



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 10/8/08 TIME 1:00pm

SERVED BY Quam

RECEIVED BY S. J. [Signature]

AMENDED

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 26, 2008

September 9, 2008

September 23, 2008

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Case #H-08-105. Santa Fe Railyard Depot. Adjacent to a landmark structure. David Pennington, agent for New Mexico Department of Transportation, proposes to remodel the train station area for the Rail Runner near the Santa Fe Depot Landmark by construction of a sidewalk, a boarding platform to a maximum height of 4', and a kiosk to a maximum height of approximately 11'6". An exception is requested to construct a pitched roof on the kiosk where a pitched roof is not allowed (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)(d)). (David Rasch)

I. OLD BUSINESS

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-106. 514 Johnson Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rudy & Julie Rodriguez, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by replacing all doors and windows including location and dimensions, raising the building height to 14'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'7", construct an approximately 130 sq. ft. portal, reduce an approximately 201 sq. ft. portal to 59 sq. ft., remove an existing wood shed, construct an approximately 39 sq. ft. addition and alter existing gate opening and construct yardwalls to a maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-08-107. 130 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Lincoln Partners LTD, proposes to remove an exterior escalator and enclose approximately 144 sq. ft. for an elevator and remodel a stairway of a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

3. Case #H-08-108. 433 Delgado Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles Ash, agent for Joel & Suzanne Sugg, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by removing a non-historic pergola and portal and construct a 109 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height, and 785 sq. ft. portal, and raising parapets to match existing adjacent height to screen the portal and skylights. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-08-109. 233 ½ Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to demolish a 1,692 sq. ft. non-contributing residence and construct a 2,638 sq. ft. residence to the maximum allowable height of 14'10" and construct a 6' high yardwall and vehicle gate. (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-08-111A. 434 San Pasqual Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owner/agent, proposes a historic status review of a contributing residence for a potential downgrade. (David Rasch)

Case #H-08-111B. 434 San Pasqual Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a residential structure which includes a 360 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15', redesign the pedestrian gate area, and construct a 212 sq. ft. sombra on the south lotline to a height of 9'. (David Rasch)
6. Case #H-08-112. 218 Don Gaspar. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts, proposes to remodel the St. Francis Hotel, a significant commercial building by replacing a door with a nicho infill, replacing a window with a door, stucco surface a wooden access gate and remodel the dining courtyard with changes in opening locations and dimensions and creating new openings where openings do not exist. An exception is requested to alter primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-114. 209/215A Polaco Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Norman and Barbara Yoffee, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing property by constructing a 255 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height, replacing the metal roof in-kind, constructing a 6' high yardwall and wooden pedestrian gate, and constructing a 274 sq. ft. free-standing structure in the rear yard to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 15'2". An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule for the addition (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-110. 123 E. Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for 100 San Francisco Partners, LLC, proposes to remodel the ally between significant and non-contributing commercial properties by construct a 4' high 12' wide metal vehicle gate, a 6' high coyote fence along the west side of the alley, and a 7' high coyote fence to screen trash bins and electric meters. (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-08-115. 149 Candelario Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Ann Galloway, owner/agent, proposes to relocate and construct a wood fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the October 14, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, October 14, 2008.

3. Case #H-08-108. 433 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles Ash, agent for Joel & Suzanne Sugg, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by removing a non-historic pergola and portal and construct a 109 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height, and 785 sq. ft. portal, and raising parapets to match existing adjacent height to screen the portal and skylights. (David Rasch)
4. Case #H-08-109. 233 ½ Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to demolish a 1,692 sq. ft. non-contributing residence and construct a 2,638 sq. ft. residence to the maximum allowable height of 14'10" and construct a 6' high yardwall and vehicle gate. (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-08-111A. 434 San Pasquel Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owner/agent, proposes a historic status review of a contributing residence for a potential downgrade. (David Rasch)

Case #H-08-111B. 434 San Pasquel Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a residential structure which includes a 360 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12'4" where the maximum allowable height is 15', redesign the pedestrian gate area, and construct a 212 sq. ft. sombra on the south lotline to a height of 9'. (David Rasch)
6. Case #H-08-113A. 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes a historic status review of a non-contributing residence and garage. (David Rasch)

Case #H-08-113B. 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes to remodel the residence and garage by replacing windows and other minor alterations. (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-112. 218 Don Gaspar. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts, proposes to remodel the St. Francis Hotel, a significant commercial building by replacing a door with a nicho infill, replacing a window with a door, stucco surface a wooden access gate and remodel the dining courtyard with changes in opening locations and dimensions and creating new openings where openings do not exist. An exception is requested to alter primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-114. 209/215A Polaco Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Norman and Barbara Yoffee, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a contributing property by constructing a 255 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height, replacing the metal roof in-kind, constructing a 6' high yardwall and wooden pedestrian gate, and constructing a 274 sq. ft. free-standing structure in the rear yard to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 15'2". An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule for the addition (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)
9. Case #H-08-110. 123 E. Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for 100 San Francisco Partners, LLC, proposes to remodel the ally between significant, non-contributing, and contributing commercial properties by construct a 4' high 12' wide metal vehicle gate, a 6' high coyote fence along the west side of the alley, and a 7' high coyote fence to screen trash bins and electric meters. (David Rasch)
10. Case #H-08-115. 149 Candelario Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Ann Galloway, owner/agent, proposes to relocate and construct a wood fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the October 14, 2008 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, October 14, 2008.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
October 14, 2008

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes		
August 26, 2008	Postponed	2
September 9, 2008	Approved as amended	2
September 23, 2008	Approved as amended	2-3
Approval of Findings and Conclusions	None	3
Communications	Discussion	3-4
Business from the Floor	None	4
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>Case #H 08-105</u> Santa Fe Railyard Depot	Approved with conditions	4-8
Old Business	None	8
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-106</u> 514 Johnson Lane	Approved with conditions	8-11
2. <u>Case #H 08-107</u> 130 Lincoln Avenue	Approved as recommended	11-13
3. <u>Case #H 08-108</u> 433 Delgado Lane	Approved with conditions	13-15
4. <u>Case #H 08-109</u> 233½ Delgado Street	Approved with conditions	15-28
5. <u>Case #H 08-111A</u> 434 San Pasqual Street	Status changed to non-contributing	18-20
<u>Case #H 08-111B</u> 434 San Pasqual Street	Approved with conditions	20-22
6. <u>Case #H 08-112</u> 218 Don Gaspar	Postponed with instructions	22-27
7. <u>Case #H 08-114</u> 209, 215A Polaco Street	Approved with conditions	27-29
8. <u>Case #H 08-110</u> 123 E. Water Street	Postponed with instructions	29-32
9. <u>Case #H 08-115</u> 149 Candelario Street	Approved with conditions	32-33
Matters from the Board	None	33
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:55 p.m.	34

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

October 14, 2008

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker
Mr. Dan Featheringill [arriving later]

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Two Vacancies

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Kelley Brennan, City associate Attorney
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. August 26, 2008

Ms. Shapiro noted that Ms. Rios, in the minutes, had seconded many of the motions she herself had made.

Mr. Boaz said he would figure it out and make the corrections.

