



Agenda

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, December 11, 2018 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1st FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, December 11, 2018 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 27, 2018
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-18-124A, 636 Garcia Street.

Case #H-18-098, 1258 Canyon Road.

Case #H-18-133, 531 Hillside Avenue.

Case #H-18-135A, 411 East Alameda Street.

Case #H-18-115, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue.

Case #H-18-116, 650 A Old Santa Fe Trail.

Case #H-18-132, 130 Lincoln Avenue.

Case #H-18-134, 628 ½ Camino de la Luz.

Case #H-18-136A, 525 Camino Cabra.

Case #H-18-138, 620 Camino del Monte Sol.

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

1. Case #H-18-139, 1184 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architects, agent for Sage Haven LLC, owners, proposes to construct a 3,564 sq. ft. residence and attached guesthouse to a height of 14'3" where the maximum allowable height is 16'5" on a vacant lot. (Carlos Gemora, Planner, CEGemora@santafenmn.gov, 955-6670)
2. Case #H-18-140, 828 Allendale and 338 Don Cubero Place. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Carl Batt, agent/owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct 72" high coyote fences and a 72" high pedestrian gate, repair canales, install exterior lighting, and re-stucco one non-contributing and one un-statused structure. (Gary Moquino, HPD Construction Inspector, GSMoquino@santafenmn.gov, 955-6657)
3. Case #H-18-142A, 110 Delgado Street Unit D. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, requests designation of primary elevations on a contributing structure. (Carlos Gemora)
4. Case #H-18-142B, 110 Delgado Street Unit D. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, proposes to remove concrete steps, a deck and a ramp, infill doors and windows, and install windows on a contributing structure. (Carlos Gemora)
5. Case #H-18-137, 100 East Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Loyd and Associates Architects, agent for The City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure and construct a new 1,400 sq. ft. structure to a height of 14'10". (Carlos Gemora)
6. Case #H-18-143, 627 Camino de la Luz. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Barton, agent for Continuum LLC, owners, requests a historic status review with designation of primary elevations, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential property. (Carlos Gemora)
7. Case #H-18-144, 1413 Paseo de Peralta. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Evan Geisler, agent for 1413 Paseo LLC, owners, proposes to construct a 45 sq. ft. addition, remove doors, install windows, and construct a 53" to 72" high yardwall with brick capping on a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: 12/05/2018

TIME: 10:14 AM

8. **Case #H-18-136B, 525 Camino Cabra, Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Tom Lechner, agent for Rebecca Koskela, owner, proposes to construct a 204 sq. ft. addition to a height of 13'0", a 180 sq. ft. deck, install windows, and reroof a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

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 https://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board 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

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, December 11, 2018 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1ST FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, December 11, 2018 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 27, 2018
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-18-124A, 636 Garcia Street.

Case #H-18-098, 1258 Canyon Road.

Case #H-18-133, 531 Hillside Avenue.

Case #H-18-135A, 411 East Alameda Street.

Case #H-18-115, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue.

Case #H-18-116, 650 A Old Santa Fe Trail.

Case #H-18-132, 130 Lincoln Avenue.

Case #H-18-134, 628 ½ Camino de la Luz.

Case #H-18-136A, 525 Camino Cabra.

Case #H-18-138, 620 Camino del Monte Sol.

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

1. Case #H-18-139, 1184 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architects, agent for Sage Haven LLC, owners, proposes to construct a 1,076 sq. ft. residence and an attached 1,042 sq. ft. casita to a height of 14'3" where the maximum allowable height is 16'5" on a vacant lot. (Carlos Gemora)
2. Case #H-18-140, 828 Allendale and 338 Don Cubero Place. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Carl Batt, agent/owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct 72" high coyote fences and a 72" high pedestrian gate, repair canales, install exterior lighting, stucco for a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
3. Case #H-18-141, 730 Alto Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Richard Horcasitas agents for Santa Fe Boys and Girls Club, owners, propose to install telcelcom and construct parapets to an additional height of 7'0" to conceal the equipment on a non-contributing non-residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
4. Case #H-18-142A, 110 Delgado Street Unit D. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, requests primary elevation designation of a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
5. Case #H-18-142B, 110 Delgado Street Unit D. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, proposes to remove concrete steps, a deck and a ramp, infill doors and windows, install windows and on a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
6. Case #H-18-137, 100 East Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Loyd and Associates Architects, agent for The City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure and construct a new 2,244 sq. ft. structure to a height of 14'10". (Carlos Gemora)
7. Case #H-18-143, 627 Camino de la Luz. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Barton, agent for Continuum LLC, owner, requests a historic status review with designation of primary elevations, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)
8. Case #H-18-144, 1413 Paseo de Peralta. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Evan Geisler, agent for 1413 Paseo LLC, owner, proposes to construct a 45 sq. ft. addition, removal of doors, install windows, and construct a 60" to 72" high yardwall with brick capping and a 72" high coyote fence on a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: 11/20/18

TIME: 9:35 AM

9. **Case #H-18-136B, 525 Camino Cabra. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Tom Lechner, agent for Rebecca Koskela, owners proposes to construct a 204 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12'6", a 180 sq. ft. deck, install windows, and reroof a non-contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

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 https://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board 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
December 11, 2018

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
D. Approval of Minutes - Nov. 27, 2018	Approved as amended	2-3
E. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	3
F. Business from the Floor	None	3
G. Communications	Departures announced	3
H. Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-18-139.</u> 1184 Cerro Gordo Road	Approved as recommended	4-7
2. <u>Case #H-18-140.</u> 828 Allendale and 338 Don Cubero Place	Approved with conditions	7-11
3. <u>Case #H-18-142A.</u> 110 Delgado Street Unit D	Primary designations	11-15
4. <u>Case #H-18-142B.</u> 110 Delgado Street Unit D	Approved part with conditions	15-18
5. <u>Case #H-18-137.</u> 100 East Water Street	Approved with conditions	18-23
6. <u>Case #H-18-143.</u> 627 Camino de la Luz	Made Contributing/Primaries	23-26
7. <u>Case #H-18-144.</u> 1413 Paseo de Peralta	Part approved; part postponed	26-32
8. <u>Case #H-18-136B.</u> 525 Camino Cabra	Approved as recommended	32-35
I. Matters from the Board	Comments	35
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:40 p.m.	35

