



Agenda

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

FIELD TRIP CANCELLED

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 26, 2020 at 5:30 P.M.

AMENDED

ATTEND VIRTUALLY

SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

In response to the State's declaration of a Public Health Emergency, the Mayor's Proclamation of Emergency, and the ban on public gatherings of more than five (5) people, this meeting will be conducted virtually using Zoom.

Viewing on YouTube: Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCuW5Fb7iWuKpTdsWYNDurgA>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most computers, mobile devices, and smartphones. A video recording of the meeting will be posted on YouTube and available for viewing after the meeting.

Attending on Zoom: Members of the public may attend the Zoom meeting on a computer, mobile device, or phone. The video conference link and teleconference number are as follows:

- Zoom link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87828006000?pwd=Vm5aVkxkdG1zTVNFWUIVZEdxR2l0dz09> (Password: 324307)
- Phone numbers: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 (Webinar ID: 878 2800 6000)

This information will also be posted on the City of Santa Fe's Calendar of Events website at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting: <https://www.santafenm.gov/events>.

Public Comment:

- **By video:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conference (using a computer, mobile device, or smart phone) may provide public comment during the meeting. Attendees should use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized by the chair to speak at the appropriate time.
- **By phone:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by phone may provide public comment during the meeting but **must** provide advance notice to City staff. Please contact Lani McCulley (505-365-3055, lmcculley@santafenm.gov) no later than Thursday, May 21, 2020, and provide your **full name, address, and the phone number** you will be using to call in to the teleconference. Without your phone number, the chair will not be able to recognize you to speak at the meeting.
- **In writing:** A person may submit written public comments in advance of the meeting by email (LandUsePublicComment@santafenm.gov) or U.S. Postal Service (City of Santa Fe, ATTN: Lani McCulley, PO Box 909, Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909). Please include your full name and address, and identify the specific agenda item you are commenting on. To be included in the official record and considered at the hearing, written public comment **must** be received no later than Thursday, May 21, 2020.

CALL TO ORDER

- ROLL CALL
- APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
 - HDRB Field Trip minutes: none
 - HDRB Hearing minutes: May 12, 2020

D. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #2020-00001976-HDRB, 807 Abeyta Street.
Case #2020-001990-HDRB, 206 McKenzie Street.
Case #2020-001995-HDRB, 610 Paseo de la Cuma.
Case #2020-002009-HDRB, 970 Acequia Madre.

Case #2020-001977-HDRB, 502 Apodaca Hill.
Case #2020-001991-HDRB, 494 West Water Street.
Case #2020-002008-HDRB, 535 Douglas.

E. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #2020-002044-HDRB, 448 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for John Horton, owner, proposes to change a yardwall/fence and driveway gate on a non-historic, non-contributing residence and requests and exception to place an undivided window and door on a publicly visible façade, per Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e). (Lisa Roach, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657) (POSTPONED FROM 4/28/2020)
2. Case 2020-001997-HDRB, 535 Douglas Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Dennis Storz, owner, proposes to replace windows, alter window openings, raise a parapet wall, add onto a portal and repair stucco at a contributing residence. (Daniel Schwab) (POSTPONED FROM 5/12/2020)
3. Case 2020-001998-HDRB, 970 Acequia Madre. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Charles Schulze, owner, proposes raising a roof, chimney stucco and parapets, and replacing windows and ramada at a contributing residence. (Daniel Schwab) (POSTPONED FROM 5/12/2020)
4. Case#2020-002040-HDRB, 715 Manhattan Avenue. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christine Purdie and Timothy Culbreth, owners/agents, request primary façade designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)
5. Case#2020-002011-HDRB, 633 Gomez Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Robert Jaye, owners/agents, request primary façade designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)

H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

I. 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.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: May 19, 2020

TIME: 5:37 PM



Agenda

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

FIELD TRIP CANCELLED

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 26, 2020 at 5:30 P.M.

ATTEND VIRTUALLY

SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

In response to the State's declaration of a Public Health Emergency, the Mayor's Proclamation of Emergency, and the ban on public gatherings of more than five (5) people, this meeting will be conducted virtually using Zoom.

Viewing on YouTube: Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofsantafe>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most computers, mobile devices, and smartphones. A video recording of the meeting will be posted on YouTube and available for viewing after the meeting.

Attending on Zoom: Members of the public may attend the Zoom meeting on a computer, mobile device, or phone. The video conference link and teleconference number are as follows:

- Zoom link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87828006000?pwd=Vm5aVkxkdG1zTVNFWU1VZEExR2l0dz09> (Password: 324307)
- Phone numbers: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 (Webinar ID: 878 2800 6000)

This information will also be posted on the City of Santa Fe's Calendar of Events website at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting: <https://www.santafenm.gov/events>.