Ms. Rios noted that on page 26, in the 9th paragraph, she had been referring to Ms. Shapiro's parents. **She also suggested that they postpone the approval of the minutes.**

2. September 9, 2008

Ms. Rios said on page 25 in the eighth paragraph, asked that there be a period after the word "proposal," and that the rest of the sentence be left out because it did not make sense.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the September 9, 2008 minutes as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. September 23, 2008

Ms. Walker requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 11, fourth paragraph, the word had been "proliferate," not "promote."

On page 13, and others, it should be "Mr. Malmud."

On page 14, Ms. Abbey did not reside at 653 East Site 22 but at "653 E. Barcelona Court."

On page 15, she said The New Mexican had done an editorial, and a site visit and had said the poles had made noise. She said what they had actually said was that the boxes sounded like washing machines. She also noted that at the bottom of the page, it should read "Mr. Geoffreys who lived at 832 Camino Ranchitos."

On page 22, in the second paragraph, the word should be "palette," not "pallet."

On page 26, and elsewhere, the name "McPortion" should be "McPartland" Roofing.

Mr. Featheringill arrived at this time.

Ms. Shapiro requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 5, fourth paragraph from the bottom, the word "like" should be deleted.

On page 26, the third sentence from the bottom, it should read "Ms. Shapiro asked if you had installed them before."

Ms. Rios requested the following change to the minutes:

On page six, fourth paragraph, it should read "Vice Chair Rios said she originally was not happy with the coyote fence, but after hearing the fence would be open and far from the street, she was okay with the fence as presented."

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve the September 23, 2008 minutes as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

None.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said the Drury Inn project requested a session with the Board to discuss their program and their needs, as well as the Board's needs for preservation of the historic buildings. He said they also wanted to get on the same page regarding jurisdiction over facades. He said they proposed either a separate venue and date from an HDRB meeting, as an informational study session. He said in that case, they would have the minute-taker present, and said they would put up a notice, and could hear public comment, but no action would be taken. He said it would probably be done in the community room in the library. He said they could also do a study group, which was a non-quorum number of members of the Board, meet in the Board's room upstairs. He said they could also have the information given at a regular meeting.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan if they were not supposed to have study sessions with only a few Board members because it became ex parte.

Ms. Brennan agreed but said they could have it as a public study session.

Ms. Walker said it was such a massive project, and had such a potentially huge impact, that she felt they should have a separate meeting for it.

Ms. Rios said it would not be ex parte if the Board had an informational session, and gave notice and invited the public.

Ms. Brennan said they would need a quorum for it to not be ex parte.

Chair Woods asked if they had a light agenda coming up.

Mr. Rasch said the first meeting in November had only eight cases, but there were no second meetings in November or December.

Ms. Walker said they could schedule a second meeting in November. She said they would have more members of the public because they would not have to sit through so many other cases.

Mr. Rasch said he would prefer, if the Board did decide to schedule a separate informational meeting, that they have it at an outside location, like the library, so that it was on "neutral turf."

Chair Woods asked about a Chapter 14 update at the meeting as well.

Mr. Featheringill thought that would be okay. He said that, during many of the informational meetings, the Board ended up making suggestions, and the suggestions were often brought back as decisions. He said they needed to be careful because it could be misleading to the applicant. He thought it would be better to make the decision at the informational meeting.

Chair Woods said she understood.

Mr. Rasch said the informational meeting might be at the Convention Center if he could get a room.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1 **Case #H-08-105.** Santa Fe Railyard Depot. Adjacent to a landmark structure. David Pennington, agent for New Mexico Department of Transportation, proposes to remodel the train station area for the Rail Runner near the Santa Fe Depot Landmark by construction of a sidewalk, a boarding platform to a maximum height of 4', and a kiosk to a maximum height of approximately 11' 6". An exception is requested to construct a pitched roof on the kiosk where a pitched roof is not allowed (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)(d)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch explained that they would vote on the proposal. He said he tended to put all government projects under the Administrative Matters portion of the agenda because they had a different format.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"The Santa Fe extension of the Rail Runner service will terminate in Santa Fe near the Depot which is listed as a landmark in the City of Santa Fe register. The Depot was constructed in the Mission Revival style with a clay tile pitched roof and a heavy pebble dash stucco finish. The Board is charged with purview over adjacent construction to ensure that the landmark status of the Depot will not be degraded (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(b)).

"The applicant proposes to remodel the Depot site with the following five items.

"1. A kiosk will be constructed on the terminal platform to the south of the Depot. The kiosk will have a central support pole that is wrapped with information panels on the bottom and a hexagonal cantilevered standing-seam pitched roof at 11' 2" high. The top finish of the support pole should be clarified.

"An exception is requested to construct a pitch where a pitch is not allowed (Section 14-2.5(D)(9)(d)), although the nearest surrounding structures including the Depot and the other landmark the Gross Kelly Warehouse do have pitched roofs, and the required responses are attached.

"2. A raised platform will be constructed to the north of the Depot. The platform will be surfaced with colored stamped concrete possibly representing brick. A simple metal handrail will be installed at a maximum height of 4'.

"3. Visible detectable warnings will be installed along the edge of the terminal platform.

"4. A brick-surfaced sidewalk will be installed that runs from Guadalupe Street to the terminal platform by way of the north side of the Depot.

"5. A vertical sign at 11' high will be installed near the sidewalk entrance to the station on Guadalupe Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application with the exception request for a pitched roof on the kiosk, as these adjacent alterations do not mimic or degrade the landmark status of the Depot building."

Mr. Chris Blewett, from Albuquerque, was present and sworn. He said he wished to explain some of the proposal in more detail. He began by apologizing for the eleventh hour appearance. He said they had tried to follow all the protocol, and this was one that got away from them. He said he would be very brief but wanted to explain what they were proposing. He showed an overview of the railway area, and the existing lot. Then he showed the features in an overlay.

Mr. Blewett said the edge of the existing platform had deteriorated considerably, so they had to install an edge with a warning strip for safety, and to meet ADA requirements. He said they had built the

foundation on an administrative approval. He said it was a block of cement with a lip. He showed what it would look like with the strip on it.

Mr. Blewett said the level of the cars were not level with the existing platform so they had to provide a place for level boarding. He said it was called a "mini-high," and it would be higher by a foot to provide a level area with the passenger car floor with a fold out ramp from the train, which was made of fiberglass to bridge the gap. He said it was set back about two feet from the platform. He showed the ramp and the handrail for it, which was also required by the ADA. He said most of them were silver, but they could make it any color the Board thought was appropriate. He said it was 12' wide and 17' long, and on the north end of the platform. He said only one ramp was needed. They were larger in Albuquerque, and some had two with canopies. He said the one they were proposing was the most basic concept. The floor would not be stamped concrete but would be of the bricks they stored from the old platform.

