to talk more about criterion #5 - due to special conditions not the result of the applicant. It feels like this is the action of the applicant.

Vice-Chair Katz asked to what extent portions of the house are not accessible now.

Mr. Hoopes said a lot of the house is not wheelchair accessible. Most entrances drop down immediately six to ten inches and they will be working with the floor level. With the exception of this portion on the west, it will be remodeled on the interior.

The second exception where the portal is being enclosed was read by Mr. Rasch.

Mr. Hoopes pointed out the primary façade and a separate building and they are trying to combine them into one. It is already considered one building by Staff because there is one roof over both. But there is not any way to get from one to the other without going outside. We were looking for a way to have a connection without disturbing anything. This portion here is historic and primary and here as well so no matter what we do, we are doing an addition in front of an historic primary façade. He set it back so as to not be visible as you walk to the front door, and trying to hide that as much as possible. In doing that, they looked at many different options.

Vice-Chair Katz asked what other options they considered.

Mr. Hoopes said one was to pull it back further and whether we should build out there. But no matter what they did, they could not get ten feet away from a primary façade. It didn't seem expedient when connecting the rest of this house with the main mass of the house.

Member Biedscheid asked if they considered making that new hallway in the courtyard adjacent to the current hallway.

Mr. Hoopes said this is exterior space now. He pointed out where they are leaving it open. That suggestion would mean that they would not be able to get to that part of the building then. They needed to get to various parts of the historic structure.

Member Biedscheid said it seems there is no doorway connecting ... If you made an effort to preserve #1 and #2 and there are no other options for entry into that, she didn't know.

Mr. Hoopes said the only thing they could do is pull it back further. That is the only option that would still give access to the historic portion.

Member Biedscheid asked what the problem is with pulling it back.

Ms. Sarah Brown was sworn and as, as you walk up to the house, there is a door and the former owners put a portal over it and has a little fence and is the oldest building. It is very dark, dirty, and unappealing as you walk up to the charming door. The little white area is the dryer. "If we moved it back to that point, which is where we have it, it gives you safe on both sides of the door. I don't believe we will harm the primary wall. I don't think we have to take down any part of the primary wall. The rule said, it later we wanted to go back to the primary wall, and we had put in the partition, it would still be there and not be destroyed. It would just make it more pleasant and we were hoping to use the hallway for displaying art. So we would like to have as much space as possible. The other reason we talked about the hallway- we really debated. Traditionally, a lot of adobes had a room and maybe not a window and then another, and maybe

not even a window next to it. You go outside and in. The property here to the right - little guest house and greenhouse, although are not historic, are charming and they have doors that open out and thought about it. But we realized we are not in our 30's anymore. We really need to have a way to get in and out as we get older. By doing the garage there by the greenhouse and attaching the bedroom and the hallway, we could get out of our car and go to the bedroom. Anybody could, no matter what their age."

Vice-Chair Katz asked regarding that same wall. There are two issues - the primary façade, which you are covering part of, and the 10-foot rule, not to build near a primary façade. "What concerns me, if you move that wall three feet, three inches to the right on that drawing, you would still have your access. It would be less than what it is. There's an angle that you could see that entire primary wall, as it is. And I see that you are planning a skylight over the door of the portal anyway. So that would bring light there. Is that an alternative and why wouldn't it work? You would probably rob significant space from it."

Mr. Hoopes said it would still be building in front of a primary façade.

Vice-Chair Katz said it would be only at the edge of it and leave the primary façade open.

Mr. Hoopes agreed to put it back to that point.

Third Exception was for putting the door in this location where no door existed.

Mr. Hoopes said it was criterion #3 again. They looked a lot of different alternatives on how to address the garden, which is the primary entertaining garden for the house. Doug and Sarah have a desire - the house was originally built in an orchard and their desire to re-establish the orchard in the back garden and make apricot preserves, etc. and marketing or gifting their wares in an old style of country agriculture. They wanted an access to go into the garden. And the idea of pulling up to that door with groceries so they don't have to walk through the entire house. It is a door of convenience to them. This is very similar to many other houses along Manzano that have kitchen doors immediately adjacent to the front door of the houses. So, it is in keeping with the community, itself, for what is going on. They talked about the possibility of having it in a different location, but this was the one that is least visible that has accessible to the garden. What they were looking at was strictly a function of theirs in wanting to get from parking area to the kitchen directly.