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

December 11, 2018

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:

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

[one vacancy]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Carlos Gemora, Senior Planner
Mr. Gary Moquino,
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Carol Johnson, Land Use Department Director
Mr. Gregory Chakalian, 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

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Bayer, to approve the agenda as published.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 27, 2018

Member Biedscheid requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 42, 4th paragraph, second to last sentence, she believed she said, "Hotel St. Francis has an extremely large lobby and the existing floor plan labeled a garden in the current interior and she asked if there was external access there."

In the sixth paragraph, the last sentence such read, "The window seems sufficient for the current gym, and wondered if it was necessary."

In the eighth paragraph, it should say, "Member Biedscheid asked if that door would be recessed."

On page 51, fourth paragraph, first sentence, it should say, "Member Biedscheid appreciated that we can see the house and is a very nice aspect about the fence, but the opening could be accomplished with another design."

Member Boniface requested a change on page 46, fourth paragraph, the last sentence should read, "But the other thing was that on the cover photo, there is actually a white picket fence in front of it that was left out of the photograph."

MOTION: Member Boniface moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, to approve the minutes of November 27, 2018 as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed by a majority (4-0-1) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz and Roybal voting in the affirmative, none voting against and Member Bayer abstaining.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Boniface, to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-0-1) voice vote with Members Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against. Member Bayer abstained.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Stefanie Beninato said regarding the decision for the Hotel St. Francis from the last meeting, that they are part of the Heritage Hotels. The same company came in and asked for approval of a pool on the second floor at the Eldorado, which you had to approve because, other than one detail, you couldn't really see it. I'm unhappy that the idea, first of all, that this representative could come in here to talk about what the family had contributed to the community and was a 12th generation New Mexican, which was totally irrelevant. You have cut other people off with that, but you certainly didn't cut him off. As a 12th generation New Mexican, I would hope that these two men, both 12th generation New Mexicans would realize the value of water and the importance of water and the scarcity of water and not having pools and the so-called soaking tubs were using not only water for those, but also getting in and getting out. So again, next time, I understand you are bound by design, but if you are bound by design, then your staff should not be talking about economics, and certainly, whether you are a 12th generation New Mexican or you just arrived here three weeks ago, should not make a difference."

There was no other business from the floor.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Gheen formally introduced Mr. Chakalian who recently joined the staff as Assistant City Attorney and will be the "go-to person" for questions tonight. "This is my last board meeting and I have two updates."

Tomorrow, an appeal will be heard on 76 E San Francisco - the elevator appeal. And on January 9, 2019, an appeal for the Plaza del Monte regarding status and demolition.

Chair Rios introduced Director Carol Johnson as the Land Use Director.

Director Johnson announced to the Board a total of nine very interested candidates to interview this Friday for the HP Staff and also a follow up on December 17 and hope to have that position filled. David Rasch is negotiating on finances.

She presented a certificate of appreciation for Ed Boniface for his six years of service to the HDRB and wished him well.

H. ACTION ITEMS

Chair Rios asked for staff to display the case being discussed and announced to the public the procedures for appealing a decision of the Board.

1. **Case #H-18-139, 1184 Cerro Gordo Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architects, agent for Sage Haven LLC, owners, proposes to construct a 3,564 sq. ft. residence and attached guesthouse to a height of 14'3" where the maximum allowable height is 16'5" on a vacant lot. (Carlos Gemora, Planner, CEGemora@santafenmn.gov, 955-6670)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1184 Cerro Gordo is an approximately 0.25-acre vacant lot located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct a 3,600 sq. ft. residential structure which includes a one-bedroom principal house and a one-bedroom attached guesthouse. The applicant seeks to comply with Recent Santa Fe Style guidelines and would incorporate the following design features:

1. "Belle Glade" colored cementitious stucco building walls to a height of 14'-3" (16'-5" maximum height allowed). Stucco around the alcoves and under portals will be colored "Navajo White."
2. "Charcoal Smudge" colored steel fascia and canales.
3. "Classic French Grey" stained wood columns.
4. "Shale" colored metal-clad windows. All windows not under portals will have divided lites.

The south elevation is notable for large, plate-glass windows and doors which are greater than 40% of the total area but which are not publicly visible and are located under large portals in compliance with Recent Santa Fe Style guidelines (14-5.2(E)(2)(b)). The two properties to the west of 1184 Cerro Gordo are also notable for southern-facing plate-glass atriums on non-publicly visible facades.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by

retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

- (a) No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks or other design elements;
- (b) The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;
- (c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;
- (d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;
- (e) The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic; and
- (f) flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Gemora said on a winter day, a person could see through the vegetation the northern and some of the east façade, but most of it is hidden.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Trey Jordan, 227 East Palace, Suite W, was sworn and said this is a quiet, tucked in building. He stood for questions.

Questions to Applicant

Chair Rios asked him to describe the stucco color.

Mr. Jordan said it is a new color and asked if the Board did not get the sample he submitted.

Chair Rios asked if it would have sharp corners.

Mr. Gemora looked for the sample to share with the Board.

Mr. Jordan said the corners were not crisp, but slightly rounded.

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

Mr. Jordan said no.

Mr. Jordan described the stucco color as like Sahara but slightly less yellow.

Chair Rios noted there is a porch which explained the lack of divided lites.

Mr. Jordan agreed.

Chair Rios asked for the window color.

Mr. Jordan said it is Shale, which is a dark grey and he also submitted a sample sheet for that color.