Public Comment:

- **By video:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conference (using a computer, mobile device, or smart phone) may provide public comment during the meeting. Attendees should use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized by the chair to speak at the appropriate time.
- **By phone:** A person attending the Zoom meeting by phone may provide public comment during the meeting but **must** provide advance notice to City staff. Please contact Lani McCulley (505-365-3055, ljmcculley@santafenm.gov) no later than Thursday, April 23, 2020, and provide your **full name, address, and the phone number** you will be using to call in to the teleconference. Without your phone number, the chair will not be able to recognize you to speak at the meeting.
- **In writing:** A person may submit written public comments in advance of the meeting by email (LandUsePublicComment@santafenm.gov) or U.S. Postal Service (City of Santa Fe, ATTN: Lani McCulley, PO Box 909, Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909). Please include your full name and address, and identify the specific agenda item you are commenting on. To be included in the official record and considered at the hearing, written public comment **must** be received no later than Thursday, April 23, 2020.

CALL TO ORDER

- ROLL CALL
- APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
 - HDRB Field Trip minutes:
 - HDRB Hearing minutes: May 12, 2020

D. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #2020-00001976-HDRB, 807 Abeyta Street.
Case #2020-001990-HDRB, 206 McKenzie Street.
Case #2020-001995-HDRB, 610 Paseo de la Cuma.
Case 2020-001997-HDRB, 535 Douglas.
Case 2020-001998-HDRB, 970 Acequia Madre.

Case #2020-001977-HDRB, 502 Apodaca Hill.
Case #2020-001991-HDRB, 494 West Water Street.
Case #2020-002008-HDRB, 535 Douglas.
Case #2020-002009-HDRB, 970 Acequia Madre.

E. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #2020-002044-HDRB, 448 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for John Horton, owner, proposes to change a yardwall/fence and driveway gate on a non-historic, non-contributing residence and requests and exception to place an undivided window and door on a publicly visible façade, per Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e). (Lisa Roach, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657) (POSTPONED FROM 4/28/2020)
2. Case #2020-001784-HDRB, 339 and 341 Plaza Balentine. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. H.Q. Construction, agent for Elizabeth Beall, owner, requests historic status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab, dnschwab@santafenm.gov, 955-6660) (POSTPONED FROM 4/28/2020)
3. Case #2020-001823-HDRB, 339 and 341 Plaza Balentine. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. H.Q. Construction, agent for Elizabeth Beall, owner, proposes to replace windows, replace a fence with a yard-wall, restucco and construct an addition. (Daniel Schwab) (POSTPONED FROM 4/28/2020)
4. Case#2020-002040-HDRB, 715 Manhattan Avenue. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christine Purdie and Timothy Culbreth, owners/agents, request primary facades designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)
5. Case#2020-002011-HDRB, 633 Gomez Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Robert Jaye, owners/agents, request primary facades designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)

H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

I. 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.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: May 6, 2020

TIME: 4:13 PM

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
May 26, 2020

| <u>ITEM</u> | <u>ACTION TAKEN</u> | <u>PAGE(S)</u> |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Call to Order | 5:30 pm | 1 |
| A. Roll Call | Quorum Present | 1 |
| B. Approval of Agenda | Approved as Published | 1-2 |
| C. Approval of Minutes May 12, 2020 Hearing | Approved as Amended | 2 |
| D. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law | Approved | 2-3 |
| E. Business from the Floor | Comments | 3 |
| F. Communications | Comments | 4 |
| G. Action Items | | |
| 1. Case#2020-002044-HDRB 448 Camino Monte Vista | Approved | 4-6 |
| 2. Case #2020-001997-HDRB 535 Douglas Street | Postponed | 6-7 |
| 3. Case #2020-001998-HDRB 970 Acequia Madre | Approved with Condition | 7-10 |
| 4. Case #2020-002040-HDRB 715 Manhattan Avenue | Primary Façade Designation | 10-15 |
| 5. Case #2020-002011-HDRB 633 Gomez Road | Approved | 16-18 |
| H. Matters from the Board | Comments | 18 |
| I. Adjournment | Adjourned at 6:58 p.m. | 18 |

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
MAY 26, 2020
VIRTUAL HEARING**

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Cecilia Rios, Chair, on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. at a virtual meeting held at <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofsantafe>.

A. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chairwoman
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. John Bienvenu
Mr. Anthony Guida
Ms. Flynn G. Larson

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Mr. Buddy Roybal

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Lisa Roach, Planner Manager
Mr. Daniel Schwab, Senior Planner
Ms. Angela Bordegaray, Senior Planner
Ms. Andrea Salazar, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Melissa Byers, 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 Preservation Office and available on the City of Santa Fe Website.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Guida and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. HDRB Hearing Minutes May 12, 2020

Member Bienvenu requested the following changes:

- On Page 11, the 3rd paragraph should read, "Member Bienvenu questioned whether the color of stucco proposed was also consistent."
- On Page 19, the 6th paragraph should read: "Member Bienvenu confirmed he understood the explanation to be that they can see the framing around the window but technically there is no window within that space."