Vice-Chair Katz understood that desire for a door to the kitchen. But in moving the kitchen from where it is to that part of the house means that it is being moved to an area that has three primary façades. He asked if there was some reason why they didn't consider the alternative of keeping the kitchen in the location where it is.

Mr. Hoopes said they looked at that. The kitchen is not big enough to allow for counters to work on. The kitchen is not large enough by today's standards. It was built in the 1920's but today's kitchens are different and open to the living spaces for conversations while cooking. So, they sought an alternate location for the kitchen and reasoned that this proposed location is the most desirable.

Member Powell said, on the field trip, the Board saw it is a special place. But as we go through each of these exceptions, he thought they were going to spend two hours redesigning this house in order to meet

the exception criteria. Normally, the Board only has one or two exceptions to consider. He didn't know that they have two hours to do this. He thought the design is nice, but it lacks sympathy with the historic structure. He thought it should be postponed for redesign.

The applicants were agreeable.

Member Powell said it is a wonderful house, but he saw some things that don't allow it to be congruent with modern living. At the same time, changing everything to do that didn't give him much enthusiasm for what is there.

Mr. Brown said, "Sarah is a trained chef in New York. We need a real kitchen with two ovens and a microwave and refrigeration. If we can't live in this house the way we want to live in it, I'm not sure we want to do this."

Member Powell pointed out that in the interior they can do what they want, and he thought they could find a compromise.

Action of the Board

Member Powell moved in Case #H-17-066 at 415 Camino Manzano, to postpone for reconsideration of exception criteria and redesign. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Member Roybal who dissented.

5. **Case #H-17-098A. 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for non-statused residential structures. (David Rasch)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago are single and fourplex residential structures with an associated garage/carport that were constructed in a vernacular manner after 1966 in Plaza del Monte. Evidence of non-historic alteration consists of added massing with Spanish-Pueblo Revival portals and loss of original windows with non-historic replacements. The structures, along with associated yardwalls, have no historic status designation within the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

122 single-family residence

1,182 square feet, 2 bedrooms, built in 1968, blueprints revised 1.24.72 or 76.

124 single-family residence

1,148 square feet, 2 bedrooms, built in 1969, blueprints dated 5.22.67.

125 fourplex

3,111 square feet, 4 bedrooms, built in 1968, foundation blueprint dated 9.25.69.

126 fourplex

2,898 square feet, 8 bedrooms, built in 1968, blueprint log dated 9.5.67.

Garage/carport

No information, not on 1966 aerial image.

HPD staff requests historic status designations of these structures.

RELEVANT CODE DEFINITIONS

NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A structure, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H District.

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Given that there are older similar residential units in Plaza del Monte, staff recommends that the Board designate these five structures as non-contributing due to marginal historic date of construction, lack of Santa Fe style, and non-historic alterations.

Questions to Staff

Vice-Chair Katz asked why the fact that none of these are 50 years old isn't controlling.

Mr. Rasch said 122, 125 and 126 were built in 1968. 124 was built in 1969.

Member Powell said they were designed before that.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He pointed out the one unit that was built later. He showed a map of 1962 and said we could do a status review of all of them.

Member Roybal said the character of the first houses was different. These almost seemed like apartments.

Mr. Rasch said the whole subdivision was the result of the Presbyterian Church. They needed housing for their people and this was part of Ghost Ranch. That part has been demolished for El Castillo but believed this part was separate ownership. The flavor is slightly more dense at the southern end.

Member Roybal said the character where they drove in was more and there was a lot of change. The others looked more commercial.

Mr. Rasch said the first ones looked more like single-family dwellings but these have multi-family structures.

Member Powell said he liked these buildings. They are quite interesting and have a regional style.

Vice-Chair Katz found it interesting in the diagram that the future plans were more substantially single-family houses.

Member Bayer asked about their integrity.

Mr. Rasch said they have good integrity but most windows were built without a permit and many had additions. Without the portals, the windows would look strange. That changed the massing. They are easily removed.

Member Biedscheid asked about the HCPI.

Mr. Rasch said there is no HCPI. Because it was for the Presbyterian Church, there are no tax records.

Member Biedscheid asked about the architect.