Public Comment

Mr. John Eddy, 227 East Palace, Suite D, was sworn. He indicated that he had nothing positive or negative to say about this project, but about visibility and tree vegetation. We are likely to see many trees go away with climate change and will have to put an extra layer of criteria in there when there might not be so many trees.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, was sworn. She agreed with Mr. Eddy and thought the policy has been not to consider vegetation which can go away from climate change or human intervention. She wondered about allowing a non-approved color. As one for the tourists, she suggested that instead of 44 shades, you should go to 50 shades.

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

Board Discussion

Chair Rios said public visibility is very important in these cases and was not considering vegetation. If you can see a project, it affects the streetscape. And she was not saying they don't have to comply with rules and regulations in the ordinance.

Member Katz noted regarding visibility, that we don't have to wait for climate change because every winter, the leaves fall off and we are judging it on that basis. And the north and the northeast of the east façade are visible, and they are compliant. So he thought there was not a problem.

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Roybal moved, seconded by Member Boniface, in Case #H-18-139 at 1184 Cerro Gordo Road, to approve the application as recommended by Staff. It meets all the design standards.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

2. **Case #H-18-140. 828 Allendale and 338 Don Cubero Place.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Carl Batt, agent/owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct 72" high coyote fences and a 72" high pedestrian gate, repair canales, install exterior lighting, and re-stucco one non-contributing and one un-statused structure. (Gary Moquino, HPD Construction Inspector, GSMoquino@santafenm.gov, 955-6657)

Mr. Moquino presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

828 Allendale consists of a single-family residential structure, an accessory dwelling unit "guesthouse" addressed as 338 Don Cubero Place, and an accessory building (garage/studio). All the structures are built in a Pueblo-Revival or vernacular style and none are designated as contributing or significant to the Don Gaspar Historic District.

The main house was built in the early 1930's, the guesthouse was constructed as a workshop at an unknown time and became a residence no later than 1949, and the accessory building was considered "new" in 1995.

The project was issued a Stop Work Order (Red Tag) on 8/21/2018 under the section code of 14-3.11 Construction Permit for installing a window on the north elevation and 14-8.5 Walls and Fences for demolition of a block wall along Blacksmith Alley.

The applicant proposes the following for the Guest House:

1. Install a 36"x18" window on the north elevation.
2. Replace four windows with vinyl frame windows in the same dimensions and locations on the east and south elevations.
3. Install a low voltage exterior ceiling light above the entry way.
4. Maintenance of existing canales on the front of residence.
5. Re-stucco guest house with El Rey cementitious Desert Rose stucco.

The applicant proposes the following for the Studio:

1. Remove a window on the north elevation and replace it with a metal door.
2. Install a 32"x16" window on the west elevation.
3. Replace the French door with a new French door on the east elevation in the same dimensions and location.
4. Re-stucco studio with El Rey cementitious Desert Rose stucco.

The applicant also proposes to demolish an existing block wall along Blacksmith Alley and replace it with a 6' latilla fence with irregular tops and a pedestrian gate.

Install a 6' latilla fence with irregular tops going east to west and north to south between 338 Don Cubero Place and 828 Allendale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Gemora clarified that the preliminary zoning review considered only the proposed changes at this address and that the other things like number of dwelling units, parking spaces, and how the units were used. This proposal does not change any of those things and they will be addressed at time of permit.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked how much of this proposal has already been done.

Mr. Moquin said pretty much everything except for the French doors on the studio and the stucco on the studio and the front portion of the guest house have not been done yet.

Member Boniface asked, for the record, to tell the Board how many of these changes occurred before the current owners purchased this property.

Mr. Moquin said the big majority of windows were changed before except for the guest house north elevation window was not, but everything else was done after purchase - the demolition of the block wall and construction of coyote fence.

Chair Rios reasoned that the former owner did many changes without a permit and then the new owner continued without permits.

Mr. Moquin agreed.

Member Katz pointed out that the portal on the north looks in poor condition and wondered if the Applicant was going to do anything about that.

Mr. Moquin agreed, but it is not part of this application. There was no mention of any rehabilitation at that area.

Member Biedscheid asked what the status of the building is now.

Mr. Moquin said it is non-contributing.

Member Biedscheid noted that the studio is old enough to be historic and asked for its status.

Mr. Moquin said the studio is non-statused.

Member Biedscheid asked how tall the block wall was that was demolished.

Mr. Moquin thought it was six-feet high.

Member Biedscheid asked if vinyl frame windows were replacing aluminum frame windows.

Mr. Moquin said yes.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Carl Batt, 117 Duvlin, Groton, NY, was sworn. He said they plan to move to Santa Fe in two years and came across this house and purchased it. We did a modest inspection and bought it and discovered the previous owners did start quite a few things but didn't finish the work. They wanted to finish what was started and repair the portal.

Questions to Applicant

Chair Rios asked if he knew this was in a historic district.

Mr. Batt said, "We are now. I do profess a good amount of ignorance, living in upstate New York."

Chair Rios asked if he was using cementitious stucco.

Mr. Batt believed he was.

Chair Rios asked if he was proposing a metal door on the north side and if so, if he would describe that.

Mr. Batt agreed. He said the previous owner put in a small window and now he wanted to put a metal door in there. He said it does not face the street.

Chair Rios asked how many windows are being replaced.

Mr. Batt said they planned to replace a couple more in the guest house and a new window on west side of the studio.

Chair Rios noted that both buildings are being stuccoed.

Mr. Batt agreed. They are in disrepair.

Member Katz clarified that one problem in doing things without approval is doing them wrong. "One of the things you did wrong was the way you did the coyote fence on the west side. You would not have gotten approval for the coyote because support structure is on the outside where other people could see the supports. It looks like it would be fairly easy for you to change that. He explained the support structure must be on the inside, so the public just sees the latillas.