Mr. Blewett said the kiosk was where they stored information like schedules, maps, connections, a phone for emergencies, and a speaker. He showed where it would be located and a drawing of what it would look like. They would use treated concrete but no tile. They would have a giant gravel parking lot with hard surfaced walkways out to Guadalupe Street where the City would provide the shuttle service. He noted he had brought samples of colors for the Board to choose from. He said the walkway was about eight feet wide. He said the vertical sign would be on Guadalupe to indicate that they were close to the Rail runner Station. He said it was a way-finding device for people to find the station.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Blewett to show the image of the kiosk again. She said most people were under seven feet tall, and thought the kiosk should be 8' high, and the roof diameter should be less. She said her other suggestion was that, on the raised platform, the sides of the raised platform be earth-toned.

Mr. Blewett said that could be done.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the drawing in the packet had an expanded view. Mr. Blewett agreed.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they could make the roof more like a shed roof.

Mr. Blewett there were a lot of things they could do if it worked structurally.

Mr. Featheringill said he had heard about stamped concrete. He said he hoped they could have real bricks everywhere.

Mr. Blewett agreed they could either use the saved bricks from the old platform, or match them closely.

Mr. Featheringill said that would work.

Ms. Rios noted the edge was concrete and asked if it could be brick.

Mr. Blewett said it would be covered with the yellow warning strip.

Mr. Rasch said the edges would not be earth-toned.

Mr. Blewett said he thought they could make them earth-toned.

Ms. Rios asked if the warning strips had to be yellow.

Mr. Blewett said that was the requirement.

Ms. Rios asked if they could get the height down to 8'.

Mr. Blewett said they would do what they could to bring it to that height.

Ms. Rios suggested they do a pitched standing seam roof. She said they could use steel on the sides to hold it up.

Mr. Blewett said they could work with that.

Chair Woods said the top of the pitch had to be higher. She said the bottom should be at 8'.

Ms. Rios asked how wide it would be.

Mr. Blewett said it would be 3 to 3.5 feet wide. He said the roof should go out a couple of inches more, maybe four to five feet.

Ms. Shapiro was concerned with the roof color. She asked if they could bring the color to staff for approval. Mr. Blewett agreed.

Ms. Shapiro suggested if they used cement, it should be colored or stuccoed. She said the bricks were much lower at the edge. She asked if they would bring them up.

Mr. Blewett said the edge was about 6", and they wanted to make sure it was level throughout.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they had kept enough bricks.

Mr. Blewett said he thought there were. He said it depended on the pattern they would use. He said he did not know without knowing how much coverage they needed. He said if there were extra, they might just save the bricks to replace damaged ones on the platform.

Mr. Featheringill said there was a sign in front of the Kelly Warehouse. He said they could use that design and tie it all together. He said he thought the newer brick should be used for the walkway away

from the station.

Ms. Walker asked about the visible detectable warnings. She said, in downtown, they had used a reddish earth tone, and said now, all of a sudden it was no longer acceptable. She asked if the reddish one was on the list the federal government had put out.

Mr. Blewett said he would check it out.

Mr. Rasch said there were six two-foot wide panels on the kiosk.

Mr. Blewett said showed the brick samples to the Board.

Chair Woods shared a little drawing for the roof. She said the Board had chosen the darker brick sample as the preferred color. She summarized the items discussed including an earth-tone on the platform and on the edge and the lowered kiosk.

Mr. Blewett said it would be most helpful to be able to start on the mini high and see if the existing bricks were okay. He said they had to order some materials for the kiosk. He said that if the Board did not want the hexagonal shape, they would need direction.

Ms. Walker said the railing should be earth-toned.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case H 08-105 with the following conditions:

1. That the kiosk be postponed, and the applicant take into account all the discussion on the kiosk,
2. That the construction of the brick walkway use the darker brick,
3. That they use an earth tone on the sides of platform and the edge of the platform,
4. That they use a red color instead of yellow for the detectable warning strips,
5. That the railing be earth-toned.
6. That the platform surface be with the reclaimed bricks from the original platform.
7. That the construction of the platform be done as submitted.
8. That the vertical sign design be brought back to the Board.

Mr. Blewett said they could make the sign shorter if that was what the Board wanted.

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

I. OLD BUSINESS

None.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 08-106.** 514 Johnson Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Rudy & Julie Rodriguez, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing building by replacing all doors and windows including location and dimensions, raising the building height to 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 7", construct an approximately 130 sq. ft. portal, reduce an approximately 201 sq. ft. portal to 59 sq. ft., remove an existing wood shed, construct an approximately 39 sq. ft. addition and alter existing gate opening and construct yardwalls to a maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence located 514 Johnson Lane was originally constructed in the 1950 but burned extensively in 1989 according to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The applicant has been provided information by the realtor that a fire occurred in the 1960s. The existing building that was renovated after 1989 includes non-historic aluminum slider windows, a low pitch shed roof with parapets on the west elevation, and 5' 6" high stuccoed wall along the west, Johnson Lane elevation. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic Review District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following changes:

"Construct an approximately 130 square foot portal on the west, Johnson Lane facing elevation to a height of 12' 2" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 7". The portal will include wood posts, beams, carved corbels, and projecting viga beams. An interior and exterior fireplace is proposed on the west elevation.

"Reduce the existing 201 square foot portal on the east elevation to 59 square feet. The portal will be similar to the new portal on the west elevation and will be to a height of 12' 2" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 7". Also proposed for the east elevation is an approximately 39 square foot addition.

"The applicant proposes increasing the building height to 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 7". A parapet will be constructed on all elevations. The south and north elevations will include exposed viga beams with copper caps.

"All window and doors will be altered including dimensions and locations. Windows and doors will be Sierra Pacific divided light windows in either the color Teal or Harvest Cranberry.

"The building will be stuccoed with synthetic stucco in the color Adobe Brown. A cooling unit will be placed on the roof and will be concealed by the parapet. Three skylights are indicated on the floor plan.

"The applicant also proposes to reconstruct the pedestrian entrance on the west, Johnson Lane elevation. The existing 4' 2" high wall will remain the single wood pedestrian gate will be replaced with

double wood gates. The stepped stucco accent will be slightly remodeled and will be to a height of 6'. Stucco type and color need to be clarified.

"The yard wall will turn at to the south to form a 6' high courtyard wall.

"Lastly an existing non-historic temporary storage shed will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that the copper viga caps are patinized or a galvanized metal is used, that there are no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances, that wood gate finishes are clarified, and that stucco for the yard wall is clarified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Rudy Rodriguez, of 404 Camino Viejo. He said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Rios asked for the stucco type and color.

Mr. Rodriguez said he had submitted some samples.

Ms. Barrett said the samples were on page 11.

Mr. Rodriguez said he gave three possible choices for the Board to choose from.

Chair Woods said they would probably prefer Adobe Brown.

Mr. Rodriguez said they would like to use STO.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker said they preferred cementitious stucco because it was more authentic looking.

Mr. Rodriguez agreed that was fine.

Ms. Walker asked if they had received permission for their new lot coverage.

Mr. Rodriguez said the lot coverage was a little less than existing.

Mr. Rasch said it did say they needed a possible variance.

Mr. Rodriguez said the staff thought it would not be a problem.

Chair Woods said Johnson Lane was a wonderful little street. She said they showed sliding glass

doors that would be seen from the street and asked if they could do French doors.

Mr. Rodriguez agreed.