Mr. Rasch said Philippe Register died not too long ago. What he recalled is that we made the main building contributing and it went in front of the Governing Body. He told them it was an opportunity to extend the architecture allowed for mid-century and the Governing Body didn't want to do that. This is mid-century design and not very traditional. There are a few others. This one is a little larger. There is another on Garcia Street.

Member Powell asked if this one is the most compact.

Mr. Rasch said not necessary. Plaza Chamisal is also.

Member Biedscheid said the definition of contributing includes that it adds to the historic association. If this is the only one of its kind in the historic district, the Board should consider that as its status.

Mr. Rasch said yes, or if the Board considers a mid-century subdivision as important to the district.

Member Roybal found not much character in it.

Member Powell said he couldn't help but think there is something special about it. It is unlikely to be repeated here in Santa Fe.

Member Boniface said that to him, the thing that stands out the most is that without the portals, these buildings are pretty much nothing. The portals make the character but is not what we are discussing. He understood what people say about the subdivision. Seeing all the old character-defining buildings is what this is all about. You can see it in the original site plan. For some reason, these were built later. And they don't seem to have any defining character or defining element. He was not on the side of preserving these.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Wayne Lloyd, Suite A at 321 East San Francisco Street, was sworn. He said the Board has already pointed out the difference of where it started and where it ended up. The owner is not interested in removing any further buildings. If there is character that is similar in the buildings we want removed, it certainly is in the buildings that are older. The only thing is if there were major modifications and there was one with major modification. This is all that will be requested to be torn down.

He said, "We cannot pin down if any are historic. The others show up on tax assessor's record in 1968 but we don't know when in 1968. We just know that they did not appear in photos until that time. At least one is from 1969 and the drawings are from 1969. We are not interested in taking any of the others down."

Questions to the Applicant

Member Powell said he has been involved in so many others that have been lost. This is a great example.

Mr. Lloyd said this is zoned residential and will stay residential. Something else will be built there.

Member Bayer asked for clarification on the portals. Mr. Rasch said they were added later. But at 124, it says 1967 and it shows the portal.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It is the one with an original portal.

Member Bayer asked if all the others don't have an original portal.

Mr. Rasch said the others have ledger board so they were built later.

Public Comment

Mr. John Eddy (previously sworn) said this is really difficult situation. First and foremost, it is complicated by the fact that the Ghost Ranch building is already gone. "I think it is lamentable that the Governing Body doesn't have a deep enough understanding of architecture and that keeps them from

appreciating mid-century architecture. The main building was a classic example of that. The stage was set at the H Board that allowed the demolition to happen. I see this property as being of a piece - that whole block that was created by the Presbyterian Church. When I drive through it, I see a very unique attempt to create housing for people of differing economic levels. Although they may not have any obvious character, and you struggle with that. The adjoining properties have much more character. So I would caution you in that regard.

"The Allison James building can be seen now that the Ghost Ranch building has been removed and is very important in our history and anything on these properties will impact that building. I really encourage you to take your time with it and look at it carefully. I know it is frustrating, but you need to set the tone going forward. As long as you go to them with informed recommendation, based in law and the expertise that you bring to this Board, you've done your job."

Member Roybal pointed out that it is Staff's job to make a recommendation and they have made that for Noncontributing.

Ms. Madeline Pryor, 3362 La Avenida de San Marcos, was sworn. She said her address until May 31 was 125 Camino Santiago, when she was required to move after living there for 11 years. She still knows a fair number of people living there. There are 37 units that are diverse, single-family homes, duplexes and two four-plexes. "I liked the diversity and the choices there. If you drove through and looked at these dwellings, all of them have been vacated since the end of May. That was required by the end of May. To me, it looks bleak. That's not the usual appearance of it but it has been vacant. I'm not sure what maintenance happened there since then, but doesn't look as warm and inviting as once it did. I do think all of it - 37 units - functioned as a whole and allowed for diversity among neighbors. To remove these will make the whole place look worse.

I was interested in the history of it and found the history committee of Presbyterian Church a great source of information. They do have information on the plans and the ages of the homes and might be a source that could be tapped.