Chair Rios requested the following changes:

- On page 10, the 4th paragraph should read: "Chair Rios asked to confirm the maximum allowable height feet is 15'9" and that the applicant was asking for an additional 4 feet due to changing of slope."
- On page 17, the 9th paragraph, under *Questions for Staff*, should read: "Chair Rios asked staff to comment on the plastic windows on the building."
- On Page 26, 3rd paragraph, under *Board Discussion*, should read: "Chair Rios added a friendly amendment to use raw steel spindles on the balcony."
- On Page 39, 4th paragraph, under *Board Discussion*, should read: "Chair Rios, commented, the casita was never a garage, to the best of her recollection."

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Guida, to approve the HDRB Hearing Minutes of May 12, 2020, as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Guida and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

D. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #2020-00001976-HDRB. 807 Abeyta Street
Case #2020-001977-HDRB. 502 Apodaca Hill
Case #2020-001990-HDRB. 206 McKenzie Street
Case #2020-001991-HDRB. 494 West Water Street
Case#2020-001995-HDRB. 610 Paseo de la Cuma
Case#2020-002008-HDRB. 535 Douglas
Case#2020-002009-HDRB. 970 Acequia Madre.

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

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Guida and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

E. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Stefanie Beninato thought she read online that there would be video participation. She said she is hoping that happens when cases are presented. Also, she noticed if making a written comment, you have to make it the day before the agenda comes out. The deadline is Thursday before the meeting and the agenda is out on Friday afternoon, so she isn't sure how anyone can make written comments. She brought that to the Board's attention so they could perhaps get more participation by making it possible for people to respond to the agenda/submittals.

Chair Rios said the Board doesn't have a say on the video participation. She asked staff or the City Attorney to comment.

Ms. Roach explained the agenda is posted 15 days *prior* to the hearings, not the day before. The packet goes online the Thursday before the hearing and the deadlines for public comments are set by the Open Meetings Act and the City Attorney's Office. She was not aware of anything online that the Board will allow video participation from the floor. Staff has not received instruction to that effect by the City Attorney's Office, and to her knowledge, the Open Meetings Act does not require video participation. It is a logistical challenge to move every person on the floor to the panel who wants to speak and be seen. As host of the hearing she was instructed that she has the choice to do that, and she chooses not to.

Ms. Beninato noted that online at www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board it says: "*A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conferencing may provide public comment during the meeting.*" It says by *video*. Also, even if the agenda posted 15 days, if you don't get to see the packet and what is proposed until Friday, you cannot knowledgeably comment. The agenda is nice, but the packet is the important part.

Chair Rios said Ms. Beninato brought video participation up at the last meeting. Chair Rios said she thought it more important to have the audio participation and to be able to hear people.

Ms. Roach added that is what the Open Meetings Act requires, and her instructions come from the City Attorney's Office. What is written online, which is also on the agenda, is that a person attending online can be *heard* at the hearing and they are doing that.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Rios noted in today's newspaper there was an article about the Preservation Awards. She encouraged everyone to read the article. The article talked about the importance of people such as them, the volunteers on City boards, to keep the beauty of Santa Fe going in regard to preserving and protecting the built environment.

G. ACTION ITEMS

Chair Rios said there were five cases before the Board. She reminded the applicants if they disagree with the decision this evening they have the option to appeal to the City Council within 15 days after the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law have been approved.

Chair Rios limited public comments to two minutes and asked Ms. Roach to keep the time.

1. **Case #2020-002044-HDRB. 448 Camino Monte Vista. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Architectural Alliance, agent for John Horton, owner, proposes to change a yardwall/fence and driveway gate on a nonhistoric, non-contributing residence and requests and exception to place an undivided window and door on a publicly visible façade, per Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e). (Lisa Roach, lxroach@santafenm.gov, 955-6657) (POSTPONED FROM 4/28/2020)

Ms. Roach presented the staff report as follows:

STAFF REPORT:

448 Camino Monte Vista is an approximately 5,500 square-foot single-family residence constructed in approximately 1985-1991 and designed by architect Charles R. Dupwe Jr. as a contemporary or "post-modern" expression of Territorial Revival style. It is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The partial two-story residence features brick coping at the flat-roofed areas and a sawtooth gable clerestory elsewhere, as well as white wooden window and door trim with pedimented surrounds. An approximately 850 square-foot, non-contributing accessory structure/casita is also present on the property. A low white wooden picket fence fronts Camino Monte Vista. Staff was able to locate no records of any alterations that have been made since the home's original construction.

At the April 28th hearing of the HDRB, the applicant received approval to perform a variety of exterior alterations, including window and door changes, demolition of portales, modification of walls, adding rooftop solar panels and skylights, construction of four small additions at the main house, and modifications to the casita. Now, the applicant returns with a proposal to satisfy the following conditions associated with the previous HDRB approval: 1) that an exception be requested for the undivided light window and door on the north elevation; 2) that the applicant

return with a revised fence and gate design for the north street frontage; 3) that the applicant work with staff to depict the arrangement of solar PV panels on the south elevation; 4) that the north addition be reduced by 4" to accommodate an existing adjacent window.