Ms. Shapiro said they had mentioned copper viga caps. She asked if they intended to put a patina on them.

Mr. Rodriguez said galvanized would be fine.

Ms. Shapiro said the copper would be a little over the top.

Mr. Featheringill liked the shape of the gate and wall but the little thin strip over the gate looked odd.

Mr. Rodriguez said he could change it.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the sides could be lowered to the same height. Mr. Rodriguez agreed.

Chair Woods summarized the Board's wishes: French doors, cementitious stucco, galvanized caps on vigas, no roof top appurtenances, and a little design of gate that could be submitted to staff.

Ms. Walker asked what finish they were going to use on the gate.

Mr. Rodriguez said it would be a wood gate.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case H 08-106 per staff recommendations, and with the following conditions:

- 1. That the stucco be cementitious,**
- 2. That they use French doors,**
- 3. That the viga caps be galvanized metal,**
- 4. That the stucco on the yard wall be Adobe Brown in color**
- 5. That the gate be redrawn and submitted to staff and that it have a natural wood finish.**

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

- 2. Case #H 08-107. 130 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Lincoln Partners LTD, proposed to remove an exterior escalator and enclose approximately 144 sq. ft. for an elevator and remodel a stairway of a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)**

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Territorial Revival style, two story, commercial building located at 130 Lincoln Avenue was constructed in the 1950s by John Gaw Meem according to the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI). The building was originally built as the Sears Department Store and now houses galleries and retail stores. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remove the partially visible exterior escalator and enclose approximately 144 square feet and install an elevator at the east, Lincoln Street elevation entrance. The existing stairway next to the escalator will also be remodeled changing in size from 8'9" to 6' 7".

"The addition will be minimally visible and will be stuccoed to match the existing color and texture. The interior area of the addition includes a standard brushed chrome door with 2" face frame painted white to match the territorial trim, a relocated light fixture, and a relocated handrail.

"No other exterior changes are proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of the application as it Complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail. He said escalators were very expensive.

Ms. Shapiro asked which light fixture they planned to relocate.

Mr. Enfield said there was one on the side inside.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they were buying new ones.

Mr. Enfield said they were not. He said the door to the elevator was metal.

Chair Woods said there was a brushed bronze door available.

Mr. Enfield said they were really expensive. He said they would consider it if the Board wanted them to. He said he turned the elevator so it did not face the front that would be stuccoed.

Ms. Walker asked about the hand rail.

Mr. Enfield said they were just moving it over to the stair.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case H 08-107 per staff recommendations. Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker asked about having Mr. Enfield's client consider the bronze door.

Mr. Enfield said he would be happy to do that.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H 08-108.** 433 Delgado Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles Ash, agent for Joel & Suzanne Sugg, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by removing a non-historic pergola and portal and construct a 109 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height and 785 sq. ft. portal, and raising parapets to match existing adjacent height to screen the portal and skylights. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

***433 Delgado Street is a 4,299 square foot single-family residence that was constructed in the Territorial Revival style in 1940. Historic 1953 and 1,471 square feet of non-historic alterations have occurred which may be considered sensitive. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The west elevation may be considered as primary.**

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

- *1. A 109 square foot addition will be constructed on the east elevation of a non-historic addition.**
- *2. An existing non-historic portal and pergola will be removed and replaced with a 785 square foot portal. The portal is designed in the Territorial Revival style and will match adjacent parapets in height**
- *3. The non-historic studio addition will have the parapet raised to match the adjacent parapet.**
- *4. Existing paired French doors on the east non-historic elevation will be relocated in position.**
- *5. In the historic 1953 addition on the southeast a picture window and grille will be replaced with two casements windows and a single door will be replaced with French doors. It is unknown if these items are historic or not.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

***Staff recommends approval of this application after there is clarification about the historic materials and historic footprint issues as they relate to the maximum allowable square footage of additions. It**

appears that the 50% footprint allowance is 1,414 which have already been exceeded in 1999 additions. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Ms. Rios asked if any part of the proposal hindered the historic status of the building.

Mr. Rasch said it had undergone many alterations. He said it was a sprawling footprint.

Present and sworn was Mr. Charles Ash who explained that the picture window was part of the '53 addition. He said they had replaced a window on the other side of the room with French doors, and could not remember why they hadn't done the others at that time. He said it was a sprawling addition done in 1999, and had kept the primary façade the same. He said there were a brick cap and a re-roofing in the 1980's, which had put the roofing against the copper and had destroyed it. He said the two French doors were off-center to match some furniture inside.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Charles Newman, 429 Delgado (and a neighbor to the property), was sworn in. He asked if there would be lighting changes on the north elevation. He said the security lighting issue often came up, so he was asking that they not install security lighting...

Mr. Ash said there were none on the north elevation.

Mr. Newman said exterior lighting should come to staff.

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

Ms. Walker said she was confused by the staff recommendation. She asked if the increased footprint needed an exception.

Mr. Rasch said he was asking the applicant to clarify how much was historic and how much was not.

Mr. Ash said in 1999, they were under 50%, and said at that time it was not historic then but now was historic. He said, on the site plan, the 1940's house was a little space, which he pointed out. He said in the '50s it had been added onto with a portal, the garage changed into a laundry room and added a dining room and family room and a new garage. He said they later added on the living room. He said it was barely under fifty percent.

Mr. Rasch said it sounded like he was okay.

Ms. Rios asked if the opening on the picture window was going to change.

Mr. Ash said it would be a little bit smaller.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were any skylights proposed.

Mr. Ash said they were proposing four flat skylights on the portal, which would not be seen and there would be one in the kitchen which was hidden.

Ms. Walker moved to approve case H 08-108 per staff recommendation with conditions that no security lights be installed, that the skylights not be visible, and that any lighting that was not shown be brought to staff for approval. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H 08-109.** 233½ Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for Richard & Nedra Matteucci, proposes to demolish a 1,692 sq. ft. non-contributing residence and construct a 2,638 sq. ft. residence to the maximum allowable height of 14' 10" and construct a 6' high yardwall and vehicle gate. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"233 ½ Delgado Street is a single-family residence that is located away from the streetscape and which was recently confirmed for non-contributing historic status to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to demolish this 2,900 square foot structure and to reestablish the streetscape with a 2,650 square foot residential building.

"The existing building is not historically important, has code violations and structural problems, and is not an essential part of a unique streetscape. Therefore, the reporting requirements have been met for the Board to entertain a demolition request.

"The proposed building is designed in the Territorial Revival style including brick parapet coping, brick sills and headers, and square posts on the front portal with accents of Mission Revival or Baroque elements including a low arched parapet and rounded elevations.

"The building is designed at the maximum allowable height of 14' 10" from grade.

"Light fixtures will be metal scones with mica windows, as submitted. Stucco will be a heavy pebble dash in "Rancho Brown". Window and door trim will be white. Exposed woodwork will be a natural pine color.

"A 6' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed along the north and west property lines. The driveway entrance will be flanked by 6' 6" high pilasters with brick caps and a rolling rusted steel

simply-designed vehicle gate will be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-3.14 Demolition of Historic Structures, 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Mr. Rasch said ARC clearance was required.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dale Zinn, P.O. Box 756, Santa Fe. He said the building there was close to the same. He said what they were demolishing was bigger than what they were putting back.