I also know that under 'Background and Summary' in the staff report, I would make a couple of corrections. The four-plex at 125 had six bedrooms, not four. I lived in a 2-bedroom unit. And on 126, there are four bedrooms; not eight. Each of those four units have one bedroom. I can't speak to the rest. But I would hope that when you make the decision on what to do, to keep in mind that it has been a long-term rental and that is not of no consequence. It hurts to be losing long term rentals. And it has stood vacant since May. I hope you consider those things."

Member Powell asked her if she felt they were substandard.

Ms. Pryor said no. "They have age to them. But if you want a historic building, they are fine. Mine was well built and charming. Apartment #2 had a roof leak, and nothing was done in the last year. I didn't feel they were substandard at all. Originally, they were well built, and the portal is very charming. I don't know what the plans are for what would be planned if they are demolished. We have historic trees in Santa Fe and one is a giant cottonwood as you exit to Old Taos Highway. It would be hard to keep those trees if you don't keep the whole place intact."

Ms. Gheen reminded the Board that this case is about the status of those structures and not on plans for the future.

Ms. Penelope Perryman, 109 Camino Matias, another residence in Plaza del Monte, was sworn. She thanked the Board for their attention to the status designation of this area. It has been a neighborhood since it was first built. My house dates to the 1940's it was housing teachers from Allison James School and for clergy and missionaries. They didn't own their own homes - churches had a house they could live in. And when they came back from abroad they had a home. Each building is completely unique - unlike any other subdivision - no buildings are alike. I only know oral history - the original tenants were allowed to ask for specific designs for their homes.

This was a neighborhood and housing. Santa Fe is hurting for housing. We, as residents, don't know where it was going. It was nonprofit owned until 2014. Slicing off one arm of it would be different if it was back. It was a place that time forgot. It has the original driveway and original bathroom and original tile. It is worth considering as a unique architectural element. I could answer questions too."

Mr. Raymond Herrera, 359 Hillside Avenue, said, "Thanks to the lady. She said 90% of what I was going to say. This is a neighborhood and Santa Fe is lacking neighborhoods by increasing development. It is a well-established, well suited neighborhood, much like Plaza Chamisal in its own way. It was vacated in May and just now coming to you, were they going to tear them down without notice. Why were they vacated since May? Thanks."

Ms. Linda Payne, 414 Bishop's Lodge Road, was sworn. She said, "I don't live in Plaza del Monte, but my home is separated from Plaza del Monte by a wall and I have lived in this residence now for 45 years. When my parents and I first moved in there, it was an absolutely beautiful complex. The ministers lived there, and it was a community. And it has always been a community to me. I always called Plaza del Monte my front door neighbors. Any time I was hurt, or my parents needed my help, I knew I could call on these neighbors to come and help me.

I was so upset that they demolished what we called the big house. And now, I fear - I walked the property yesterday. And all these buildings look like they are going to be demolished. You were talking about the sameness. But I think that it is so important and these apartments - There is nothing wrong with being different. I just love this neighborhood. And for those residents that did leave at the end of May, I know that there's been a lot of work done on the homes. They replaced roofs, cleaned up yards, put in new appliances in many of them. I just think that it is very tragic that they would demolish this beautiful neighborhood.

I think if they did the reconstruction on the outside of these places and bring up the yard it could be a beautiful community that it was once before. It does look bleak. But I walk through and see the beauty of it. They would have picnics on the green. And I do think, if they could construct the outside - exteriors and interiors, that we too, could once again have a beautiful community, close to downtown and a prime property for renters.

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

Action of the Board

Member Bayer went back to the portals and the architectural design qualities. On page 89, #126 has portals on that drawing, as well. And on page 19, #122 looks like portals on those drawings. I can't tell on #125 on page 36, if it is just a foundation plan but it looks like there are portals in these historic drawings.

Mr. Rasch said he couldn't prove these are construction drawings. They are not perforated. But it is likely the portals were designed and then later built. He didn't know if the applicant has more information, but most have ledger boards, so they don't look original.

Member Powell said sometimes you don't run the beams in below.

Mr. Rasch said at #124, clearly, they did that. It was original.

Mr. Powell made another comment.

Vice-Chair Katz asked Mr. Lloyd if he had any answer about Mr. Rasch's question about the portal.