To address these conditions, the applicant proposes the following:

- 1) The applicant requests an exception to have an undivided window and French door on the north elevation of the main residence. There is a combination of divided and undivided windows on the home presently. Exception criteria and responses are included in this report.
- 2) The applicant proposes to retain the white picket fence and gates at the north street frontage, and a new vehicular gate design is proposed. The pedimented arch over the existing vehicular gate will be removed for improved vehicular access onto the property, and the new gate design mimics the pediment shape of the archway that will be removed.
- 3) The applicant will continue to work with staff to present and review the configuration of solar panels on the south elevation of the main residence.
- 4) The applicant has presented revised drawings reflecting the minor reduction in the previously approved north addition to the main residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the criteria for an exception have been met and recommends approval of the proposed project, in compliance with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked if Ms. Roach agreed with all three criteria.

Ms. Roach said she did.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, was sworn. He said they fell in love with the picket fence and decided to keep it. On the gate they found that the pediment on the back was added at a later date and they have a photograph showing that. He thought they would find the original brick work behind the frame and garage door once it is removed.

Chair Rios said she was happy that they had the discussion they did. Sometimes an applicant comes forward with what the Board feels would not be an improvement. She said this applicant listened well. She asked Mr. Enfield to thank the applicant for keeping the fence.

Mr. Enfield said he is okay with the fence and realizes it is part of the neighborhood. He added that the Board would probably have other cases like the windows divided and undivided,

that had been approved by previous Boards. He wasn't bothered that some windows are undivided, and some are not and thought that was for a reason.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

None.

PUBLIC HEARING

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, was sworn. She was happy the applicant kept the picket fence and thought the gate is better, but she didn't think the exception criteria was met. She said given that the house is not contributing, she wasn't sure why the applicant needed an exception. But if they do need one, she doesn't feel they met it. Not harming the public welfare is not the same as preventing a hardship to the public welfare. It doesn't prevent a hardship to the applicant to have a door opposed to a window because windows can also mean egress. She suggested having a more substantial lintel with the same design as over the door. Also, she would strongly ask that the same lintel be over the windows and the existing opening at the wall. That would retain more of the character of the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Rios said a home, whether the home is historic or non-historic, in this district if the windows are publicly visible, they are required to be divided. That was the reason the applicant had to come forward with exceptions.

MOTION: In Case #2020-002044-HDRB, 448 Camino Monte Vista, Vice Chair Katz moved to approve the application per the recommendation of staff and finds that the criteria for the exception per staff, have been met. The motion was seconded by Member Bienvenu.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Guida, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

2. **Case 2020-001997-HDRB. 535 Douglas Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Christopher Purvis, agent for Dennis Storz, owner, proposes to replace windows, alter window openings, raise a parapet wall, add onto a portal and repair stucco at a contributing residence. (Daniel Schwab) (POSTPONED FROM 5/12/2020)

Mr. Schwab stated the applicant requested postponing until June 9, 2020.

MOTION: In Case 2020-001997-HDRB, 535 Douglas Street, Vice Chair Katz moved to postpone to June 9, 2020. The motion was seconded by Member Guida.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Guida, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

3. **Case 2020-001998-HDRB. 970 Acequia Madre. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Christopher Purvis, agent for Charles Schulze, owner, proposes raising a roof, chimney stucco and parapets, and replacing windows and ramada at a contributing residence. (Daniel Schwab) (POSTPONED FROM 5/12/2020)

Mr. Schwab presented the staff report as follows:

STAFF REPORT:

970 Acequia Madre is a single-family residence listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The property consists of two structures: a main house and a guest house. Both have contributing status. On May 12, 2020, in case 2020-2009-HDRB, the HDRB designated the façades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 19 on the main house and the north-facing façades of the casita as primary (see façade diagram).

The main house was originally a 3-room residence built below grade, dating from before 1940, and was augmented by 4 rooms (see house evolution diagram) probably in the 1960s. It is a flat-roofed structure in a pueblo revival style, with parapets, canales, vigas and two chimneys. The windows of the older part have pedimented trim, including a set of French doors opening onto a patio on the west façade.

The guest house is of similar style, built in the 1950s. Publicly visible is the north façade, which contains a large plate-glass window probably dating from the mid-1960s to 1970s and a newer window to the left of it. On May 12, 2020, in the same case, the HDRB designated the façades all the north-facing facades of this structure were designated as primary.

The applicant proposes the following on the main house:

1. Raise the kitchen roof and add clerestories facing west to 11 ft. above grade (the shaded portion of proposed site pan). The maximum allowable height is 16 ft. 3 in.
2. Raise the stuccoed portions on the existing chimneys to cover more of the clay flue tile at the rear of the house;
3. Replace the large-pane windows on façade 8 with divided lite windows in aluminum clad in a turquoise color. These windows are not on primary facades and changing them is permissible;
4. Construct a nine foot tall wood ramada from pine 8 x 10 lumber on the northeast corner in front facades 1 and 19, finished in a medium brown stain. This will not be attached to the main structure and thus does not constitute an alteration to the primary facades.