Mr. Batt agreed to make that change.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said, "I find this is an example that they didn't know they needed permits. Generally, homeowners do know they must have permits and in the process of closing, the owners must disclose to the buyer that they got permits to give a clue that the new owner needs to get permission. Or they are so ignorant they did not know it was a historic district. It is up to the Board to determine if it is appropriate or if it needs to be changed. I'm glad the coyote fence change would be a condition.

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

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid in Case #H-18-140 at 828 Allendale and 338 Don Cubero Place, to approve the application with the condition that the coyote fence have the support structure placed on the inside.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

3. **Case #H-18-142A. 110 Delgado Street Unit D.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, requests designation of primary elevations on a contributing structure. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

110 Delgado Street Unit D (originally 120 Delgado Street) is a 1,400 sq. ft. non-

residential office building designated as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The building was originally constructed as a residence in the late 1920's as part of a larger family complex and was converted into office space in the late 1990's. Though most of its footprint and windows are historic, the western façade has a non-historic wooden ramp, deck, and doors. Although the building's eastern façade has been assumed to be the primary facade, addressing complications and potentially incomplete historic reports led staff to request a formal designation of primary elevation(s).

Staff concur with the applicant's request to designate the eastern façade as the primary elevation. Though the north and south elevations contain historic windows and doors, staff find that the historic elements contributing to the district are also replicated in the more visually significant eastern, street-facing façade.

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.

14-12 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.

14-12 Primary Façade:

One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends designating the eastern, street-facing façade be designated primary per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked Staff to describe in more detail the southern elevation.

Mr. Gemora said it has historic windows and a historic door, set in 6-8 inches and a couple of concrete steps coming down with old steel pipe railing.

Chair Rios suggested that could be another primary façade.

Mr. Gemora agreed but noted it just has same features as the eastern façade.

Member Biedscheid said regarding the recommendation for primary façade designation, that on page 12, the HCPI report in the packet discusses the evolution of the garage and mentions that the original building was fenestrated only on the north, west and south elevations and that the fenestrations on the east were added at the last renovation in the fifties. She wondered about the best selections of primary façades. It seemed the primary characteristic of this building.

Mr. Gemora clarified that the evolution of the garage that was talked about was the rear unit, which again, was confused as Unit D at one point in time. He thought that unit might have had that fenestration. In this case, it seems like the eastern façade - and again, it looks like those are fairly original openings.

Member Bayer thought that it was confusing. She asked if Unit D was originally the garage in the back.

Mr. Gemora believed it was at some time, Unit D was identified as the garage in the back. That may have been in error at some point in time. Right now, Unit D is the unit we are talking about - that front house.

Member Bayer then asked if what they say is Unit D is the same Unit D now or is the garage in back. Maybe the Applicant could respond.

Member Biedscheid pointed out that the HCPI said it was once 120 Delgado, Unit D, which matches.

Mr. Gemora said they also talked about the Bernard and O'Neal Roberts house, which is 110 Delgado, Unit B. The addressing has caused some problems as is shown on pages 12-13. They talked about what was 120 is now 110 Delgado, Unit B.

Chair Rios thought Mr. Gemora's recommendation was for the east façade to be primary because it is the most prominent. It is the one facing the street.

Member Bayer asked if the portal on the east was historic.

Mr. Gemora said it was constructed in at least the 1930's because the fire insurance map shows some type of portal but probably it was added onto at some point in time, so he was unclear if it is all the portal or just part of it that is historic.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, was sworn. He said the evolution of the garage is on page 12. They had the little windows added on the north side, and there was nothing on the back side. It is talking specifically about the garage. In 1930, they show a small portal but the next aerial in 1969 shows the portal in its present configuration so that portal is from then.

We are not sure about the door and steps, but it was representative of the historic details. We are not removing that door. What we were trying to do was give it a minimal reveal by moving the door forward. We think the door is original but not the steps and ramp.

Questions to Applicant

Member Bayer asked if the door is original.

Mr. Enfield said maybe the door itself is not, but the opening probably is original.

Member Boniface disagreed with Staff that the door on the south is recessed much more than 6-8 inches. He thought it was- more like 12 inches.

Member Katz pointed out that when we have a historic building with unusual features like a recessed door. They are both visible and very historic, so he was puzzled with saying one façade has everything that is important to the house.

Chair Rios agreed. David Rasch would indicate one façade as primary and if another had same features, he would not consider it important. She had never agreed with that.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) agreed with Member Biedscheid's comment. Contributing doesn't limit a structure to one façade as primary. The footprint is historic, and part of your goal is to preserve the historic footprint so designating more than one as primary is important. The Board is to decide if one or more façades are primary. Nor is staff to inform the Board what they should decide .

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

Board Discussion

Member Katz said the Board does rely on expertise of staff and are happy to do that.

Chair Rios added that staff delves into historic records and does a lot of research. And Mr. Gemora told the Board on one case, that he spent more than 3 hours of research on the file.

Action of the Board

MOTION: **Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid, in Case #H-18-142A at 110 Delgado Street Unit D, to designate the east and south façades as primary.**

VOTE: **The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.**

- 4. Case #H-18-142B. 110 Delgado Street Unit D.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Thunderbalm Partners, owners, proposes to remove concrete steps, a deck and a ramp, infill doors and windows, and install windows on a contributing structure. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

110 Delgado Street Unit D (originally 120 Delgado Street) is a 1,400 sq. ft. non-

residential office building designated as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The building was originally constructed as a residence in the late 1920's as part of a larger family complex and was converted into office space in the late 1990's. Though most of footprint and windows are historic, the western façade has a non-historic wooden ramp, deck, and doors. East south is primary.

The applicant proposes the following changes:

1. Move a window from the north to the western façade and infill the opening.
2. Remove the non-historic wooden ramp, deck and doors on the western façade. The doors will be infilled, and a new opening will be created for the window from the north façade.
3. The door on the south façade has a deep reveal. The applicant proposes to move the door a few inches outward but will still leave at least a 3" reveal. The door and the opening will be retained.
4. Remove the concrete steps on the south façade leading to the doorway.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

Windows & Doors:

14-5.2(D)(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.

(iii) No existing opening shall be closed.

(b) For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures, architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Provided that the north, south, and west elevations are not designated primary, staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Since south is also primary, the retention of concrete steps and landing as well as changing the door would have to be considered by the Board.

Questions to Staff

Member Biedscheid asked, with the south being primary, if an exception is required.

Mr. Gemora said if the steps were considered historic, it would. For moving the door, he believed the Board thought the recess was also historic. And it seemed the wall was one foot thick and the door was recessed about half way.

Member Boniface said he looked at the photo and the shadow line seemed a little deeper than that.

Mr. Gemora reasoned that the drawing is off, then.

Member Katz pointed out that a different color makes a difference; and the tree is growing around it.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Enfield (previously sworn) said they would leave the door and the steps where they are. He pointed out that they are not destroying historic material but relocating them. Anytime you change an office to a residence, those things happen, and he thought that was what happened on the west façade. The steps and ramp will not be used so they will just leave it.

Mr. Chakalian said since there was a question about the stairs, the Board should state on the record if it finds that to be part of the primary elevation.

Questions to Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said she was happy the applicant was keeping the door and stairs as is.

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

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Bayer moved, seconded by Member Boniface, in Case #H-18-142B at 110 Delgado Street Unit D, to approve the application a submitted with the exception of #3 and #4 and find that the stairs, because they are attached, are considered part of the primary elevation and consider the historic and with a condition that the Applicant revise the drawings and submit them before a construction permit is issued.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

5. **Case #H-18-137. 100 East Water Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates Architects, agent for The City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure and construct a new 1,400 sq. ft. structure to a height of 14'10". (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

100 East Water Street is a municipal parking lot with an approximately 1350 sq. ft. pay booth, porte cochere or vehicular gateway area, and a bathroom designated as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The pay booth and vehicular gateways were built in the mid-to-late 1960's and the bathroom addition was built around 1972, both using simplified Spanish-Pueblo features. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing building and, in a new location, construct an approximately 1,400 sq. ft. (heated floor area) municipal building to house public bathrooms.

In determining whether a request for demolition should be approved or denied, the

HDRB shall consider the following (per 14-3.14):

- a) Whether the structure is of historic importance;
- b) Whether the structure for which demolition is requested is an essential part of the unique street section or block front and whether this street section or block front will be reestablished by a proposed structure; and
- c) The state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration.

The existing building is in good condition, staff does not find that it is an essential part of the street section, and the block front will be reestablished by a proposed structure which should create better street massing and pedestrian scale. Finding the responses to criteria “B” and “C” do not prevent the proposed demolition, staff recommends that the board determine the historic importance of the structure.

The structure is currently listed as non-contributing but the north, street-facing portion of the building, including the covered vehicular gateways, was present prior to 1969. Staff recognize that the pay booth and gateway area have character but defer to the Board to identify historic importance.

The southern portion of the building, which currently houses public bathrooms, is not historic and staff finds it to have relatively unremarkable features. Staff recommends granting approval to demolish the southern, non-historic breezeway and bathroom. The applicant also proposes a new, 1,400 sq. ft. (heated floor area) restroom building directly east of Cerletti Park with a pedestrian orientation (on Water Street) and which will fill a portion of the relatively empty block. The applicant proposes the following design features:

- 1. “La Luz” colored cementitious parapet walls built to a height of 14’-10”.
- 2. Exposed wood features located under a northern, street-facing portal using a linseed oil and turpentine substitute finish.
- 3. Wood clad true divided lite windows.
- 4. Painted metal doors.
- 5. A 12.5 sq. ft. wooden sign under the north-facing portal. The sign will read “Public Restrooms” and be painted red, white, and blue.
- 6. Skylights and rooftop appurtenances will be lower than the parapet.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-3.14 DEMOLITION OF HISTORIC OR LANDMARK STRUCTURE

(B) Hearing Required

(2) The HDRB or *governing body*, as applicable, shall restrict its review to a consideration of whether the *application* will be in conformity with the standards established by this section.

(G) Standards

(1) In determining whether a request for demolition in a historic district should be approved or denied, the HDRB shall consider the following:

- (a) Whether the *structure* is of historical importance;
- (b) Whether the *structure* for which demolition is requested is an essential part of a unique *street* section or block front and whether this *street* section or block front will be reestablished by a proposed *structure*; and
- (c) The state of repair and structural stability of the *structure* under consideration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Regarding the demolition of the existing building, staff defers to the board to determine the historic importance. If the board finds no historic importance, staff recommends approval of the demolition. If the board finds the northern, historic portion important, staff recommends approval of only the southern, non-historic portions of the building.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed construction which complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Member Roybal asked what the location of the new building is.

Mr. Gemora said the new building does not overlap the old building at all. He would let the Applicant explain that.

Member Katz thought the new restrooms would be much better than the old ones.

Member Biedscheid asked about the paint color on the metal doors.

Mr. Gemora said that was not specified.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Wayne Lloyd, 321 W San Francisco, was sworn. At the monitor, he talked about the location of the proposed building. It is pushed as close to the edge as possible. The parking lot will lose several spaces and gain some by taking down the old building. There is no need to keep the entry portion which is over 50 years old. So it doesn't take much out.

Questions to Applicant

Chair Rios asked about the kiosk.

Mr. Lloyd explained the City Parking Division wants an unattended parking lot like in other locations. They put up a kiosk for payments and use the receipt on the dash. It would help them and give more opportunity to run their parking lot.

Member Roybal asked how functional the existing bathrooms are.

Mr. Jason Kluck, City employee, was sworn explained that demolishing that section will increase space and move the infrastructure over more cheaply. It is a different scenario for bringing utilities over. At present, the bathrooms are sometimes available to the public, depending on an attendant and are fully functional but not ADA compliant.

Member Katz asked about the number of windows on the west façade at the women's restroom.

Mr. Lloyd said they are positioned high on that façade and they would be frosted so the inside was not visible. Frosting makes them translucent.

Member Katz asked if there is a more attractive way to do that.

Mr. Lloyd said there is a "water ripple" type of glass that is more expensive.

Member Katz thought it would help on the south and north elevations to have windows that look less forbidding. He thought the windows on the west looked into stalls and the north looked into mirrors and sinks.

Mr. Lloyd said there could be windows.

Member Biedscheid asked what color of the paint would be on the doors.

Mr. Lloyd said, "You get to pick the color."

Member Biedscheid said it should be an earth tone.

Mr. Lloyd agreed.

Member Biedscheid asked if this is part of the mobile units at the park.

Mr. Kluck said the two trees on Water Street are both locust trees and already slated for removal, since they have been infested with locust bores. The tree to the left is a small evergreen and it would be difficult to avoid taking it down, but we can plant new trees.

Member Biedscheid thought that would help.

Mr. Lloyd said they went through several location choices. "We wanted them really accessible so that coming down the street from the Plaza is really easy there. And it creates a streetscape.

Member Biedscheid asked about the big sign.

Mr. Lloyd said the City uses red, white and blue but he was open to other suggestions.

Public Comment

Mr. Eddy (previously sworn) had a land use question, if the Board could ask the applicant to give the low down on number of stalls between women and men.

Mr. Lloyd said there were 13 stalls in the women's; six urinals and 7 toilets for men.

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) liked Member Katz's suggestion for windows. Those walls are very blank and uninteresting looking. 14' feet seems very high and she wondered why it couldn't be 12'. She also wondered what is happening at the corner park. It is the only designated smoking area but must be 20' away from a public building so it is a concern. Her other concern was that they are kept locked a lot of the time because of inappropriate behavior within them.

Mr. Lloyd said the official name of that corner park is Cerletti Park. The only part that is 14' is where rooftop equipment must be hidden by a parapet. The rest of the building is lower - closer to 12'.

Mr. Gemora said it is 13' 4".

Chair Rios asked about lighting for the area.

Mr. Lloyd said that is only under the portal. "We are away from funding so there is time to bring those things up for lighting."

Chair Rios wanted more lighting.

Mr. Lloyd agreed. And if there is no attendant present, it could be a mess.

Mr. Kluck was aware of other projects there and the plan to install cameras and better lighting. They are in process and he didn't know the schedule. That corner is well lit currently.

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) requested, on the windows, to make them bring in light. She suggested they- could use glass block if frosting is objectional. It works pretty well.

Chair Rios thought what is best is what is least publicly visible.

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

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Roybal in Case #H-18-137 at 100 East Water Street 184 Cerro Gordo Road, to permit demolition of the old bathroom but not the entry structure; to approve construction of the restrooms with two windows on the west elevation and two windows on the north elevation at the men's restroom and two windows on the south elevation at the women's restroom, with a condition that "ripple water" glass be used in the windows and revised drawings be submitted to Staff for approval.

Mr. Lloyd asked if they could stucco the entry structure the same color as the new bathrooms.

Chair Rios agreed and said that Staff can approve that.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

6. **Case #H-18-143. 627 Camino de la Luz.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. John Barton, agent for Continuum LLC, owners, requests a historic status review with designation of primary elevations, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential property. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

627 Camino de la Luz is a single-family home currently designated non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. While the original structure was built in the late 1950's, multiple non-historic additions have been added (see page 6 of the HCPI). Non-historic additions include two carports, a utility room, a living room, and a high wall which make up almost half the existing footprint. Many of the windows and doors appear to be non-historic and staff does not find that the few remaining historic features (such as the portal entryway) contribute character to the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff find that the non-historic additions overwhelm and obscure the historic portions of the building and recommend maintaining the status as non-contributing per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked if the footprint remained as original.

Mr. Gemora said no and referred to page 10 of the packet and page 6 of the HCPI. Approximately 50% is non-historic additions. And carport and a high wall.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. John Barton and Ms. Colleen Gavin were sworn. Mr. Barton said he agreed with the Staff recommendation on this property.

Questions to Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) appreciated the concern of the Board. The historic part is intact and has the character of that period worthy of preservation. Adding on doesn't mean the original footprint is not contributing.

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

Board Discussion

Chair Rios asked if there was anything on this building that is historic - on the front part.

Mr. Gemora said the portal is historic and the window under the portal and he thought the door might be historic also. The windows on the western façade might be historic but he didn't look at the detail on the windows. They are not seen from the streetscape. If the Board decides the remaining historic features should be preserved, it would exclude the footprint. That is not historic.

Member Katz understood there are historic portions on the north and some not so attractive. But the historic part is the large chunk of it and what you see when you drive by. The wall was original and attractive. So the historic part is worthy of preservation and he assumed the owners would do what is appropriate.

Chair Rios said the wall is not historic.

Member Katz clarified that he meant part A.

Mr. Gemora said part A has the yard wall on the western part. That is 1950's and the wall was built in late 1970's.

Member Boniface noted the historic part appears to have a lot of integrity. The yardwall, as we've ruled in the past, is the same as we've observed with vegetation - it could be removed at some point and still have a historic building. The carport and other parts don't really fit in with the rest of the building. If someone were to seek to do some demolition or remodeling, he would not lose sleep over those three blocks of the building but keep the historic part. It has a historic footprint with good massing.

Member Biedscheid agreed. The A portion is typical of buildings in this neighborhood and she would want to designate that façade.

Mr. Barton felt it is a non-contributing structure, mostly because of the major additions and alterations of the structure, including the wall with a foundation.

Member Bayer said the historic footprint does remain.

Member Katz summarized that this is a historic footprint but surrounded by non-historic parts and here, the historic footprint is prominent - out front. Perhaps the other part could be brought up to the historic's attractiveness.