Mr. Lloyd didn't think they were perforating plans back then. "We went through Presbyterian Foundation to get these drawings. Some were dated in 1969, some earlier but obviously they were not built earlier. There is some duplication of minutes as we do the inventory on the west. I think 80% of those will become contributing, merely based on their age. We are not asking to destroy the neighborhood. We like it, as well. There is a nice little park in the middle. We are asking only to put down buildings we believe are not yet 50 years old. This is a two-part request. You are first discussing the status and then discussing the demolition.

Member Roybal moved in Case #H-17-098A at 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago, to approve the Staff recommendation to have them remain noncontributing.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Member Biedscheid said she has learned more from the public tonight and didn't have enough information in the packet. She would like to see a full HCPI to see its history, how it came to be, etc. There is a lot more than just the age to consider.

Member Biedscheid moved in Case #H-17-098A at 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago to postpone the matter and request a full HCPI report on all of Plaza del Monte and adjust the status of units. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Member Roybal who dissented.

6. **Case #H-17-098B. 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests demolition of the structures with yardwalls. (David Rasch)

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-098B at 122, 124, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago to postpone the request for demolition. Member Bayer seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Member Roybal who dissented.

7. **Case #H-17-099. 235 Delgado Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Anthony Garcia, agent/owner requests designation of primary elevation(s) for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

235 Delgado Street is a single-family residence built in the vernacular style. The house was constructed by 1928 according to a city directory. It is of adobe construction and is characterized by a flat roof over the majority of the house with a shed roof where a porch was enclosed at the northeast corner. It appears that the house was initially a rectangular structure located near the front of the street and then was added onto over the years to accommodate the family. Over time windows and doors were replaced as needed. The house originally had brick coping around the parapets but they were stuccoed over at some time prior to 1983. The front stoop with rock surround is noted in the 1983 Historic Building Inventory form but does not appear to be historic. The applicant is requesting the designation of primary elevations.

DEFINITIONS

NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A *structure*, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H District.

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

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.

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 the west elevation of the home (façade 1), excluding the stoop with rock walls, as primary.

Questions to Staff

Member Powell asked regarding the primary elevations recommended if Staff could read out the numbers.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she recommended just #1 as primary.

Member Bayer said she included the definitions, but thought this is just for primary elevations.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed.

Member Powell said that on the field trip, it was noted the windows are original on the north façade. So he asked if the north could be recommended as primary.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas didn't recall that many were original. It is a vernacular structure and didn't know of other character defining features.

Member Powell asked if she would not consider the north as primary.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed. It is not any different than the street-facing façade.

Member Powell said it is unique in this neighborhood.

Member Biedscheid asked if it is a private drive on the north.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it serves three houses total, including this one.

Mr. Rasch said that means it is considered a public way.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Anthony Garcia, 235 Garcia, was sworn. Mr. Garcia thanked the staff for their help and their patience. He agreed with their recommendations.

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 Powell asked Mr. Garcia what he thought about the north elevation.

Mr. Garcia said definitely not. You can see the mail box that has been run over. That whole area needs to be fixed for safety.

Member Powell made an inaudible statement.

Mr. Garcia did not believe it should be primary. It would complicate things. It was his grandfather's, his father's and will be his son's house. And it needs to be modernized.

Member Boniface asked him if he could tell the Board about what appears to be a stuccoed over brick parapet.

Mr. Garcia said his Dad did that. It seems like yesterday. He was not certain, but believed it was to give it more structural integrity.

Member Boniface said some people cover over what looks old. We are not discussing remodeling tonight but think about bringing the brick parapets and exposing them and uncovering the stuccoed over sills too. That would be wonderful to bring back the history of the house.

Member Powell made a comment.

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-17-099 at 235 Delgado Street this case to follow staff rec and make west elevation primary. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Member Bayer asked that the motion exclude the stoop and rock wall. Member Boniface agreed, and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-17-100. 118 East Santa Fe Avenue.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Cherry See Reames Architects, agent for Brainy Lewis, owner, requests historic status review with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for a contributing residential structure. (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

118 East Santa Fe Avenue is a contributing Bungalow style single family residence located within the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The house was built by the Andrews Family around 1917 and is an excellent example of the Bungalow style properties located in the Don Gaspar Area that were built in the early part of the twentieth century. The architectural history, architectural drawings, and a Historic Cultural Properties Inventory form are provided for the Board's review. The applicant is requesting that the historic status of the house be upgraded to significant.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A *structure*, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H District.