On the casita, the applicant proposes the following:

1. Replace the north facing window in the casita bedroom with a wooden door with vertical slats painted turquoise and aged in appearance, of the same width as the current window to provide legal egress. This change requires an exception as it involves altering a window opening on the primary north-facing façade of this casita. The responses to the exception criteria are included in this report;
2. Reroof the existing house with 60 mil Tan TPO
3. Repair and restucco to match existing cementitious stucco El Rey "adobe."

Finally, the applicant proposes to install a 48" high pair of black wrought iron vehicular gates with thin vertical square elements spaced 4 inches apart and horizontal top and bottom rails at the driveway. This will be attached to the ground using posts and will not be affixed to the contributing wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that all the exception criteria in Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b) have been met and recommends approval of the proposed project, in compliance with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Vice Chair Katz asked about the north façade of the guest house, the last page of the materials shows the picture window, but it is not shown.

Mr. Schwab said the picture window will remain. The elevation does show that the picture window remains.

Chair Rios reminded the Board that the primary façade on the casita is the north facing façade and is 1-6 and 19 in the main house.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn, said she wondered on the casita if a big enough window could serve the purpose for a legal egress. It does not need to be a door. The fact that you can't see it didn't impress her because they are changing the primary façade. And if the fence goes away you would be able to see it and it would be taking away historic material. Although the ramada is not attached to a primary façade, it is in front of two primary façades. Her hope was they would ask the applicant to situate it, so it doesn't get too close to the primary façade, overwhelming it by its presence.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Christopher Purvis, 222 E. Marcy St., Suite 19, was sworn in. He said the plan is incorrect on the casita. They originally planned to change the window and he failed to change the plan. When the window became contributing, they decided not to change it because it might be historic. The proposed replacement is a non-contributing window that has insulated glass and was clearly installed in the 80s or 90s.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Member Biedscheid asked the applicant to speak to the design details of the pergola, that, as noted stands in front of two primary facades. The Board has approved that before and one case that stands out to her is visible from Alameda. That window was not placed close to the contributing house but stands out because it is a light stain color. She asked the applicant to talk about the stain color and the impact the pergola design will have on the primary façades.

Mr. Purvis indicated the stain color is a medium brown that should blend into the stucco behind it and is designed to blend in. They kept the ramada form structure simple with square beams and posts so it would not conflict or stand out. By keeping it a foot and half away, the sunlight can get in but doesn't impede the view and only the four posts are in the way.

Member Guida said he didn't have an issue with the placement of the ramada. It is where it needs to be and away from the building and he was happy it couldn't be confused with historic material. He was curious about the size of the 8 x 10 rafters and the impression of mass. He asked Mr. Purvis' thoughts and if he had notes of something similar.

Mr. Purvis wasn't sure about something similar, but he explained, the lumber here shrinks and fails over time. The rafters are deliberately oversized, so they won't move or twist or rot immediately. He thought of them as more of a reference to what might have been done with vigas or logs, back in the day when traditionally they were used to store things on top. He used the same form, except with a squared, more modern piece of lumber.

Chair Rios thanked Mr. Purvis for always having the existing and proposed elevations on the same page.

Vice Chair Katz asked why he wanted to turn a window into a door in the guest house.

Mr. Purvis explained as currently configured, it doesn't meet egress and you can't get out of the room without going through the bathroom.

Member Biedscheid noticed the new casita has a pergola that appears to be made of small rounded vigas. She asked if that is historic.

Mr. Purvis said at the risk of guessing, he thought it looked like a more modern addition. In the photographs it appears to be something done in the last ten years.

Member Biedscheid asked if that is the same height as the new pergola.

Mr. Purvis thought it appeared a little lower, possibly because the members are skinnier.

Mr. Schwab noted a photograph of it on page 28 in the packet.

Ms. Roach requested the Board if they approve the application, include in their motion that staff receive elevation drawings of the proposed pergola to verify height and dimensions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

MOTION: In Case 2020-001998-HDRB, 970 Acequia Madre, Vice Chair Katz moved to approve the application, finding that criteria for the exception to change a window to a door has been met per staff findings, and the applicant's statement that the door provides the only entrance, except through the bathroom, to that room; and with the condition the applicant provides drawings of the proposed pergola for the main house with the dimensions. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion with a friendly amendment that the proposed floor plan for the casita be revised and resubmitted to reflect the retention of the plate glass window.

Vice Chair Katz accepted the friendly amendment.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Guida, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

4. **Case#2020-002040-HDRB. 715 Manhattan Avenue. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Christine Purdie and Timothy Culbreth, owners/agents, request primary façade designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)

Mr. Schwab presented the staff report as follows:

STAFF REPORT

715 West Manhattan Road is a single-family rectangular one-story residential structure designated as Contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. It was built in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style by 1928 from adobe with a yellow-tan stucco. The applicant requests designation of primary facades in advance of an application for remodel.

The most character defining feature is the flat-roofed portal with five archways at the south-facing front facade (façade 1), the other façades being very plain. The archways, according to the HCPI from 1996, though historic, are probably not original. The portal has a white wood board ceiling. The white iron archway-grilles were installed after 1996. The front door is a non-historic ten-light

French door behind a non-historic metal glass door, and the windows are non-historic aluminum sliders that replaced the original 6-over-6 double-hung wood painted windows since 1996.

Façade 2, (west) has limited public visibility from the driveway. It has simple stucco massing with a parapet that descends stepwise towards the rear. The windows are non-historic aluminum sliders. The door is a possibly historic 30-inch wood door four lights and with an aluminum door in front.

Façade 5 is a porch in that has been enclosed with wood paneling and large aluminum sliding windows at a non-historic date. Façades 6 and 7 are a non-historic washroom shed with a shed roof and stucco walls.

Façade 8 again a simple stucco massing with a parapet and two aluminum sliding windows that are not publicly visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the historic status of the structure be maintained as contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures. Staff recommends designation of the south-facing façade (façade 1), excluding the non-historic door and windows, as primary.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Member Biedscheid said both the east and west façades present a stepped parapet that she thought wasn't captured on the south, and it is a unique characteristic. She asked Mr. Schwab to comment on that. Secondly, she wanted to know if the low yardwall in front of the south façade, had been determined historic.

Mr. Schwab deferred to the division manager on whether the stepping is special because he felt he wasn't versed enough to say. He also, wasn't sure if the yardwall is historic. Although it is in the 1985 HCPI, he wasn't sure it is included in the historic status.

Chair Rios said the reference to the wall is a good point and she thought it always important to address walls so they can be preserved if they are historic.

Member Larson commented that the yardwall height is unique and captures what will probably be considered a primary façade, so is important to include.

Member Biedscheid wanted Ms. Roach to comment if she had more to say about the parapets.

Ms. Roach said she agreed the step in the parapet is a characteristic feature of the house. The Board has the discretion if they feel that feature is worth preserving and should be captured on a primary façade.

Member Biedscheid explained she asked because there is a house with similar stepping on the same street that the Board looked at previously. She believed they had designated that façade as primary in order to capture that.

Chair Rios asked, in reference to the wall that was not part of the application, she wasn't sure they knew the history of the wall. She asked Mr. Schwab and/or Ms. Roach if the Board could go forward on the wall, its historicity and designation.

Ms. Roach stated if additional information confirms the date of construction, the Board can designate the status of the wall. Staff did provide notice for a primary façade designation for a contributing residential structure, but a wall is different. They are basically making it a primary façade. The Board could move forward if they wished, but she isn't sure it is a necessary part of the application.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Schwab the height of the wall.

Mr. Schwab replied it is about three feet high.

Chair Rios thought that would be very common. When building houses, most people would put a fence or a short wall to delineate their property line. She asked if Mr. Schwab agreed.

Mr. Schwab did agree and added it delineates the house from the street.

Chair Rios added that usually the houses in that neighborhood originally had low walls.

Member Bienvenu said he was struggling with the primary façade criterion and character defining features. It seemed like the staff recommendation is that the façades, other than façade one, are not character defining because they are plain. He asked if being plain couldn't be the character defining trait; they are plain stucco massing.

Ms. Roach stated the definition of a primary façade is that it is one or more principle façades, or elevation of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture. Staff makes a recommendation, but it's up to the Board to determine which façades capture features they feel should be preserved and would preserve the character of the structure.

She suggested if the Board wished to preserve the stepped massing, they should capture the east elevation as it is more publicly visible. She is not as familiar with the property, but Mr. Schwab could address the public visibility, which speaks to whether it is a principal base or elevation.

Mr. Schwab noted that the driveway is located on the east side and there is no fence. The east side is more prominent and visible. A photograph on page 6 of the packet shows the west side hidden behind a 6-foot high wooden fence. That has the same stepping but is not as prominent as the east façade. He did not include a photograph of the east façade.

Chair Rios addressed Member Bienvenu and said she wanted to comment in reference to the simplicity of the building. The building is 92 years old and she would say that people probably built very simple buildings during that time. In many cases they didn't have the revenue to build anything extravagant. She said the simplicity is oftentimes a good character defining feature.

Member Larson added when describing a vernacular building type, that would be one of the criteria. In this case since they see minimal architectural details more, than in a building defined by simplicity and a typical vernacular in more of a rectangular box-like shape. In this case they see a little more detail than that and although still in the vernacular typology, it has more definition.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Christina Purdie, 715 W. Manhattan Avenue and Timothy Gonzalez Culbreth, 715 W. Manhattan, were sworn.

Chair Rios asked the applicants if they agreed with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Purdie asked for the recommendations again for clarity.

Chair Rios said staff recommended that the south façade be the primary façade, excluding the door and the windows.

Ms. Purdie and Mr. Culbreth both agreed with staff's recommendation.

Chair Rios pointed out that the Board has the option to add other façades.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Member Biedscheid asked the applicant if they had any knowledge of the age of the wall in front.

Ms. Purdie said they talked to the previous owner whose family had purchased the lot in 1925. They have a photograph from 1935 and the yardwall was not present, but she doesn't know when the wall was built.

Member Biedscheid mentioned about a small fence in the photograph.

Mr. Culbreth described it as a wire-mesh fence.

Vice Chair Katz said the applicants heard the Board's discussion of the east façade and step-down parapet. He asked their thoughts on that being designated as a primary façade.

Mr. Culbreth said they were looking at installing solar panels beneath the parapet and are somewhat concerned. If the side façade was designated primary that might create issues in the future to get the parapets level and keep solar panels on the roof out of public view.

Ms. Purdie added in terms of a primary façade the arresting part of the house is the south facing façade; the archways, the wall and the whole gravitas of the front of the house. When she saw the house, the step downs were not something that drew her in and made her feel like it was part of Santa Fe style. She would defer to the Board's judgment as experts of what has historical significance and in helping them determine which sides should be insignificant in the house.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn, agreed the south façade should be primary. A façade characteristic doesn't have to be special; it has to be characteristic of those of the building and the neighborhood. In the neighborhood they see a lot of step down. Because it is simple it doesn't mean it is not worth preserving. She wondered on installing solar if they could do it with visual screening that would still leave the step down. She thought the wall is character defining and with these little walls she is concerned when owners come and ask for a four-foot wall, which they can get administratively. East Santa Fe Avenue and Don Gaspar have several buildings with four-foot walls that are connected to coyote fencing and that is not typical. To leave it vague allows change that could actually change the character. She thought there could be an aerial photograph that indicates a wall was there in about the 1960s.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Rios said the Board should not delve into what can happen in the future, although in this case she understands what the applicant is saying in reference to solar panels. This evening the Board is only dealing with primary façades. Not what is or isn't going to be changed on the house.

Chair Rios said in reference to the low wall the 50-year mark is now 1970 and she would venture that the wall probably went up way before 1970.

Vice Chair Katz asked to confirm with Ms. Roach or the City Attorney that solar panels could be put on the roof without having to shield them.

Ms. Roach thought it might not be appropriate to address that during a status review case. She said solar panels could be accommodated in one way or another.

Vice Chair Katz said he understood the sense that the step-down parapet is characteristic of the house, and perhaps others. He wasn't sure how the Board could then make an exception; having found this a characteristic they love and the basis for making that façade primary. He asked if they really wanted to restrict themselves from building up the parapet to conceal solar panels. Vice Chair Katz said he believed there can be visible solar panels in this district.

Ms. Roach said she agreed the Board should be making a determination of primary façades based on what character they wish to preserve. But whether an exception would be needed to put publicly visible solar panels on the roof of this home; the choice would not be to allow or not allow

them. The Board could allow solar panels to be publicly visible so she wouldn't speak to if an exception would be needed. The Board could grant an exception to raise the parapet, but their focus should be what character should be preserved on the home. There is a path for solar panels if the applicant wishes to do that. She would be happy to advise them further after the hearing.

Chair Rios repeated her caution to the Board that they should not be addressing what *can* happen in the future. They are currently addressing primary façades.

Member Larson thought everyone agreed that the step-down parapet is an important feature to preserve. Also, that is something that can be preserved, even if it has to be raised. They should be able to repeat that geometry in the future without compromising the design.

Member Biedscheid asked, with the knowledge from the photograph that the yard wall was originally low, if the Board could designate the wall height as a character defining feature and a primary façade. Not necessarily, the stucco materials since they are not sure of the age.

Ms. Roach advised the Board if they wish to include a wall in the contributing status of the home, they should designate it as part of the contributing structure. They shouldn't worry about whether to include the stucco. She recommended they make it contributing if they feel the wall creates a character defining feature based on its configuration and attachment to the home.

Chair Rios said she agreed with that recommendation.

Mr. Schwab noted that the HCPI says the materiality is a stucco masonry wall.

Chair Rios said the character defining feature of the wall is the height; it is really low and allows you to see the beautiful porch of this house.

MOTION: In Case#2020-002040-HDRB, 715 Manhattan Avenue, Member Guida moved to designate Façade #1 as [~~contributing~~] primary, per staff's recommendation, specifically including the porch with the arches; excluding the metal bars; and including the window and door openings in the façades, but not the actual windows and doors themselves; and including the low, approximately 3-foot high yardwall as a [~~character defining~~] contributing feature. The motion was seconded by Member Larson.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Guida, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

Ms. Roach asked to clarify the wording in the motion: The Board is designating façade #1 as *primary*, not as contributing and that the yardwall is *contributing* not character defining.

Member Guida agreed that was correct. [Note: The clarification is noted in the motion.]

5. **Case#2020-002011-HDRB. 633 Gomez Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.** Robert Jaye, owners/agents, request primary façade designation for a contributing residential structure. (Daniel Schwab)

Mr. Schwab presented the staff report as follows:

STAFF REPORT:

633 Gomez is a Spanish Pueblo Revival single-family house designated as Contributing to the Don Gaspar Historic District. With this application, the applicant requests designation of primary facades in advance of an application for remodel.

The original portion of the house was built by 1940, with 16-inch thick adobe walls in a rectangular footprint. There is an historic addition from an unknown date on the north end of the house, which frames an L-shaped patio on the northwest corner. The structure was re-stuccoed in 2016.

The house has a portal on the southwest corner (facades 8 and 1) which is publicly visible. Originally the portal extended further to the north, but half of it was enclosed at an unknown historic date.

The portal contains an historic stuccoed post which forms an archway to the south (façade 1), a flat roof with rounded parapets which are stepped down toward the porch and a historic yard wall at the corner. The front door and window are non-historic, but are set deeply (14-15 inches) into the historic adobe wall. The glass block window on façade 8 replaced a divided lite window in 2005.

Façade 2 is publicly visible. It has massing that is character defining and historic, with a short stuccoed chimney at the east corner. It also contains one deeply set aluminum clad divided light window from 2015 in the original punched opening. While the window has character, it is not historic.

Façade 3 is not publicly visible. It can be described as a simple stuccoed wall expanse with three historic single-pane true divided light windows.

An addition has been made on the north side of the house (facades 3, 4, and 5). Despite this, the HCPI from 1995 states that the overall structure maintains a high degree of integrity. On the north addition and on façade 3, the windows are historic single-pane true divided light windows. Façade 4 has a non-historic French door. Façade 5 has a historic single-pane true divided light window, and façade 6 has two non-historic aluminum windows. Façade 7 is publicly visible and has a non-historic door and a non-historic window with imitation muntins that are not character defining.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the south and west facades (façades 1, 2, 7, and 8) with their publicly visible thick adobe walls and the corner portal be designated primary, but due to the loss of historic windows that the windows be excluded from the primary façade designation, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios pointed out this is in the Don Gaspar Historic District and she noticed the relevant code citations in the packet are the Westside Guadalupe Historic District.

Ms. Roach indicated the code citations are essentially the same.

Member Biedscheid asked if the garage is being considered in this application.

Mr. Schwab said no, they are just assigning primary façades. There is no application being made for primary façade on the garage.

Chair Rios asked if Mr. Schwab knew whether the garage is contributing at this time.

Mr. Schwab thought it was not part of the contributing structure off the top of his head. He offered to look at the details and the age of the garage.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Robert Jaye, 63 Gomez Road, was sworn. He thought this would be one of the better projects hopefully approved, in Santa Fe. He offered to provide information on the garage. It is a one car garage with a non-historic electric overhead door. There is a small room behind the garage they call a studio, and the material is concrete block. He assumed it is not historic because of the concrete block used after the home was built, which is adobe. He has an aerial photograph from 1967 that shows the garage, the house, and the walls surrounding the house.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Ms. Roach asked to comment on the garage. She suggested if it is on a 1967 aerial photograph that it is historic, but the Board does not know its status. The Board should not designate primary façades on a building for which they do not know status.

Chair Rios agreed. She thought that should come to the Board at a later time.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn, agreed with staff's recommendations of the primary facades and thought it clear that the garage is historic, if not contributing. The applicant should be clear they would have to come back to get status and designate primary façades if they want to do something to the garage.

Chair Rios said that is true that the garage could be historic but doesn't mean it is contributing. As far as the Board knows there is nothing that was presented stating it is contributing. She said if the applicant wanted to do anything to the garage, they would need to bring that to the Board.

Mr. Jaye said there are no proposed plans to do anything to the garage.

BOARD DISCUSSION

MOTION: In Case #2020-002011-HDRB. 633 Gomez Road, Member Bienvenu moved, based on staff's recommendation, that facades 1, 2, 7 and 8 be designated as primary with the exclusion of the windows. The motion was seconded by Member Larson.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Guida, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against.

H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Chair Rios asked if Ms. Paez was present.

Ms. Roach indicated she was not.

Chair Rios said she had a question for Ms. Paez regarding field trips. She thought Ms. Paez had indicated that the Board could do individual field trips, if advertised. She asked Ms. Roach if that was correct.

Ms. Roach replied further discussion was needed on the topic because of the many factors involved. They did have a discussion on a caravan-style field trip. She thought that would be legal, however, logistically bringing 8-10 cars down the tiny streets in some districts would be challenging. That needs further discussion.

Chair Rios said her thinking was more about individual field trips. She thought they would be allowed if advertised.

Ms. Roach replied they are not allowed. The time and date would have to be advertised and the public has to be able to join in. That is the challenge and why further discussion is needed. She offered to follow up with Chair Rios and they could discuss it with Ms. Paez.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rios adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:58 p.m.

Approved by:

Cecilia Rios

Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

Melissa D. Byers

Melissa D. Byers, Stenographer

For Byers Organizational Support Services