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Boniface moved, seconded by Member Katz in Case #H-18-143 at 627 Camino de la Luz, to make the status Contributing with the south and west elevations designated primary, and exclude the yard wall from any historic designation, and clarified that Block A is the historic portion.

Member Katz requested that the Board discussion be considered as findings and the basis for making this structure Contributing. Member Boniface agreed.

Member Biedscheid suggested that it includes the portal. Member Boniface agreed.

Mr. Gemora clarified that parts B, C, and part D of the west façade are not historic.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-1) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, and Katz voting in the affirmative and Member Roybal voting against.

- 7. Case #H-18-144. 1413 Paseo de Peralta.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Evan Geisler, agent for 1413 Paseo LLC, owners, proposes to construct a 45 sq. ft. addition, remove doors, install windows, and construct a 53" to 72" high yardwall with brick capping on a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1413 Paseo de Peralta is a 2,500 sq. ft. 3-unit condo building listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Historic District. Built prior to 1912 in the Territorial style, the building was historically inhabited by multiple generations of the Romero family and has undergone a series of historic and non-historic changes and expansions. In 1912 the property contained a primary, "L" shaped building and a detached accessory structure to the rear. By 1982, multiple additions were documented to both the principal and accessory structures. By 1993, the two structures were connected into a stretched "C" shape.

Historic documents record numerous proposals and changes to the structure between

1982 and 2014. Many of the approved changes were never built and many of the built changes were never approved. While it is difficult to determine exactly what has been changed, approved changes include nearly all the windows (perhaps not the front), all the doors, and numerous changes to openings. Built changes include the enclosure and changing roof styles for what was once an open portal on the inner corner and is now a small entryway with a notable lower parapet and lack of brick coping. It appears that the most significant features remaining are the brick parapets of varying heights, signifying the different additions, and the simple window and door openings on the front, north-facing primary façade.

The applicant proposes to:

1. Extend the enclosed portal area an additional 45 sq. ft. and repair/rebuild the existing roof with no changes to the parapet height. Though a portal has existed in the same area since the 1930's, the area has been enclosed and undergone various roof changes, most notably a change from a shed to a parapet roof since 1993. A non-historic window will be relocated, if able, or replaced in a similar orientation.
2. Enclose a non-historic doorway on the west façade. The doorway existed prior to the 2014 renovation but staff believes the section of the building was constructed without permit between 1982 and 1993 per historic building inventory reports.
3. Construct a brick-capped stucco yardwall along the streetscape and with two gates. The majority of the yardwall will be built to the maximum allowable height of 53" with areas around the gates built to an allowable height of 6'-0".

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)(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.

(iii) No existing opening shall be closed.

(b) For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures, architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.

14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District

(2) Walls; Fences; Solar Collectors; Administration

Applications for erection, alteration, or destruction of *walls*, fences, and solar collectors and required submittals shall be reviewed by the land use department. Approval, disapproval, or referral shall be indicated by the division on the *application* for the *building permit* and on each of the required submittals, all of which shall be signed by the division staff assigned to the review. The division shall report approvals, disapprovals, or referrals to the board at its next regular meeting as an informational item. (Ord. No. 2007-45 § 30)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios noted the inventory shows there was a wall there.

Mr. Gemora agreed. It looks like it was some type of masonry wall around 4-5' tall.

Chair Rios asked if it was the same height all around.

Mr. Gemora said yes.

Chair Rios asked where the proposed six-foot section of the wall would be located.

Mr. Gemora distributed a document showing the new elevations.

[A copy of the photo simulations of the new elevations is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1.]

Mr. Gemora said in the front near the doorway. Lined up with the doorway would be a little inset for a gate which would also rise to six feet; also to the northwest, the wall would have a six-foot gate pilaster before returning to 53" on the corner.

Member Biedscheid asked how tall the wall is on the west side.

Mr. Gemora didn't know. It appears to be probably four feet high.

Member Biedscheid asked if the coyote at the rear is at six feet.

Mr. Gemora agreed.

Member Roybal referenced the 2005 denial and asked what the difference was of that proposal and this one on page 25. To him, it looked almost identical.

Mr. Gemora said that denial was for a portal on the north-facing elevation above the door. It had been red-tagged and the Board denied that request for that portal at the front door. This proposal is to extend a portal that is not on primary façade. The shaded area is where the 45 sq. ft. extension is proposed.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Paul Domenico, PO Box 1322, was sworn. He said he purchased this home in 2013 and did renovations in 2014 as a commercial income property. "The front half of it was vacant and I couldn't lease it, so we are going to use that as our primary residence. Extending the portal is now a hallway to the master bedroom and our intent is to enhance the character, increase the aesthetic of the streetscape, and give privacy and security with some outdoor space. We have dogs and eventually will have grandchildren. That is the history and what we are intending to do.

Chair Rios understood the wall would be 4' 5" in front except around the door. She asked if on the south, the wall would be six feet high.

Mr. Domenico said the six feet is only around the gate opening.

Mr. Evan Garza, 220 West Manhattan was also sworn. He said they have two entry ways and have gates at six feet with pilasters on the sides and otherwise, lowered to 53".

Questions to Applicant

Member Katz liked the renderings that really give an idea of their project. But he would really like it not to have a wall because it hides the house. He was glad they agreed to have it lower. He was very unhappy with the door in the wall. A gate at the same level as the wall would be much more appropriate in front and didn't care about the one on the side.

Mr. Garza asked if he was requesting a gate there instead of a solid door.

Member Katz said he was.

Mr. Garza clarified that they would be okay with having it all at 53".

Member Bayer agreed with Member Katz. She felt the gate that looks like a door was very distracting. She would prefer the wall be at one consistent height and would prefer a gate as more harmonious.

Member Biedscheid echoed those opinions about the wall. The front façade is just perfect, the way it is. It is an excellently preserved Territorial style and any wall would detract from that symmetry. The 1983 HCPI said the original was an iron fence which she preferred - a fully fenestrated fence instead of a wall.

Mr. Garza said they had discussed a combination of stucco. There are other properties on Don Gaspar that have 28" of stucco and iron on top. Perhaps that could appease all the comments today.

Member Biedscheid said she saw one with a Romero fence in front like that in the South Capitol neighborhood and wondered if it might be worth looking at. There might be some connection between those properties.

Public Comment

Mr. Eddy (previously sworn) appreciated the Board's focus on the walls and would agree that visibility of these houses is very important to the streetscape of the additions or whatever changes they want to make. He wanted clarification whether this is the application with metal canopies over doorways.

Member Biedscheid said that was of a previous application on the same property.

Mr. Gemora said those pitched eyebrows were in an application approved in 2014.

Mr. Eddy asked if they were not part of this application.

Mr. Gemora said yes.

Mr. Eddy saw no reason for not applying a little more creativity here. He would like to see such enhancement brought to this streetscape. They would need to bring those designs back.

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) remembered this application coming in 2013 and the owner asked for things that were unusual and it had development of outdoor space on the east. That was unrealistic, and she agreed with the importance of this façade and didn't think the Board should approve a wall at all but agreed with Member Biedscheid that fenestrated fence and gate at no more than six inches higher than picket fence next door. The wall being referenced is on the Simon Greer property which is very big with big round wrought iron things and makes sense on that property but not on this one. Simple and low and open is the way to go. She also didn't know why two openings were appropriate to get into that area.

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

Board Discussion

Member Katz agreed that hiding the house at all is kind of a shame and his preference would be a wrought iron fence as more appropriate all the way around.

He was reluctant to move to do that. He would like to ask the applicant if it would be okay to postpone it for redesign of that wall.

Chair Rios suggested the Board could approve items #1 and #2 and postpone #3

The Applicant said they would prefer doing that, so they are not delayed on their permit for the new structure.

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Biedscheid moved, seconded by Member Roybal, in Case #H-18-144 at 1413 Paseo de Peralta, to approve items 1 and 2 in the application and postpone #3 for redesign.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

8. **Case #H-18-136B. 525 Camino Cabra.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Lechner, agent for Rebecca Koskela, owner, proposes to construct a 204 sq. ft. addition to a height of 13'0", a 180 sq. ft. deck, install windows, and reroof a contributing residential structure. (Carlos Gemora)

Mr. Gemora presented the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

525 Camino Cabra is a 1,600 sq. ft. Spanish-Pueblo Revival style residential home designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house is believed to have been originally built with adobe in the late 1940's or early 1950's with a series of pre-1967 historic additions that established the current footprint. In the late 1980's, a large masonry wall was built which obscures the house from the street. In November 2018, the Historic Districts Review Board elevated the building to contributing status and designated the south-western portal and walls underneath as primary façades.

The applicant now proposes the following:

1. An approximately 200 sq. ft. kitchen addition to the south-eastern (side/rear) portion of the building to a height of 13'-0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'-8". The addition will use "Adobe" colored cementitious stucco to match the existing house and clerestory windows on the south eastern wall. The addition will be located greater than 32'-0" to the rear of the designated primary façades.
2. A 180 sq. ft. deck to the rear of the building constructed out of treated wood with

a natural finish.

3. Reroofing the building with foam insulation and a “brown” colored “Brair” roofing material.
4. New windows and doors will be “bronze” colored aluminum & wood clad and are required to have divided lites. Existing windows are almost entirely vinyl-clad without divided lites.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

Proximity of Additions to Primary Façades:

14-5.2(D)(2)(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 facade. 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 facade. 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts – Height, Pitch, Scale, and Massing, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Questions to Staff

Chair Rios asked about the windows to be replaced.

Mr. Gemora said the existing windows on eastern façade and the existing kitchen window would be removed.

Member Roybal asked if the existing windows had been replaced.

Mr. Gemora agreed. He believed they had a date stamp of mid-1980s and not historic.

Member Roybal surmised there would be no removal of historic materials.

Mr. Gemora agreed.

Chair Rios asked what the height of the existing building is.

Mr. Gemora said it is about 10' 6" to finished grade where the portal is. And what was once a garage is probably around 10' 6" but sunken down a foot or two.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Thomas Lechner, 24 Vista de la Ciudad, was sworn. He said the windows were installed in 1985 and are old Anderson vinyl-clad windows and no historic windows were left. The only historic opening is the front door. He offered to put in divided lites if the Board wishes, but all the rest are not divided lites.

Questions to Applicant

Chair Rios asked if the height is 10' 6".

Mr. Lechner agreed and said the addition on the back is 12' 6". The existing interior height on the west is 7' 5" and kitchen is 7' 1". The bedroom ceiling goes from 7' 3" down to 7' 1". The new kitchen would be 9' 8" with clerestory windows above kitchen cabinets with rigid foam on top and one-foot parapets.

Chair Rios asked how far back the new addition is.

Mr. Gemora said it is 32' back to the rear portal wall and he didn't have a measurement of the wall.

Mr. Lechner said the wall is about 8'.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought this project will improve the house and have a room not so close to their heads. Since it is non-historic, she thought the divided lites windows will make it more harmonious.

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

Board Discussion

Chair Rios considered the ceiling very low.

Mr. Lechner said it is especially in the bedroom at 6' 11".

Action of the Board

MOTION: Member Boniface moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid in Case #H-18-136B at 525 Camino Cabra, to follow Staff's recommendation and approve the application.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, and Roybal voting in the affirmative and none voting against.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Member Katz thanked Ed Boniface for his service.

Member Boniface said in his six years, he has seen so many good things come here and has high respect for Board members and Staff. "I will certainly miss you, but it has been my high honor to work with all of you and a pleasure."

Chair Rios also thanked the Board members for their faithful service during all of 2018 and to Staff and to Carl.

Mr. Boaz thanked Member Boniface for mentoring him throughout his tenure on the Board.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Approved by:



Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.

EXHIBIT 1