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

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.

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 an upgrade of the historic status of the house from contributing to significant per the applicants request and in compliance with 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to Staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Tina Reames, 220 Gold SW was sworn. She thanked Staff for reviewing and making the recommendation. The owner just wants to upgrade it to help preserve the nature of the house.

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 Powell moved in Case #H-17-100 at 118 East Santa Fe Avenue, to approve the application as submitted with staff recommendation to upgrade the property to significant status. Member Boniface seconded the motion.

Member Biedscheid clarified that the shed has no status. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Member Roybal was not present for the vote.

9. **Case #H-16-078, 564 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Bransford Builders, agent for Roy and Linda New, owners, request to increase the height of a non-contributing accessory structure to 12'0" where the maximum allowable height is 14'9". (Nicole Ramirez Thomas)

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

564 Garcia Street is a Spanish-Pueblo Revival style residential structure that is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. No remodel is proposed for the home. The applicant came to the Board for a request to build a 576 square foot free-standing garage in the place of a carport in 2016. The applicant received a red tag from the Historic Inspector at the time of the interim inspection because the drawings on file did not match what was constructed.

The applicant requests the following:

- 1) The application was approved for a garage height of 10'-6". The applicant constructed the garage and added a necessary 1'-6" to accommodate the garage doors. He had drawn the 10'-6" of the garage in error and is now requesting the additional 1'-6" of height. The maximum allowable height is 14'-9".
- 2) In addition, the applicant is requesting approval of the installation of French doors on the east elevation of the garage and installation of a window on the south side of the garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project 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

Member Boniface noted the report said the builder did not ask for interim inspection. He asked if she knew why.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas didn't know. She explained that interim inspections are not called for in the code and sometimes that causes a problem.

Member Powell said the Board is discussing the height being what was changed and alterations to the building. He asked if that requires a separate application.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said no.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Joseph Bransford, 3000 Governor Mechem Road was sworn.

Vice-Chair Katz asked why this happened.

Mr. Bransford said "I don't do much work in historic districts and was not familiar with interim inspections. As for going too high, that was my mistake when I put 10' 6" on the plan. To get a slope and parapet, it had to be higher.

As for the window, the owners wanted a window and I said I could put it in. I knew nothing about historic inspections.

Member Powell said he thought it was standard practice.

Mr. Bransford said he did get a permit.

Mr. Rasch said it is a challenge for our inspectors. The City inspectors approve them in the field because they have no board to report to when it is outside the historic districts. No style is required. Our inspector has to make sure of all of that.

Member Powell said he just did a project outside the historic district and had to submit an application.

Mr. Rasch said it doesn't always happen.

Member Roybal asked if it would have been approved.

Mr. Bransford said the French doors were submitted to Staff.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed.

Mr. Bransford said when he originally drew up the plans, there was a leaning carport ready to fall over and they wanted a garage so when he submitted plans, it was his mistake to have the roof without a slope and to bring it to code, it must have a minimum quarter-inch slope and parapets.

Member Roybal reasoned that the additions he made do comply to code.

Mr. Bransford agreed and added that it all was inspected.

Member Powell appreciated him coming to the Board. So often people bypass the application process.

Mr. Bransford said it was his mistake.

Questions to the Applicant

Member Boniface asked if the window shouldn't comply with the 30" rule.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said it does have 30" on diagonal

Member Boniface said the drawing did not appear to comply.

Mr. Bransford said it is 8' from a plastered wall. The window is 48" wide and 52' tall.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she was incorrect. So an exception is required for that window or replace with a divided-lite window.

Mr. Bransford said he could do that. He could put in a divided lite and can just order the sashes for that.

Public Comment

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

Action of the Board

Member Boniface moved in Case #H-16-078 at 564 Garcia Street, to approve the application as recommended with the condition that the window on the south side be made compliant to meet the 30" diagonal dimension and ask that the applicant speak with Ms. Ramirez Thomas before ordering the window. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

Member Biedscheid asked for a friendly amendment that the drawings be revised and submitted to Staff for review and approval. Member Boniface accepted that as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Vice-Chair Katz announced the next meeting is December 12.

J. ADJOURNMENT


The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Approved by:



Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Jr.