Mr. Rasch said he stood corrected.

Mr. Zinn said Ron Winters was executing a data recovery plan for ARC.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Zinn to tell the Board about the gate. She asked how visible it would be and how far back it was.

Mr. Zinn said it would be across the driveway, and would be 250 feet back.

Ms. Walker asked if the rolling rusted gate was fenestrated.

Mr. Zinn agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if the pilasters were six feet high.

Mr. Zinn agreed. He said the gate was 5' 6".

Ms. Shapiro asked if they were planning any light fixtures for the exterior.

Mr. Zinn said they had submitted some sconces like on the LANB building. He said there were eight of them, but only four were publicly visible.

Ms. Walker said they were on page 32.

Ms. Shapiro asked what size they would be.

Mr. Zinn said they were about 14" tall. He said the owner said they were on three sides.

Ms. Walker said she had a question on the colored drawings of the east elevations. She said there was something at one end that looked like a silo. She asked what it was.

Mr. Zinn said it was the rounding of the fire place. He said the walls were softening the lot. He said it was basically buried by buildings on four sides.

Ms. Walker asked why the French doors on the north elevation were not centered.

Mr. Zinn said it was because of the interior of the plan. He said the back door and front door were aligned.

Chair Woods said she had not seen a Territorial building with curved walls and brick coping.

Mr. Zinn said it was made out of adobe. He said he was trying to make it look like a pueblo building that had been Territorialized. He said he just thought it would be fun.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Leroy Huckabee was sworn in. He said he had come to see what was going to be changed. He said he lived on the north end of the property. He said he should have talked with Nedra Matteucci about it, but had not. He said he had a bunch of trees on the property line and wondered if they could put a coyote fence instead of a wall there to save the trees. He said they were nice trees.

Mr. Zinn said if they used a wall they could reduce the setback from 15'. He said if they could not work it out with zoning, he would be glad to change it to a coyote fence. He said Zoning dictated a solid wall. He said it was 14.5' from the line. He said he wanted to re-establish the driveway there. He said the intent was to keep the trees.

Mr. Huckabee said he hadn't wanted to cause any trouble. He asked if there were lights on that side.

Mr. Zinn said there were two of them on the north side. He said they would not be very high.

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

Chair Woods summarized the concerns of the Board and the public.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case H 08-109 with the condition that any exterior lights on the north side of the building be down-faced, and that the applicant work with the neighbor to save the trees. Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Ms. Rios asked that they add their approval of the demolition of the non-historic house and that the applicants try to work with zoning for use of a coyote fence to save the trees.

Ms. Walker agreed.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios noted that the letter on page 25 was dated 2005. She said it should be 2008.

5. **Case #H 08-111A.** 434 San Pasqual Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owners/agents, propose a historic status review of a contributing residence for a potential downgrade. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

434 San Pasqual Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo style before 1938. On October 22, 1990, a previous owner of the property gained unanimous permission from the HDRB to construct a second story addition which was not carried out. At that time, staff represented the building as non-contributing although both the 1983 and 1991 Historic Cultural Property Inventories recommend contributing status. On August 10, 1992, the HDRB granted permission to remodel the property with significant changes that included window replacement, conversion of the carport to a bedroom on the west, addition of another bedroom on the northeast, addition of a kitchen on the west, and an addition of a portal on the south. The heated space increased by approximately 400 square feet.

"The property is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. There appears to be no primary elevation since non-historic changes have occurred on all sides. There is only one historic window and is on the street facing elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends an historic status downgrade from contributing to non-contributing due to loss of historic materials and massing changes."

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch to clarify if there was a historic ordinance in 1990 to cover the windows.

Mr. Rasch said there was nothing on preserving historic materials or height or lot coverage.

Ms. Rios said the staff report was inaccurate. She said it had not been a unanimous vote. She said two Board members had voted against it. She asked what remained of the original footprint, and asked Mr. Rasch to describe the additions.

Mr. Rasch described each portion of the structure.

Ms. Rios asked if it had been a total window replacement.

Mr. Rasch said they had replaced all the windows except for the one historic window.

Ms. Rios asked if any openings had been changed.

Mr. Rasch said he didn't know.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there was a height change.

Mr. Rasch said none had been proposed. He said the additions met the height requirement.

Chair Woods asked if the City was the applicant.

Mr. Rasch said the owner had requested the downgrade.

John and Diana Stege, residents of 434 San Pasqual, were sworn in.

Mr. Stege said it was their first time appearing before the Board. He said they would answer any questions.

Ms. Walker said she thought the reason they wanted to change the status was because of the 50% lot coverage. She said she hated to lose a contributing house. She said she would rather that they had brought an application for what they wanted to do.

Mrs. Stege asked if they would then need to apply for a variance.

Chair Woods said there needed to be an exception.

Mr. Rasch said an exception would have to be posted, which would need to be heard at a later meeting.

Mrs. Stege said the reason they had brought it forward as a downgrade was that the house that was there had been built in 1993. She said none of the house that was there before could be seen. She said they had talked with neighbors about what it looked like. She said it faced La Paz, not San Pasqual. She said the bedroom had been the entrance. She said the old house was not really visible any more. She said that because it had been built in 1993 it was no longer historic. They had done a good job and it looked historic and what they proposed would match.

Mr. Stege said staff had suggested since all elevations were changed a downgrade was a possibility.

Ms. Rios said the Board hated to lose historic homes, but from what Mr. and Mrs. Stege had told the Board it had been encapsulated on all sides. She said she thought it called for a downgrade.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods agreed it was hard to lose a contributing structure, but the Board would compromise the historic buildings if they kept things that were not historic.

Ms. Rios moved to change the status of 434 San Pasqual Street to non-contributing, due to the alterations that had taken place. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H 08-111B. 434 San Pasqual Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John & Diana Stege, owners/agents, propose to remodel a residential structure which includes a 360 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12' 4" where the maximum allowable height is 15', redesign the pedestrian gate area, and construct a 212 sq. ft. sombra on the south lotline to a height of 9'. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"434 San Pasqual is a single-family residence that is located in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and its historic status was examined previously.

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

- "1. A 360 square foot addition will be constructed on the southeast corner of the residence. The addition will be 12' 4" high where the maximum allowable height is 15' as determined by a linear calculation. Architectural style and finishes will match existing conditions.
- "2. A free-standing 212 square foot sombra, or shade structure, will be constructed on the south side of the garden to a height of approximately 9'.
- "3. The front pedestrian gate area will be remodeled. Stuccoed pilasters will flank the gate at 7' 4" high. An existing light fixture will be reused and a duplicate will be installed so that they flank the gate. The wooden bi-leaf gate will be removed and replaced with a wooden panel bi-leaf gate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ms. Rios said on the field trip the coyote had been fairly tall. She asked what would be visible.

Mr. Rasch said just the top of the building would be visible. He said parts of the pergola could be seen about the fence.

Mr. Stege had nothing more to add.

Ms. Shapiro asked how tall and wide the existing gate was.

Mr. Stege gave the dimensions, and said the gate and pilasters were identical to those on the coyote fence.

Mrs. Stege said the pilasters would replace a little of the coyote fence. She said the reason was that they wanted to have a bell set into something that was stable.

Mr. Stege said the pilasters would not be as tall as the existing ones.

Ms. Shapiro said their house had some nice reveals, and the pilasters needed to be rounded. She asked if the light fixture would be identical. Mr. Stege agreed.

Ms. Walker said they had indicated double pilasters on page 15, and asked why they needed them, and asked why it needed to be so high. She said there could also be fenestration in the gate.

Mr. Rasch clarified that it was two faces of one pilaster.

Ms. Walker said she understood. She said she thought the pilaster was too dominating.

Mr. Stege said they could open up the top.

Chair Woods asked how tall the French door was.

Mr. Stege said it was 6' 8" tall.

Mr. Thomas Higley, of 1045 Sierra del Norte, was present and sworn. He said the top would be eight feet with the transom.

Chair Woods said she thought they had wanted to keep it the same. She said it seemed a little grand compared with the rest.

Mr. Higley said they needed to look at the east elevation. He thought the height of the addition was what they should tie into.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of existing house and the proposed height.

Mr. Stege said it was 10' 8"

Mr. Higley said the corner was 12' 6" and the new addition was 12' 4". He said there were no chimneys.

Chair Woods asked what material they were planning to use for the sombra.

Mr. Stege said they planned to use stained pine.

Ms. Rios said they needed to establish how much lower they could make the pilasters.

Mr. Higley said the pilasters were the same height as the existing coyote fence. He said they could come down to the height of the gate.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case H 08-111B per staff recommendations with the conditions that the front gate pilasters be lowered to the same height as the existing coyote fence on each side and that there be some fenestration at the top of the new gate.

Ms. Walker seconded the motion. She asked for a condition that the height of the pilasters be lowered to be even with the top of the gates instead of the top of the coyote fence.

Mr. Featheringill did not accept that condition as friendly as he thought it would look funny with the pilasters shorter than the height of the fence.

The original motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H 08-112.** 218 Don Gaspar. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts, proposes to remodel the St. Francis Hotel, a significant commercial building by replacing a door with a niche infill, replacing a window with a door, stucco surface a wooden access gate and remodel the dining courtyard with changes in opening locations and dimensions and creating new openings where openings do not exist. An exception is requested to alter primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"210 Don Gaspar Avenue, known previously as De Vargas Hotel and today as Hotel St. Francis, was constructed in the Mission Revival style by 1890. The Mission Revival courtyard wall at the northwest corner has an unknown but presumed historic date of construction. Minor remodeling has occurred and the building is listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. All façades on a significant building are considered to be primary.

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

- "1. The northwest courtyard will be remodeled with changes to the building west elevation, perimeter yardwalls, and inner courtyard.

"Two windows on the courtyard facing west elevation will be removed and the openings lengthened for doors. The submitted drawings reveal that the lower portions are below the perimeter walls, but no drawings were submitted to show these detail changes. An exception is requested to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are attached.

"The perimeter yardwalls will have new openings where openings do not exist and closing an existing opening with an exception requested to alter openings on primary elevations (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are attached. The changes include creating two arched window openings flanking the arched doorway opening on the north elevation, adding another arched window opening on the west elevation, and closing an arched doorway opening on the west elevation. The window openings will be installed with iron grilles.

"The existing wooden pedestrian gate on the north elevation will be removed and replaced with iron gates.

"The iron grilles and gates appear to be of a simplified design, but no specific details were submitted.

"A stuccoed kiva fireplace will be constructed in the northwest corner with the chimney extending above the wall. No details or elevation drawings were submitted.

"A central fountain will be constructed. No details or elevation drawings were submitted.

"Existing wooden screen walls at the rear of the courtyard will be stucco finished.

"2. An existing sealed pedestrian door on the east elevation will be removed and the opening infilled with stuccoed wall to create a nicho for a St. Francis sculpture. The sculpture design was not submitted.

"3. An existing wooden board fence and gate on the west elevation will be removed and replaced with a stuccoed wall in the same location at a slightly taller height. Details about the gate were not submitted.

"4. An existing window on the south elevation will be removed and replaced with a pedestrian door in the same height and width. An exception is requested to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are attached.

"A stuccoed yardwall will be constructed to enclose the new outdoor space by matching the height of adjacent yardwalls.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of the exception request to create openings where openings do not exist or close existing openings in historic elevations unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to approve the proposal. Staff requests that details which were not submitted are clarified during the hearing.

Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch to give details of the definition of "significant."

Mr. Rasch read the definition of Significant from the code definitions section. "A structure located in a historic district approximately fifty years old or older that embodies the distinctive features of a type, period, or method of construction. A structure may also be designated as significant for its association with places or individuals important on a local, regional, or national level. In order for a structure to be designated as significant it must retain a high level of historic integrity. A structure may also be significant if it is listed in or is eligible to be listed in the state register of cultural properties or the national register of historic places." (Section 14-12.1 – Definitions)

Chair Woods asked for clarifications on it. She asked Ms. Brennan to tell what the Board's jurisdiction over this building was.

Ms. Brennan said she had been looking into the purview of the Board generally. She said the statutory provision gave the municipality the right to adopt and enforce regulations and restrictions within the historic district. She read from the ordinance. She said it included structures that were visible from any public place.

Publicly visible meant when a building or a portion was visible from a public street or other areas to which the public had legal access. It did not need to be adjacent to a public street. She said in her opinion, those public areas would include the public areas of the hotel including the lobby and the restaurant, etc. The façade included everything from the grade up.

Chair Woods asked if the courtyard area behind the wall was under the jurisdiction of the Board because it was a public area; a publicly accessible area.

Ms. Brennan agreed.

Ms. Walker noticed that in the report, the phrase "no details were submitted" had been repeated several times. She asked if those details had appeared.

Mr. Rasch said they had not.

Ms. Walker asked how the Board could consider the application since it was incomplete.

Mr. Rasch said he thought the applicant had thought those details were not in a publicly visible place. He said the applicant could submit some of them that night.

Chair Woods said Ms. Brennan had said that the area, because it was accessible to the public, was under the Board's jurisdiction. She said they needed the drawings.

Ms. Brennan said it constituted a public place.

Ms. Rios asked if the openings that had been proposed to be altered were all historic openings.

Mr. Rasch said certainly the three windows that had been turned into doors and the door that had been turned into the nicho were historic with historic openings. He said he had put the burden of proof on the applicant about the interior walls.

Ms. Rios asked if it was 118 years old.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 460 Cerrillos Road. He explained the elements around the building. He said they planned to stucco the wall in the back. He said the gate would remain without change. He said the whole wall would remain. He showed the stone that surrounded door in the front that they would like to make into a nicho. He said he had not submitted the sculpture because they had not selected a sculptor yet. He said the door used to be for a restaurant before the 1986 renovation. He said he believed the surround was historic but the door was not.

Mr. Martínez showed the window that was to be made a door on the south elevation. He said the door into the bar had originally been a window, and had been turned into a door. He said he proposed to do the same thing; to replicate the windows above with solid panels. He said he understood it required an exception if possible. He said the iron work in the gate was very simple. He said it was the existing iron work on the building itself.

Mr. Martínez pointed out the gate location. He said they opened onto the sidewalk at that time. He said they couldn't do it at that time, so they had pushed them in so they would not open onto the sidewalk. He said the kiva fireplace would have only the chimney visible. He said he had not realized the things in the courtyard would be needed that night. He said the door had been put in 1976, so it was not historic.

Mr. Martínez said they were going from hallways out to the court yard. He said he was proposing doors as on the other side to replicate exactly the windows that existed. He said that was on the west elevation. He said it was on the inside from the restaurant to the courtyard. He said he had not intended any of the things he had proposed to change the status. He said the owner had asked for the things to help the operation of the hotel. He said he was willing to submit more drawings.

Mr. Karl Sommer was sworn. He said he had met with Mr. Rasch that day and had spoken with Mr. Martínez and said it was evident more details were required. He said the renovation of the hotel was important to Mr. Long, and said he was in the business of renovating historic hotels. He said he had done several in New Mexico using authentic materials and styles, and not things that imitated or were done elsewhere.

He said the interior was going to be totally renovated. He said the details were important to them and to the Board. He asked the Board to please give their concerns about the Nicho. He said Mr. Long was

sensitive to that. He said they were not quibbling with the regulations. He said they thought these things were within the Board's jurisdiction.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods said they had a very pristine building that was significant. She said she did not think the Board wanted to stucco over a door. She said the historic windows had not been messed with. She said that laid the groundwork. She said the kiva fireplace introduced a pueblo element that did not exist there. She said it was very important to maintain the building and its materials.

Ms. Rios agreed. She said they had to by ordinance, and they would be remiss if they didn't hold up the ordinance. She said they had to retain a high level of integrity in materials. She said they wanted to change those beautiful windows that had been there a long time and she was very reluctant to remove the windows. She asked if they had proof of the non-historic elements.

Mr. Martínez said they were in the 1986 drawings.

Ms. Walker said she felt it was not helpful to do it in bits and drabs. She suggested they postpone the case until they got those things.

Chair Woods said it was not fair to the applicant. She said they needed to help them understand what was not acceptable.

Ms. Shapiro said she was concerned about the courtyard changes. She asked if some changes had been done in 1984. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Shapiro felt the changes would just compromise it more.

Chair Woods asked if the opening in the wall was new.

Mr. Martínez said it was as far as he could tell. He said the gates were shown on the 1986 drawings. He said he could show them to staff. He said he could not find anything on the wall but said it had been added after the building had been built.

Ms. Walker said the history library was very useful.

Mr. Martínez said there were lots of photos of the front, but they could not find any of the wall.

Mr. Featheringill asked if it showed the existing structures in the 1986 blueprints.

Mr. Martínez said there had been extensive remodels that had put bathrooms in many of the rooms, and had added fire doors and fire escapes.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they were saying the gates were new in the drawings. He asked if they showed what had been there before.

Mr. Martínez said they didn't.

Mr. Featheringill said the plan view should show it.

Ms. Walker said they should find out who the project manager had been.

Chair Woods said the Nicho would be difficult. She was concerned about the kiva fireplace in the courtyard since this was not a pueblo building. She did not see closing off the gate on the far right as a problem, but the arches around the building reminded her of McDonald's and they might be a problem.

Mr. Rasch said the interior courtyard was a historic element.

Chair Woods said it would be important.

Mr. Sommer said their research revealed that the wall was not historic. He said it was a pueblo style wall, and it was an element that was not in character with the rest of the building. He said it was an alteration on the interior, and if it was non-historic, he did not think it made a difference. He said he understood that the courtyard was important.

Chair Woods said it was important to determine if it was historic or not and asked what the fenestration patterns would look like. She said she was speaking for herself but sensed it was the Board's response. She thought it should be postponed for drawings and discover what elements were historic. She said if they were changing an elevation, the Board would need to see it.

Mr. Featheringill asked if there was something where they were planning to put the fireplace.

Mr. Martínez said it was an old stone fountain.

Ms. Walker said she did not necessarily think the iron gates would be an enhancement. They could open what was there without having the iron gate look. She thought it was charming the way it was.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case H 08-112 until drawings and details were made available. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H 08-114.** 209/215A Polaco Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Norman and Barbara Yoffee, owners/agents, propose to remodel a contributing property by constructing a 255 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation to match existing adjacent height, replacing the metal roof in-kind, constructing a 6' high yardwall and wood pedestrian gate and constructing a 274 sq. ft. free-standing structure in the rear yard to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 2". An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule for the addition (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"209 Polaco Street is an adobe single-family residence that was constructed before 1930 in a vernacular manner. The building has been remodeled and an exception was granted in 2002 to exceed the 50% footprint rule. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The west elevation may be considered as primary.

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

"1. A 255 square foot addition will be constructed on the north side of the residence, attached to the 2002 addition, and set back the required 10' from the primary west elevation. The addition will match existing adjacent height, style, and surface finishes. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required responses are attached.

"2. The historic and non-historic corrugated roof is deteriorated and leaking. The roof will be replaced in-kind.

"The rafter fascia will be restored to a white-painted finish.

"3. A wooden pedestrian gate and stuccoed yardwall will be constructed at the north side of the addition to the north property line. The wall will be 6' high and there will be a wooden surround and lintel to 7' 8" high.

"4. A 274 square foot free-standing library will be constructed at the rear northeast corner of the property to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 2" as determined by a radial calculation.

"The library is designed in a vernacular manner with a shed roof accent on the lower room mass. All finishes will match the residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends denial of the request to exceed the 50% footprint rule for additions unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to support the proposal. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District."

Ms. Rios asked if the proposed alteration would hinder the building's contributing status.

Mr. Rasch said they had already received an exception to the 50% rule. He thought their proposal was sensitive to the existing building

Present and sworn was Mrs. Barbara Yoffee. She said her husband could not be present. She said they had moved from Michigan. She said they had bought the property in 2002 with the idea that it would be the place where they would retire. She said they had just sold their home in Ann Arbor which they had lovingly restored and they had a very active historic board there.

She said they needed the room here for the library, and extra space for the primary residence. She said they had worked closely with their full time neighbors and eight had signed their support. She gave it to the Board, and a copy is included with these minutes as Exhibit A.

Mrs. Yoffee said they loved their neighbors and had especially worked with their neighbor on the north who had given them a zero lot line permission. She said they did not have windows on that side and said she would not see the library. She said their architect was also there to answer specific details on their plan. She said they would build it so it would follow the line of the existing shed on the line they shared.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Ms. Ellen Bradbury said she was present to support the project. She said they had done the original remodeling, and had done so to retain the historic nature of it. She said it had a wonderful apricot tree that the subsequent owner had cut down, and she didn't know if the person had got permission for his remodel. She said they supported Mr. and Mrs. Yoffee very much in their effort to rescue the house after the illegal stray.

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

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the pedestrian door.

Mr. John Dick was sworn in. He said the new gate would be six feet high. He said the lintel was slightly over 7 feet. He added that they had a current coyote fence that was fairly high, and said they wanted it that high for security.

Ms. Rios asked if they would consider having no lintel over the gate. She said the west side was becoming more like the east side that had either no walls or very short walls.

Mrs. Yoffee said she agreed. She said there had been no gate there before. She said she had taken pictures of the gates on Alto and Closson. She said they would be willing to eliminate the lintel. She said many of them had lintels.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case H 08-114 per staff recommendations, indicating the applicant had met the criteria for an exception and with the condition that the lintel above the gate be eliminated. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 8. Case #H 08-110. 123 E. Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for 100 San Francisco Partners, LLC, proposes to remodel the alley between significant and**

non-contributing commercial properties by constructing a 4' high 12' wide metal vehicle gate, a 6' high coyote fence along the west side of the alley and a 7' high coyote fence to screen trash bins and electric meters. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"125 Water Street is a commercial Spanish-Pueblo Revival building that was originally constructed by 1883. It has been remodeled significantly during non-historic times and it is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"120 Don Gaspar Avenue, previously known as the National Hotel, Normandie Hotel, and Montezuma Hotel, is a commercial Territorial building that was originally constructed by 1883. Historic alterations have occurred, the building was successfully restored recently, and it is listed as significant to the district.

"A steel tube "farm and ranch" gate was installed at the streetscape between the two buildings and approximately 7' high interior coyote fences were installed along both sides of the alley without historic preservation approval or a permit and a stop work order was issued.

"Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the two items as described below.

"1. The vehicle gate that was installed 14' back from the curb will be removed and replaced with a dark green painted steel gate as designed. [Exhibit B]

"2. The coyote fences and coyote gate that was installed 40' back from the curb will be lowered in height. The maximum allowable height for an interior fence on a commercial property is 8'. The west fence will be lowered to no higher than 7' with variegated latilla tops and the gate and east fence will be lowered to no higher than 6'.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application, although there is only one other vehicle gate in the streetscape and no coyote fences, which complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District."

Chair Woods asked if the coyote fence had been put in without the applicants coming before the Board. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Dale Zinn said they had not done it. He said it had been put up by Lockwood Construction by order of Theo Raven. He said the owner had agreed but had not realized it had been done without permission. He said it was on his client's property. He said the other controversy was that there was access through the alley, and said they had to unlock the gate or step over it. He said they wanted to prevent people from parking in it.

Mr. Zinn said that in a discussion with the owners and Mr. Mark Basham the attorney, they agreed to shorten the gate by three feet to allow pedestrian access, and said it would be locked to prevent vehicles. He said there were businesses back there, and they needed commercial trash pickup there. He disclosed that his clients had installed the brick there without permission. He said there was a security problem in the back with drug dealing and a suicide.

Ms. Rios said they needed some help.

Mr. Zinn said if the Board wanted something other than a coyote fence, they should suggest it.

Ms. Rios said the gate was not aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the gate design was in the packet.

Chair Woods asked what else would work for the applicants.

Mr. Zinn said St. Francis had put three jersey barriers there. He said it would be less annoying if it was shorter.

Ms. Rios suggested a thin wrought iron fence, and said they should make the gate lighter.

Mr. Zinn said the gate had been replaced four times because people ran into it. He said the bigger issue was that he had wanted to make it as transparent as possible. He suggested that the fence could be wrought iron and vertical to prevent people from climbing over it. He showed the original gate that had been there since the 1960s.

Ms. Rios said she thought the case was leaning toward postponement.

Mr. Zinn said he had made the application the previous March. He said there was not an emergency. He said it probably was annoying to John Granito. He suggested they could temporarily shorten the gate. He said he would be glad to come back with a new design.

Mr. Featheringill said he was confused by fence on left.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. John Granito, 606 Montezuma was present and sworn. They were in the building to the left. He said the gate had been constructed despite his opposition. He proposed something more open. He felt it was offensive and a security problem and also took away the light.

He said it had been open and much more pleasant before. He said there had been outrageous obstacles for them to get past to get their project done. He understood the Barkers wanted one that was

replaceable but he did not believe it had been replaced that much.

He said vertical bars would let light through and would be open, which he thought would be great. He said it was an industrial alleyway. He said he would like to see something more attractive than what was there at that time.

Mr. John Barker was sworn. He apologized. He said it had not been their plan, but it had been suggested to them by Mr. Lockwood for allowing access for Theo Raven and John Granito. He said they should have come to the Board for permission.

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

Ms. Rios moved to postpone case H 08-110 to give the applicant a chance to bring back a new fence design that would make it possible to see through the gate. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods asked the applicant to come back as soon as possible.

9. **Case #H 08-115.** 149 Candelario Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Ann Galloway, owner/agent, proposes to relocate and construct a wood fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence located at 149 Candelario St. was constructed between 1928-1934 according to the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) and includes mainly one story massing with second story projections. Alterations include massing additions, window and door alterations, and other minor remodeling. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing due to alterations.

"The applicant proposes to remove the painted wood board fence located at the northern end of the property which has been damaged by tree roots and falling limbs. A new wood board fence is proposed along the same area but will be relocated slightly to be actually on the property line. The fence is approximately 76' long and will be to the maximum allowable height of 6'. It will be painted with a design similar to the existing using the colors turquoise, sage, and periwinkle blue. The design pattern and colors have been submitted for your review.

"Also proposed is a 7 x 8 section of the same wood fence in the interior of the property. The fence is to act as a shield for a storage area. The fence will be to the maximum allowable height of 6'.

"No changes are being proposed to the non-contributing building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Ms. Rios asked what the ordinance said about having a painting on the building.

Ms. Barrett said it was only allowed under portals in the Downtown district.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ann Galloway, 149 Candelario Street. She said she had moved from Michigan and said she had never been exposed to so many rules and regulations. She said she was ignorant of all of them. She said she had been told her building was not contributing and not historic when she had purchased the property.

Chair Woods explained that she lived in a historic district and non-contributing buildings were subject to the historic ordinance.

Ms. Barrett explained that the colors should be earth tones. She said that any painting that arrested attention was prohibited. She said the painting on the fence was okay but not on the building. She said there were many fences that were painted.

Ms. Galloway said the building had just been stuccoed two years prior, and said it had started to peel off. She said she thought the plans looked beautiful. She said the stucco was bleached, and said what was under it was lighter. She said she had painted it because it would have been too costly to re-stucco all of it.

Chair Woods said the painting on the building was not allowable. She said there was a procedure they had to go through. She said she could talk with staff about it.

Ms. Shapiro asked if she was going to paint both sides of the fence.

Ms. Galloway agreed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it was painted to the property line.

Ms. Galloway said it needed to be extended out to the property line, and it would be at a straighter angle. She added that the pole needed to be pulled out to the property line.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would add another section.

Ms. Galloway said the section would extend to the pink stake.

Ms. Rios said she thought the outside should be left alone.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case H 08-115 with respect to the relocation of and continuation of the wood fence, but said the paint should be only on the inside of the fence. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Rios moved to adjourn. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Approved by:



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer