



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 11/25/08 TIME 4:20pm

SERVED BY (Kaufman)

RECEIVED BY Hydomurus

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2008 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2008 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 28, 2008

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE REHABILITATION OF THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE DEPOT.
2. Case #H-08-101. State Parking Garage. Between Don Gaspar, Paseo de Peralta, Galisteo, and Capitol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. State of New Mexico General Services Department proposes architectural details and finishes for the garage structure. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-08-136. Along Guadalupe Street near the Rail Runner Station. Historic Transition District. Tony Sylvester, Mid-Region Council of Governments, agent for New Mexico Rail Runner Express, proposes to install fourteen 5' x 2' banners on existing light poles along Guadalupe Street. An exception is requested to install banners in the historic district (Section 14-8.10(H)(12)). (David Rasch)

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-110. 123 W. Water. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for 100 W. San Francisco Partners, LLC, proposes to remodel the ally between significant and non-contributing commercial properties by constructing a 4' high 12' wide metal vehicle and pedestrian gate, a 6'6" high wooden board fence along the west side of the alley, and a 6' high wooden board fence to screen trash bins and electric meters on the east side of the alley. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-08-066. 564 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sommer, Karns & Assoc. LLP, agents for Fabienne Montoya, proposes to remodel the entry on a primary elevation of a contributing residence, construct an entry gate to 11' high from street grade in the yardwall, and construct a gas-fired fireplace to 7.5' high. An exception is requested to alter a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). David Rasch)
3. Case #H-08-112. 210 Don Gaspar. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts, proposes to remodel the St. Francis Hotel, a significant commercial building by replacing a door with a niche infill, replacing 3 windows with 3 doors, replacing a wooden fence with a stuccoed wall and remodeling the dining courtyard with changes in opening locations and dimensions and creating new openings where openings do not exist in the courtyard wall, and constructing a water feature and a corner fireplace. An exception is requested to alter primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch)

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-08-122. 121 N. Armijo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Chris Sandoval for Chapman Companies, agent for Patrick & Laura Sanchez, proposes to construct an approximately 2,308 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 14'6" where the maximum allowable height is 15'5" on a vacant lot. (Marissa Barrett)
2. Case #H-08-124. 1131 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Henry, agent for Cira Crowell, proposes to construct two vehicular gates to a height of 5' where the existing height is 6'10" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
3. Case #H-08-125. 112 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Reidy, agent for Kathrine Erickson, proposes to construct an approximately 528 sq. ft. attached studio addition to not exceed the existing height of 13'6", to construct an approximately 22 sq. ft. portal to a height of 10'11" where the existing height is 13'6" and replace doors and windows on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)
4. Case #H-08-126A. 126 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Staff proposes a Historic Status Review for a non-surveyed shed on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

Case #H-08-126B. 126 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent/owner, proposes to increase the height of a non-status shed from 6'8" to 10'8" where the maximum allowable height is 13'8", replace doors and windows, construct a 3' wall on top of an existing 5' retaining wall, construct a wood fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' and construct a vehicular gate to the maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)
5. Case #H-08-127. 512 Camino Del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Miguel da Silva, agent for Arnie & Virginia Israelit, proposes to increase the height of a stuccoed yardwall from 53" to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 60" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)
6. Case #H-08-113A. 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes an historic status review of a non-contributing residence and a non-contributing garage. (David Rasch)

Case #H-08-113B. 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes to remodel the residential building and the garage by replacing windows and doors and to alter opening dimensions and locations. An exception is requested to change openings on a primary elevations (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)
7. Case #H-08-119. 1139 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, agent for E. Alameda, LLC, proposes to construct a 3,182 sq. ft. residence to a height of 16' where the maximum allowable height is 15', a 5' high stuccoed courtyard wall, and a 3'8" high stuccoed yardwall at the east lotline. A 1' height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)
8. Case #H-08-123. 624 E. Alameda #10. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Steve Varela, agent for C. Jan Friedlander & Cindy Kristensen, proposes to construct an approximately 197 sq. ft. portal not to exceed the existing height, construct an outside fireplace, install a brick patio, and replace doors and windows on a non-contributing building. An exception is requested to exceed the 30" window rule (Section 14-5.2(E, I, c)). (Marissa Barrett)

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

K. ADJOURNMENT

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

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
December 9, 2008

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
Approval of Minutes October 28, 2008	Approved as submitted	2
Communications	Discussion	2
Business from the Floor	None.	2
Administrative Matters		
1. Santa Fe Depot Rehabilitation	Recommended approval	2-3
2. <u>Case #H 08-101</u> State Parking Garage	Discussion	3-6
3. <u>Case #H 08-136</u> Rail Runner Banners	Approved	6-8
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-110</u> 123 W. Water	Approved with conditions	8-11
2. <u>Case #H 08-066</u> 564 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions	11-16
3. <u>Case #H 08-112</u> 210 Don Gaspar	Approved with conditions	16-20
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-122</u> 121 N. Armijo Lane	Approved with conditions	20-21
2. <u>Case #H 08-124</u> 1131 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions	21-22
3. <u>Case #H 08-125</u> 112 Rim Road	Approved with conditions	22-24
4. <u>Case #H 08-126A</u> 126 Quintana Street	Approved as non-contributing	24
<u>Case #H 08-126B</u> 126 Quintana Street	Approved with conditions	24-27
5. <u>Case #H 08-127</u> 512 Camino Del Monte Sol	Postponed with instructions	27-29
6. <u>Case #H 08-113A</u> 508 Calle Corvo	Non-contributing status retained	29-30

<u>Case #H 08-113B</u> 508 Calle Corvo	Approved with conditions	30-31
7. <u>Case #H 08-119</u> 1139 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions	32-33
8. <u>Case #H 08-123.</u> 624 E. Alameda #10	Approved with exception	33-35
 Matters from the Board	 None	 35
Adjournment	Adjourned at 9:30 p.m.	35

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

December 9, 2008

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker
Mr. Dan Featheringill

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Cecilia Rios [excused]
Two Vacancies

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner
Ms. Kelley Brennan, City Associate Attorney
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rasch said staff had no changes.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the agenda as published. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods announced to the public that decisions could be appealed to the Governing Body within seven days and anyone wishing to file an appeal should speak with staff about it.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. October 28, 2008

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of October 28, 2008 as presented. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Walker announced that on January 25th, Eric Blinman would be speaking about the archaeology at the old St. Vincent's Hospital.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1. Santa Fe Depot. A Resolution Supporting the Rehabilitation of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Depot. (David Rasch)**

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

The City is bringing forward a resolution to rehabilitate the Santa Fe Railway Depot building. Staff recommends that the Board recommend approval of this resolution to the Governing Body with the understanding that the specific issues in the project will be brought to the Board for action at a later date.

The project will include electric, plumbing, and HVAC upgrades, correction of code issues, repair of stucco and exposed wooden beams, and "other remodeling and repairs" as needed.

There is still no resolution on the roof.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to recommend approval to the Governing Body. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H 08-101 State Parking Garage. Between Don Gaspar, Paseo de Peralta, Galisteo and Capitol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. State of New Mexico General Services Department proposes architectural details and finishes for the garage structure. (David Rasch)**

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

The State of New Mexico, General Services Department, Property Control Division proposes to construct a four-story 207,723 square foot parking facility on the property bounded by Galisteo Street, Don Gaspar Avenue, Paseo de Peralta, Manhattan Avenue, and South Capitol Street. The maximum height of the building is proposed at 35' 10" and the maximum allowable height is 17' 8."

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with brick coping at the parapets and window surrounds. Other design elements include a few triangular pediments, a balustraded upper floor balcony supported by corbels, and a pergola at the pedestrian entrance.

Now, the project team wishes to present architectural details including finishes and colors, including the following items. The window trim will be white painted metal and a Fypon mesh will be installed over the openings to simulate muntins. Brick coping will be "Inca" red and three colors of stucco will be "Kilim Beige," "Pueblo," and a custom color that is browner than the two others. Exterior lights will be bronze-colored hemispherical dome sconces.

This was not an action item. The Board was giving advice to the State.

Present and sworn were Ms. Paula Tackett and Mr. Bruce Farmer. Ms. Tackett started with a timeline review. She apologized for the confusion at the site visit at noon.

In late January 2008, GSD met with City representatives and the President of OSFA and it had their feedback fed into RFP. In March, the City had a very negative reaction. At the 2nd meeting they had representatives from the City and the community. The collaboration between City and State has been great and we have a better project. At the second meeting, the State agreed to go down one level and use guard rails. At the third meeting the designers said the yard wall should be higher so they raised them and added brick coping. Then at the HDRB meeting the Board asked for changes on colors and window treatment. At the last meeting the Board voiced concerns and made requests that they were now ready to address.

Mr. Farmer told the Board what they could do and then Ms. Tackett shared what they could not do.

Mr. Farmer explained that they tweaked the colors. The palette was sampled from the Capitol campus where there was a wide range. They were trying to use the colors to break up the long façade by adding them in. They were just minor shades apart; nothing to stand out. It was a long façade so it needed subtle

breaking up. They toned up the lighter ones. They were a little darker than first proposed. They were standard colors, not custom colors.

Regarding the second item - glazed windows, there was a large window on the west end where they rearticulated muntins for a more vertical expression.

They had to put something in the opening and selected a 4x4 grill to be placed into them. They were the same metal material and would help break up the opening. The muntins were really steel bars. The mesh had to be there and was a security issue on the ground floor.

Ms. Tackett said there were a number of issues they could not address:

1. Concrete - they were asked to color it or use aggregate but there was concrete all over the complex that was grey and it was very expensive to color. They looked at a stamped pattern that would be difficult to replace in the future. It was also a problem with snow melt so the decision was not to do that.
2. Yard wall heights - they checked that the heights were exactly as shown. The precast panels were already produced. She showed the human scale. There would be lots of poplar trees.
3. Stucco - they could touch it up if messed up with graffiti. They could not show it to the Board today. The elastomeric was best choice for us. Stucco was very expensive and they have maxed out our budget. The long span on north side - the grid openings were fabricated and painted off site. They have to have just one color. The labor costs would be tremendous and they could not do it. Perhaps if they had known earlier they could have.
4. Brick - the Board asked us to use different colors. The brick sample showed the variegated colors. They could not afford to order different colors of bricks.
5. Long spanned openings on first floor - it would reduce the free area for ventilation and it would become a code violation and it was very expensive. They also looked at mock columns but because they were so accessible they would require extra maintenance. They were not built in as part of the panels so they could not do those things.

She felt they tried to accommodate the Board as best they could.

Ms. Walker asked if the palette colors were all elastomeric colors. Mr. Farmer agreed.

Ms. Walker didn't see that any pansies were planted along the north side.

Mr. Farmer explained that they had to provide fire access but planting strips would be put in there. It would be in Phase II improvements. After development of the property to the north, they would put them in.

Ms. Walker suggested an espalier against the wall.

Ms. Tackett thought that after the legislative session they probably could do that.

Mr. Featheringill recalled they worked on that when they worked on the redesign and decided to have landscaping where the building faced the streets.

Chair Woods asked if this treatment was only on the north side.

Ms. Tackett said it was because they had yard walls on the south side.

Mr. Farmer said they would have 10-14' high yard walls on south. It was a security item.

Chair Woods asked what distance was between the yardwall and the building

Mr. Farmer said they were 8-12 feet from the building. They pulled them up to soften up the façade.

Chair Woods asked what the percentages were on dark, medium and light colors.

Mr. Farmer said the darker was on the parking structure and the lighter was on the closer elements. Yard walls were about 50/50 light and medium colors. Dark on spandrels and parking structure. It was done on purpose.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Rad Acton, 126 Canyon Road, who said he was gratified that the collaborative process has gone so well. It ultimately served everyone and had contributions from community and Board. He was also gratified that there seemed to be a great deal of receptivity for the role this process could have in the future. He hoped these proceedings would reinforce that willingness to participate again. He would like to see some formalization of this process between the city and state and leave it to the Board how this might occur.

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

Chair Woods thanked Mr. Acton for the enormous amount of time he contributed. All the Board appreciated that.

Mr. Featheringill preferred the colors on option #2.

Ms. Walker preferred #1 but would be happy with either one.

Ms. Shapiro preferred #2 but thought the middle color was too close to the lightest color and would like a little more brown in it.

Chair Woods preferred #2 and agreed with Ms. Shapiro.

Chair Woods thanked the applicants for coming back and for the process.

Ms. Tackett said on behalf of Secretary Jaramillo they were happy to do it collaboratively.

3. **Case #H 08-136** Along Guadalupe Street near the Rail Runner Station. Historic Transition District. Tony Sylvester, Mid-Region Council of Governments, agent for New Mexico Rail Runner Express, proposes to install fourteen 5' x 2' banners on existing light poles along Guadalupe Street. An exception is requested to install banners in the historic district (section 14-8.10(H)(12)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The New Mexico Rail Runner Express is about to begin service to Santa Fe and proposes to advertise the locations of train stops by installing banners on existing light poles along the streets near where stations are located. There are three stations within Santa Fe: Zia Station at Zia and St. Francis; South Capitol Station between Alta Vista and Cordova and between Cerrillos and St. Francis; and Santa Fe Depot Station at the Railyard. This last station is located adjacent to the landmarked Santa Fe Depot Building and the Transition Historic District on Guadalupe Street.

Numerous banners will be installed in each of these areas. Along both sides of Guadalupe Street there will be 14 banners that are 5' x 2' and designed in a four-color scheme that is simple and easily recognizable. These banners have been installed along the first phase of the project down south.

Six of the banners will be located north of Read Street in the historic district. According to Section 14-8.10(H)(12), "banners shall not be permitted as advertising within the H-District." An exception is requested and the required criteria responses are attached.

The banner material is presumed to be plastic and the duration of their installation was approximately one year.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception request to install banners along Guadalupe Street in the Transition Historic District (Section 14-8.10 (H)(12)) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exception.

Ms. Walker noted in the description it said they would be up for a year. She asked if they would come down after a year. She also asked what the colors were.

Mr. Rasch described them.

Ms. Shapiro asked how many would be in the historic district.

Present and sworn was Mr. Tony Sylvester who brought with him an actual banner to be installed. He said they would wear very well and would not fade.

He said service would begin on Dec 17 so they wanted to have them up soon. There were 14 banners in the proposal and proposed to install them on light poles for 12 months. Some would be delayed because some stations were coming on line later on. They were on Guadalupe north and south of the station. They were the same as were used in other communities. The colors came from their graphic standards and were the colors of the ATSF RR. They were selected through focus groups. He showed the locations and the entrance to the Railyard station.

He said the locations were selected for access to the platform to help customers find the station. It was frustrating when they could not find the station and places to park. They would not impede circulation, they were temporary and they wanted them to be visible. They had lots of phone calls on how to reach the platform from the Plaza and other places. The Railyard was historically a place where people came in on the train. The easier it was for them to get there, the better.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they were going to add arrows to the banners.

Mr. Sylvester said the banner meant you were getting close and needed to look for a parking place. There were other signs to direct people to the platform.

Ms. Walker asked if on December 18th 2009 they would come down. Mr. Sylvester agreed.

Ms. Walker felt there were too many.

Mr. Sylvester said they wanted to have some seen from the north and some from the south. There were more on the south side and they wanted to use existing poles.

Ms. Walker thought they only needed two banners north of Read Street.

Mr. Sylvester thought they were all important.

Ms. Shapiro asked what would happen after the first year.

Mr. Sylvester said they could take them down. All the other communities decided to leave theirs up and downtown Bernalillo was a historic area.

Mr. Featheringill asked if approval would open up the door for other banners to be allowed.

Mr. Rasch clarified that every request had to be an exception.

Mr. Featheringill asked if when they took them down the hardware would be taken down too.
Mr. Sylvester agreed.

Mr. Featheringill thought they had always had a train station there so they were not really needed.

Chair Woods felt it was great to bring in the train to the Railyard and revitalize it. Her concern was having all kinds of banners noting that the 400th Anniversary Committee wanted them too. She thought half the number would do it. She didn't think they needed them all the way up Guadalupe or on both sides. So a fewer and closer to the entrance would be better.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Sylvester said they understood the ordinance restrictions and were open to the Board's wishes.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve 08-136 agreeing with the exception responses with the condition that two banners be placed north of Garfield and four banners be placed south of Garfield on Guadalupe on the west side of the street and that the banners all be removed on Dec 18, 2009. The motion was seconded by Ms. Shapiro and passed by unanimous voice vote.

H. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H 08-110** 123 W. Water. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Dale Zinn, agent for 100 W. San Francisco Partners, LLC, proposes to remodel the alley between significant and non-contributing commercial properties by constructing a 4' high 12' wide metal vehicle and pedestrian gate, a 6' 6" high wooden board fence along the west side of the alley and a 6' high wooden board fence to screen trash bins and electric meters on the east side of the alley. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

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

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

A steel tube "farm and ranch" gate was installed at the streetscape between the two buildings and

approximately 7' high interior coyote fences were installed along both sides of the alley without historic preservation approval or a permit and a stop work order was issued.

The Board postponed action on a proposal to replace the previously installed steel tube gate and replace it with a dark green painted steel gate and retain the previously constructed coyote fences and coyote gate pending redesign that considers different fence materials other than coyote latillas that are lighter in character or provides visual access through the fence.

Now, the applicant proposes the following changes to the request.

1. The entry gate along the front of the alley is simply designed as a vehicle gate and a pedestrian gate with welded steel tubing.
2. The coyote latillas fences would be changed to board fences. Similar board fences exist in the streetscape. This proposal is somewhat lighter in character, but it does not provide more visual access than latillas. The fence heights are slightly lower than previously proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application, although there is only one other vehicle gate in the streetscape, which complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dale Zinn. He thanked the Board for letting him come back. He submitted letters of support (Ex A). He commented about a conference at the Railyard on modern architecture fitting into historic districts. He said Pen LaFarge had said that Oliver LaFarge used the characteristic as the intent of the ordinance was to make things look more handmade instead of industrial. So he went through taking pictures of gates downtown.

Mr. Zinn said Water Street was the back alley for the Plaza and up until 1949; it had the power plant for the City. After he went around, he liked the coyote fence better. They lowered it but if rejected he would move on. He felt this was more in character with a back alley.

Chair Woods said what he was proposing didn't look handmade and agreed that handmade was better.

Mr. Zinn felt the owners had a right to have a gate there. They could not do an invisible gate so this was as light as possible. They would consider a wood gate if that was what the Board wanted.

Ms. Walker recently did a photo essay of historic gates. Some of the most beautiful were wrought iron gates.

Mr. Zinn agreed but added that people tended to run into them.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Barker who said he personally would love a wrought iron gate but was not sure how long it would last. Trucks making deliveries would run into it. They had replaced it 5 times. They were trying to make it really simple. It would have to be made at a welding shop.

Mr. Zinn handed the display board to them and described the gate as a two inch tube welded up and it could have twisted wrought iron as a decorative element.

Ms. Walker said she didn't mean they should make it flowery.

Mr. Zinn pointed out that there were two gates in the proposal. He briefly explained the differences.

Mr. Rasch said on the left side was the west side of alley and on the right was the east side of the alley.

Mr. Zinn clarified it was a security issue. There were ugly things happening in the alley. He explained they were working with Theo Raven on the first 25' to make it accessible so people could come and go easily. At the back they needed visible security to screen all the trash, etc. back there. The front gate was all steel and open as much as possible.

Ms. Walker asked if it could be stepped back a little.

Mr. Zinn said it was stepped back four feet.

Ms. Shapiro asked for more description.

Mr. Zinn said it was a cedar board fence painted blue and at six foot intervals were natural posts. The blue was between Burro Alley bright blue and the Palace of the Governor's blue.

Ms. Walker questioned painting them turquoise.

Mr. Zinn said the predominance of fences around there were painted but they could stain it if the Board preferred.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. John Granito who said he was so against this solid fence on the west side. Those were usually used to shield garbage dumps. It was hardly a garbage dump or unsightly. He thought something open like wrought iron would be better. It was more a security hazard because police could not see back there. They could not put up a gate because of fire concerns and neighbor objections.

Chair Woods asked if he had worked together with the applicant.

Mr. Granito said he had no communication from the Barkers. The former fence was only a four-foot

fence and you could see through it.

Chair Woods asked if he would you be willing to work things out and work the financed out.

Mr. Granito said it had been difficult but he would talk with him. He was unsure if they could do it financially. The four-foot fence was supposed to go back up. They took this in an unfriendly manner - it was designed to freeze him out. He added that Water Street had not been a back alley for a long time. The alley was behind what he wanted to shield out.

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

Mr. Zinn said the former fence was installed by Lockwood under the direction of Theo Raven. They tried to lower the fence from 7' to 5' 8". There was some visual distraction up that alley. Mr. Granito had things along there that needed to be shielded. If Mr. Granito would agree, he would make the fence four feet and then step it back up at the end.

Chair Woods asked if he was proposing some kind of iron fence along the street and a fence at 4' to the last panel and then the last at 6' 8".

Ms. Walker thought blue for the very far gate would be fine and coyote at 4 feet would help Granitos.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-110 with the fence on west side at 4 feet, not blue, either wood panel or coyote, the rear panel at 6' and blue and front gate looking hand forged and highly fenestrated. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 08-066** 564 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Sommer, Kams & Associates, LLP, agents for Fabienne Montoya, proposes to remodel the entry on a primary elevation of a contributing residence, construct an entry gate to 11' high from street grade in the yardwall, and construct a gas-fired fireplace to 7.5' high. An exception is requested to alter a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

564 Alameda Street is a single family residence that was constructed with Pentile before 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The 1,888 square foot historic footprint has already been added to in excess of 50%. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The north and east elevations are considered to be primary.

After much discussion, the Board approved a remodel of the building by granting a 50% footprint rule exception on October 10, 2006. Last year, the applicant performed work that was not approved or permitted, including altering the primary north elevation and constructing accessory structures, so a stop

work order was issued.

On June 24, 2008 the H-Board postponed action on the front porch remodel, the entry hall attached to the yardwall, and the outdoor fireplace pending redesign including a restoration of the front primary elevation porch and steps, a reduction in height and depth of the entry hall, and a reduction in height of the fireplace to the yardwall height or lower. Some physical limitations, described below, are hindering complete adherence to the postponement request, but the applicant has made an effort to comply.

Now, the applicant is proposing to alter the property with the following three items.

1. The historic front porch entry has been altered. As shown in attached photographs, stepped spur walls flanked a stair that was faced with colored tile and the porch interior was traditionally surfaced in white. The spur walls and steps have been demolished and curvilinear steps have been constructed. This is not a traditional design for Spanish-Pueblo style, having more of a grand Spanish Baroque quality, and an exception was not requested to alter the historic material on a primary elevation.

At the October 10, 2006 hearing, the applicant submitted a new site plan. That plan showed alterations to the primary elevation steps, although they were designed rectilinearly rather than the curvilinear as built. Staff did not have adequate time to review the site plan and the minutes show that the Board did not discuss this item.

The proposed remodel does not demolish the curvilinear steps. Rather, they will be obscured by the construction of stepped planters. The curved front edges will be retained and faced with tile like the historic step risers. The planters will be stuccoed to match the residence and the porch interior walls will be restored to a white finish.

An exception is requested to alter a primary elevation and the required criteria responses are attached (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)).

2. An approximately 225 square foot free-standing entry hall was constructed at the northeast corner of the lot to a height of 9' above interior grade. The drawings that were submitted are not identical to what has been built. The drawings do not show the complete depth of the structure and an arched roof was shown. The existing structure has a canted parapet.

In addition to the structure, curvilinear steps were constructed in front between two planters. The October 2006 site plan shows rectilinear steps and the minutes show that the steps and planters were of concern.

The proposed remodel lowers the height of the entry by 2' and reduces the depth of mass from 13' to 3'. The height can be lowered to the bond beam much easier than lowering it further. A step in the yardwall is proposed on the south side of the entry to balance the north side. Stucco finish will match the residence and exterior light designs, if proposed, should be clarified by the Board during the hearing.

3. An approximately 85 square foot gas-fired fireplace was constructed *inside* the east yardwall to a height of 9'.

The proposed fireplace lowers the height to 7.5' or down to the firebox surface. This will cause the fireplace to rise above the yardwall by 1.5' and the yardwall is proposed to be stepped like the entry area and integrated into the fireplace with spur walls to hide the fireplace from the street. Stucco finish will match the residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to alter a primary elevation which was inadvertently previously approved without complete review and discussion. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn were Mr. Joseph Kams and Mr. Jeff Seres.

Mr. Kams presented on behalf of Mr. Montoya who asked him to get involved after the June hearing. Mr. Seres would walk through the proposal. He thanked Mr. Rasch and Ms. Brennan for sharing the Board's concerns. They minimized the demolition and identified a path for finality that they hoped would be acceptable.

Chair Woods said it would be best to take each of the three components at a time: building, gate and fireplace. She asked him to tell the Board what was happening on the front elevation.

Mr. Seres said they would have planters on either side to take out most of the curve of the steps and step the walls down toward the front of the steps and put the tile back on the risers of the steps.

Chair Woods asked why they would not chip out the steps and replace the spur walls. What he proposed was such a major architectural feature on top of it. She clarified they could replace the walls and leave the stairs.

Mr. Seres agreed and said it would be comparable in cost.

Chair Woods said she was personally not in favor of the tiles.

Mr. Featheringill agreed with the spur walls and thought the steps could then be straightened out.

Mr. Seres said that would be difficult because of coloring. He added that they would have white plaster underneath.

Mr. Featheringill liked having the tile replaced.

Ms. Walker liked Chair Woods's ideas as it would eliminate the bulk of the steps and she didn't care

about tile.

Ms. Shapiro asked how thick the spur walls would be.

Mr. Seres said they would match the original.

Ms. Shapiro liked the tile.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would be adding lighting.

Mr. Seres said they would not.

Chair Woods went on to the gate.

Mr. Seres explained that they would move it down to the bond beam (2") and move the mass down another 20" and remove all the mass behind. On the east side they would step the wall to match the right side and integrate it into the existing wall.

Ms. Walker asked how much depth would be removed.

Mr. Seres thought it was taken four feet off the seven feet as well as the stepping on the interior.

Ms. Walker felt those were good improvements. On the street, nothing was as overwhelming. The door was beautiful.

Mr. Seres showed the Board a photograph.

Ms. Walker asked if they still wanted a piece above the door.

Chair Woods asked what the height would be.

Mr. Seres said it would be 8' 6" from landing to bond beam. He thought it would do more for the amount of stucco on the bond beam.

Ms. Shapiro asked if all the new would have rounded edges. She asked if there were any light fixtures there.

Mr. Rasch noted it was wired for lights.

Mr. Seres didn't remember but would bring the fixtures to staff for approval.

The discussion turned to the Fireplace.

Mr. Seres said they were lowering this also to the break, taking off two courses of block and on the street side extending it out to integrate with the existing yard wall.

Chair Woods asked for the changes in height.

Mr. Seres said it be reduced from 8' 9" to 7' 6".

Chair Woods felt that was still pretty high.

Mr. Rasch thought they could consider this an accent on the wall.

Ms. Shapiro said right now it was a box and asked if it could be cut back on the sides.

Mr. Seres was not sure what was under it.

Chair Woods thought it looked strange from the street.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they could investigate the original plans.

Mr. Seres thought they could soften it with taper and step but it was solid concrete on top.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they could bring this part back.

Mr. Seres suggested they could bring down the sides. It would be chipping out and then reduce the top down and lower the height of the wall.

Present and sworn was Mr. Montoya, father to the owner, who said he was construction manager for interior of the building and found sub contractors. He said the fireplace was CMU at 12" then 8" on next tier and 6" on top. From the fire box it was constructed out of fire brick and had a metal flue and damper. It was intended to be gas fired, not wood. There was only about a foot and a half that could be taken down. The flue was 24" in height. And below that would get into the metal damper.

He said they would have to take it all down to the metal flue. There was only two feet from fire box to wall. It was massive and would take considerable effort to take it down. They would have to take the roof off first and deal with the concrete and rebar on it.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods thanked Mr. Seres and the Montoyas for working with the Board on it.

Chair Woods said the applicant would need to bring a new sketch to staff as well as light fixtures. The fireplace from be reduced from 8' 9" to 7' 6" and tie back into the wall and slope it down.

Mr. Featheringill felt tying the fire box back into the wall would just make it bigger.

Mr. Seres agreed and said they could leave the wall alone.

Ms. Walker said the Board would need to have drawings for the gate and the fireplace.

Mr. Seres asked if they could have staff approve them.

Ms. Walker agreed.

Mr. Seres said they would diminish the massing and height.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the back could be shaped as well as the front.

Mr. Seres agreed they would shape it on all four sides

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-066 with the following conditions:

1. Add spur walls on the front similar to the original,
2. Chip off the ends of the steps and use tile or not on the risers,
3. Paint under portal white,
4. Remove four feet of the existing gate and back to 3' thick and lowered to 7' 6" and step the sides,
5. Provide a revised drawing to staff,
6. Provide details of exterior lights to staff,
7. Reduce the height of the fireplace at least to 7' 6" and sculpt the fireplace,
8. Provide a revised drawing of the fireplace to staff after the demolition for staff approval.

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

3. **Case #H 08-112** 210 Don Gaspar. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts, proposes to remodel the St. Francis Hotel, a significant commercial building by replacing a door with a nicho infill, replacing 3 windows with 3 doors, replacing a wooden fence with a stuccoed wall and remodeling the dining courtyard with changes in opening locations and dimensions and creating new openings where openings do not exist in the courtyard wall, and constructing a water feature and a corner fireplace. An exception is requested to alter primary elevations (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

210 Don Gaspar Avenue, known previously as De Vargas Hotel and today as Hotel St. Francis, was

constructed in the Mission Revival style by 1890. The Mission Revival courtyard wall at the northwest corner has an unknown but presumed historic date of construction. Minor remodeling has occurred and the building is listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. All façades on a significant building are considered to be primary.

On October 14, 2008, the Board postponed action on this application pending submittal of additional drawings with more detail of proposed alterations. Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following five items.

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

The two existing window openings on the west elevation facing the courtyard were enlarged in 1986 and 6-light windows were installed to match other windows. These windows will be removed and replaced with 3-light French doors in the same height and width with the lower panels solid to mimic the visual character of the windows. Therefore, while this opening change on a primary elevation requires an exception (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the exception responses are attached, there has already been non-historic opening alterations in these areas.

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

The existing wooden pedestrian gates on the north elevation will be removed and replaced with different wooden gates. The entry wall will be thickened in this area so that the gates can be recessed to not swing into the sidewalk. The clay tile roof will be retained. Two sconces will be installed on either side of the gates.

An existing fountain and planters on the west side of the courtyard will be removed.

A stuccoed fireplace will be constructed in the northwest corner with the chimney extending above the wall. It is designed in the character of the building.

A Spanish Baroque-designed fountain will be constructed in the center of the courtyard and four trees will be planted.

Existing wooden screen walls at the rear of the courtyard will be stucco finished and a narrow wooden access door will be replaced at the west end. An additional door will be cut in the screen wall and both doors will be painted to match the stucco color. A nicho and two sconces will be installed on the wall.

2. An existing sealed, possibly historic, wooden pedestrian door on the east elevation will be removed

and the opening infilled with stuccoed wall to create a niche for a St. Francis sculpture. The sculpture design was not submitted.

3. An existing 7.5' high wooden board fence and gate on the west elevation will be stuccoed in the same location at a slightly taller height at 8.25'. The existing gate will be retained and replaced.

An existing 6-light window behind the proposed stuccoed wall will be replaced with a 12-light window at the same height but in a wider opening. An exception is requested to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are attached.

4. An existing 8-light window on the south elevation will be removed and replaced with 4-light French doors in the same height and width with the lower panels solid to mimic the visual character of the window. An exception is requested to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are attached.

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

5. The clay tile roof over the kitchen beside the northwest courtyard is leaking. The roof will be replaced in-kind to match existing conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception request to create openings where openings do not exist, close existing openings, and alter opening dimensions in historic elevations unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to approve the proposal. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn were Mr. Karl Sommer and Mr. Richard Martinez.

Chair Woods asked that they use the laser pointer to identify parts of the proposal. She asked Mr. Rasch to comment on anything that would affect the historic status.

Mr. Sommer explained that the drawings were more specific now and that was why they were back. They worked hard with Mr. Rasch.

Mr. Martinez said this was a very important building and they hoped these alterations would not compromise the building.

He started with the fence that was added in 1986. On the south side, one window would become a door. It was behind the wall and a new wall on the side with a gate to match would enclose the portal. The window at the back of the courtyard on the first floor on a one-story addition on the back that was once a barber shop and now was a guest room and would become a reading room. They proposed to double the size of the window. He explained that it was close to 80' back and would be a wood window to match. The

whole courtyard would be cleaned up because many windows looked into it. It would have clay tile on the addition on the back. That one room was one story tall. The kitchen was to have real clay tile.

Mr. Martínez pointed out the doorway on the east side that originally went into a restaurant and had been closed up since at least 1986. They proposed to close it, stucco it and have a nicho for the sculpture. They had not yet gotten the design.

Mr. Rasch wasn't sure how old the door was.

Mr. Martínez said in 1986 a photo showed it as a Dutchman's door. He couldn't find an older photo of it.

Chair Woods said she had a hard time with the door. You would see stone around a stucco nicho. Of all of them, she would hate to lose that door.

Mr. Martínez said the owners were really strong on the sculpture and he told them it would be difficult to get it approved.

Around on Water Street, the gate was a fire exit for the hotel. He could not put a gate that would open off the property so he proposed thickening it to the inside so it could open on the property. He showed a drawing of the gate.

Mr. Featheringill said as drawn it wouldn't open as it would hit the arch before it could open. He suggested they could cut it below the arch and it would swing.

Mr. Martínez said it would be stained wood and the same would go for the small gate at the back of the patio. The other doors were painted to match the stucco to not draw attention to them. One was a fire exit and the other was from the kitchen. He shared a photo of the scones and would submit the design to staff.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were two windows in the gate and two nichos on each side.

Mr. Martínez agreed. They were designed with verticals and would open the courtyard to the street. The gate windows would have wrought iron crosses and they were making new hinges and hardware. It was not historic.

Chair Woods noted the building had an interplay of square and arched openings. She asked if he would consider a square top for that gate.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

Mr. Martínez pointed out the fireplace in the corner was square with mission style opening and a flared flue. Two feet of it would be seen from outside and the wall would go around the fireplace and allow the tile to go around the back. The tile was on top of the wall now. The chimney would not affect that tile. They

also proposed the two windows at back of restaurant be made into double French doors. Those windows were added in 1986. It used to be back rooms of shops.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the window openings were historic.

Mr. Rasch said the dimensions had changed.

Mr. Martínez clarified that they were not widening the current openings.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods reviewed the issues for the Board:

Arched openings on either side of the gate

Arched gate won't open

Gate to be stained

Issue with old door

Replacement of the clay tile

Chair Woods asked where the painted doors were.

Mr. Rasch clarified they were on the inside at Water Street and not visible.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 08-112, accepting all of the applicant's changes except the nicho on Don Gaspar (keeping the door), adding the clay roof change on the west elevation and square windows on north and west elevations and changing the arched gate as reviewed and approved by staff. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H 08-122** 121 N. Armijo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Chris Sandoval for Chapman Companies, agent for Patrick and Laura Sanchez, proposes to construct an approximately 2,308 sq. ft. single family residence to a height of 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 5" on a vacant lot. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The applicant proposes construction of an approximately 2,308 square foot single family residence (1,655 square feet heated space, 509 square foot attached carport, and a 144 square foot portal) on a .378 acre lot. The new residence will be to a height of 14' 6' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 5".

The building will be constructed from frame and will include Andersen vinyl divided light windows in the color "Terratone Brown". Exposed wood beams, posts, and carved corbels for the portal will be finished in "American Pecan" which is a medium brown stain. The building will be stuccoed using Sonowall synthetic stucco in the color "Pueblo". Wood canales were proposed east and west elevations. Canale lining was not submitted. Exterior light fixtures were not submitted.

Three skylights are indicated on the floor plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that no skylights or rooftop appurtenances are publicly visible, that canales are lined with galvanized metal, and that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a building permit application is submitted. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Chapman who said the staff conditions were fine. They hadn't selected light fixtures and would submit the design to staff. Parapets would shield the skylights.

Chair Woods pointed out a single post and corbel on the south portal.

Mr. Chapman agreed to do post and corbels on both sides.

Ms. Walker congratulated him on a beautiful design.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-122 per staff recommendations with conditions that the post and corbel be used on both ends of the portal and any light fixtures be reviewed and approved by staff. Ms. Walker seconded the motion with the condition that stucco color be brought to staff for review and approval. Ms. Shapiro agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 08-124.** 1131 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Henry, agent for Cira Crowell, proposes to construct two vehicular gates to a height of 5' where the existing height is 6' 10" on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival Style single family residence located at 1131 East Alameda was constructed after 1945 and received major additions and exterior remodeling in 1997. The Official Map

lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes construction of two mechanical vehicular gates along Alameda Street. The gates would be located in the existing stone and stucco wall openings. The gates would be coyote latillas and would be to a height of 5' where the existing wall height is 6' 10".

Also proposed is the relocation of an existing coyote fence located on the west end of the property approximately 16' to the south. The fence will not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6' and will include a stuccoed pilaster on the west end.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Henry, who said the security risks were high in this neighborhood. All the neighbors put up security gates and walls and his client had numerous occasions of vandalism and attempted robbery and trespassing. They wanted to carry the coyote through to the gate to reduce climbing over it.

Ms. Walker asked if the concept was to keep people from leaping over the gate but with some visibility. She appreciated the many beautiful wrought iron features there now.

Mr. Henry felt people could scale the iron fence easier.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-124 approving the vehicular gate with some fenestration. (Some kind of opening in the coyote fence with latillas loosely spaced). Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion.

After a brief discussion, Ms. Walker withdrew her motion.

Present and sworn was the owner, Ms. Cira Crowell, 1131 E. Alameda. She said there was a coyote gate at the end of the block. It was lovely and pieces were vertical. Her windows had been beaten in by bats so she was looking for some privacy and security. It was by the river so people could get away and was scary.

Ms. Walker agreed it was a tricky location when the park shut down. But often putting in a barrier allowed people to do things behind it without being seen.

Mr. Rasch pointed out the picture on page 11, top left.

Ms. Walker moved her previous motion with the condition that the gate have irregular tops. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 08-125.** 112 Rim Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Thomas Reidy, agent for Katerina Erickson, proposes to construct an approximately 528 sq. ft. attached studio addition to not exceed the existing height of 13' 6", to construct an approximately 22 sq. ft. portal to a height of 10' 11" where the existing height is 13' 6" and replace doors and windows on a non-contributing building. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival Style single family residence was constructed in 1990 and is listed on the Official Map as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 528 square foot attached studio on the west elevation. *The studio will not exceed the existing height of 13' 6". Windows will match existing trim and the addition will match the existing stucco type, texture, and color.* Two skylights are proposed for the new studio.

The applicant also proposes replacing doors and windows on the east elevation as well as one window on the south and north elevation. The window on the north elevation does not meet the 30" window rule.

Lastly proposed is the construction of an approximately 22 square foot portal trellis to a height of 10' 11" where the existing height is 13' 6". The portal will be constructed from wood and will have a natural stain finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that skylights are not publicly visible and that window and doors not under a portal meet the 30" window rule. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Present and sworn was Mr. Elon Vershaye, 112 Rim Road who had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked about the window not meeting the 30" rule.

Mr. Vershaye said he was thinking of having a divided light window.

Ms. Barrett explained the rule and said the window was 48" now.

Mr. Vershaye agreed to make the window conform to the rule.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-125 per staff recommendations with the conditions that the window be divided like the window on the east elevation and that skylights not be publicly visible. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Featheringill said the French doors didn't need to meet the rule either.

Ms. Barrett explained that they were under a portal as were the east elevation windows and thus exempt from the 30" rule.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 4. Case #H 08-126A.** 126 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Staff proposes a Historic Status Review for a non-surveyed shed on a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The approximately 133 square foot, non-publicly visible, accessory structure (shed) was constructed in the 1950s from adobes and includes salvaged windows and a flat roof. An affidavit from a previous owner states that the structure was in poor condition at the time of her purchase and that about 2/3 of the adobes had to be replaced and the walls re-plastered. A door opening on the east elevation was replaced with a window and a door was installed on the north elevation in the late 1970s. The roof was also replaced around the same time. The Official Map lists no status for the building.

The structure was simple in style and retains no significant architectural features according to the recent Historic Culture Properties Inventory. Therefore the consultant recommends that the structure is *non-contributing* to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that the Board designate the building as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District due to lack of architectural and historic integrity that contribute to the character of the streetscape and the Historic District.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to designate the historic status as non-contributing. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. (Mr. Featheringill was not in the room for the

vote).

Case #H 08-126B. 126 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent/owner, proposes to increase the height of a non-status shed from 6' 8" to 10' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 13' 8", replace doors and windows, construct a 3' wall on top of an existing 5' retaining wall, construct a wood fence to the maximum allowable height of 6' and construct a vehicular gate to the maximum allowable height of 6'. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The owner of 126 Quintana Street was red tagged in September 2008 for doing work without a permit or Historic Design Board approval.

The applicant proposes to raise the roof of an approximately 133 square foot shed from a height of 6' 8" to 10' 8" where the maximum allowable height is 13' 8". The door and two windows will be replaced with a door and windows recycled from 127 Duran Street which went before the Board last year for remodeling. The building will be re-stuccoed to match the existing single family residence in color, type, and texture.

The applicant proposes to repair and paint white the existing natural finish dog-eared wood fence on the west elevation. Remove an existing wire fence located on the interior of the property and replace with a wood dog-eared fence to not exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'. The fence will be painted white. Repair a 5' high stone retaining wall on the north property line and construct a 3' high stone wall on top of it. The total height from the north elevation will be 8' and from the interior it will be 3' high. The stone being used for the repair and construction of the new wall have a red tint rather than the existing grayish color. The existing burnt red pedestrian gate on the north elevation will be painted cobalt blue.

Lastly proposed is a vehicular gate at the south end of the property. The vehicular gate requires a license agreement from the City of Santa Fe for construction. A chain link vehicular gate existed in this area and was removed during the single family residence remodeling. The new gate will be wood and match the existing pedestrian gate. The gate will be to the maximum allowable height of 6'. Gate finish was not submitted

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that no walls or fences exceed the maximum allowable height, that the gate be more transparent to allow sight into the property. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.

Mr. Kams (previously sworn) said the proposal had five different elements. They agreed with all staff conditions except for the gate transparency. Historically at the front entrance was a double sided chain link fence. It was installed by the City. The previous owner took the gate with her. Ms. Angriman was

requesting approval of a solid gate. The reasons were privacy and security. As one came down Quintana, you could see across Paseo where vehicles went down there and turned around there. The proposed gate was from recycled wood to a maximum height of six feet. The intent was for security and privacy.

Ms. Shapiro asked how tall the wall next to it was.

Mr. Kams said it was six feet. Because it was at the edge of the property, it required a city license.

Ms. Barrett agreed and referred to a letter from Ed Vigil that the City would approve it.

Mr. Kams added that the shed was low and she proposed to raise it from 6' 8" to 10' 8". The windows were deteriorated and she wanted to replace them with windows recycled from the property. It was not publicly visible.

Ms. Barrett said the window design was presented on page 15 and 16.

Mr. Kams said they were white wooden windows.

Mr. Kams said there were two areas of fencing: on the west side to the north end and an interior one behind the fence. The fence on west side at the time of purchase was both chicken wire and dog eared wood at six feet high. They used material on the property to fill it in and also to build in the interior part of property.

The last part was on the rear between the northerly property line, walk way and the arroyo to Paseo. The interior was higher than the path way and the rock wall deteriorated. She started work on it to rehabilitate it and raise it. It was higher because of light at night time and noise from the arroyo. She wanted to raise it on the outside to 8'. The properties on either side had coyote fence at 12'.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Ann Galloway 149 Candelario. She said the wall that faced the arroyo was higher than any other wall around there. The fence on the west side was a foot and a half over on her property. She said she had discussed it with Ms. Angriman in her home. She said Ms. Angriman was trying to get the fence as close to Ms. Galloway's buildings as possible. She said she was about to contact an attorney and to charge her rent. She thought Ms. Angriman wanted privacy because since she moved in, there had been police there every day. She said Ms. Angriman took in homeless, drunks and drug addicts and the people to whom Ms. Galloway rented had complained and called the police. "It has been a living hell with insane people running around, dangerous people right in my back yard. I protest anything she is doing."

Chair Woods apologized for what she was going through but the H-Board had no jurisdiction over property line disputes nor could they deal with undesirable people.

Ms. Galloway complained that Ms. Angriman had a trailer on her property where homeless people lived.

Ms. Brennan suggested she call constituent services. She didn't believe this was under the HDRB jurisdiction.

Ms. Galloway said Ms. Angriman evidently constructed the shed because there was not one there before on that property.

Ms. Barrett said she saw the shed two years ago. They had photos and the HCPI was done by Gayla Bechtol.

Ms. Shapiro noted Ms. Galloway had stated that the stone wall was higher than anything else but the Board had a photo that showed the coyote was much higher.

Mr. Kams said in the packet on page 30, there was a photo of a row of trees on Ms. Angriman's property. The dispute on the location would be addressed where it should be addressed. If it needed to be moved, they would move it. He added that Ms. Angriman had an RV there and it would be moved after construction was completed.

Chair Woods said the last time she came it was there. It had been there a long time and needed to be moved.

Mr. Kams said the applicant would move it by April.

Chair Woods said she didn't want to approve the fence if it was not on her property.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-126B per staff recommendations with the following conditions:

- 1. That the fence not exceed the maximum allowable height,**
- 2. That the gate be approved as a wooden gate to match pedestrian gate,**
- 3. That the shed height increase to 10' 8".**
- 4. That the fence be approved as designed on the property line as verified.**
- 5. That the rock wall be allowed at 8', and**
- 6. That the RV be removed from the property by April.**

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

- 5. Case #H 08-127. 512 Camino Del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Miguel da Silva, agent for Arnie & Virginia Israelit, proposes to increase the height of a stuccoed yardwall from 53" to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 60" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch)**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

512 Camino del Monte Sol is an adobe single family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style before 1932. A second story was added in 1970 by Bill Lumpkins. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

In 2005, the HDRB approved remodeling of the property which included the construction of a yardwall at both street frontages to a height of 55". The maximum allowable height was verified, at the applicant's request last October, to be 60".

Now that the yard has been graded to slope gently away from the residence, the yardwall no longer meets code on the interior grade and the applicant proposes to increase the height up to 72" with a request to increase the height up to 20% as allowed in the Board's 1999 external policy without a height exception.

The increased height will mimic the uneven heights and depths as constructed. The extension will be constructed at a narrower width and placed on top of 2" thick sandstone caps. There will be metal grilles installed in window openings on two locations in the El Caminito wall and in one location in the Monte Sol wall. The openings will be 1' high by 4' wide with 2" thick sandstone headers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with the 1999 HDRB external policy on walls and fences and Sections 14-5.2 (D) general design standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic Districts.

Present and sworn was Mr. Miguel da Silva, Chimayo who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Shapiro said they had gone through a series of proposals for increasing height.

Mr. da Silva said he could not speak to the grade modifications but did not think it had changed since October.

Chair Woods asked if he were proposing the entire wall be raised to 72". The only place it was a height issue was on the far west end with the rock going in along Caminito. It was not a code issue along the entire wall and if it was, they would need to clarify where it was a code issue.

Mr. Rasch showed where it was a code issue (from the gate along the south and corner). He clarified that the 20% allowance was not a code issue. People could request it if they wanted it.

Mr. Featheringill asked how high the wall was on the interior.

Mr. da Silva said it was 17" at its lowest and the additional 19" would make it 3 feet on the inside and 72" on the outside.

Chair Woods was not comfortable with flagstone in the middle of the wall. There was no precedent for it in the east side and this was a very important property right on the corner. She also had an issue on the color being different than the building.

Mr. da Silva said he didn't do that work.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case #H 08-127 with instructions to have a simple wall design no higher than necessary with a precise drawing. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case # 08-113A.** 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lom Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes an historic status review of a non-contributing residence and a non-contributing garage. (David Rasch)

Chair Woods recused herself from this case. Ms. Shapiro chaired.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

508 Calle Corvo is a single-family residence and free-standing garage that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The residence was constructed between 1947 and 1949 and the garage was constructed between 1948 and 1958. Both structures are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The 1984 Historic Cultural Property Inventory on file is insufficient to validate the historic status of both structures and additional information is submitted here.

The frame and stucco residence has undergone alterations on all elevations including porch infill on the front, north elevation and the rear, south elevation that totals up to 45% of the footprint. Also, all original doors and windows have been replaced. The dates of these alterations were not provided, although they are presumed to be non-historic. This should be clarified through discussion. The applicant proposes an historic status of non-contributing

The frame and stucco garage had the original vehicle doors replaced with a metal door on the north elevation. The west elevation has original windows and a pedestrian door which is in need of repair, although the applicant suggests that they are beyond repair. There are no massing changes to the structure. The applicant proposes an historic status of non-contributing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends maintaining the non-contributing historic status for the residence but an historic status upgrade from non-contributing to contributing for the garage due to integrity of massing, opening dimensions, and locations as well as the existence of most historic materials. Staff proposes that the north

and west elevations should be considered as primary.

Present and sworn was Mr. Lom Tryk, 206 McKenzie, who said the house's front door was original but not in its original location. The garage was pen tile not frame. He shared some photos of the windows and doors of the garage. They were well beyond repair. What he proposed to do with the main house window treatment he felt would greatly improve what was there. The house had a great variety of windows on it.

He said the garage proposal would require an exception, not on the front where the door was but on the side if the Board decided the side was a primary façade. If the Board didn't consider it primary, no exception would be required.

He said the garage was in very poor shape. It had bad cracking and was built with the cheapest of materials. It was at the back of the property, not part of the streetscape and to elevate it to contributing status would be inappropriate. Secondly he asked if it was worth preserving the window and door configuration on the side that was completely concealed from view.

He brought copies of a letter from the applicant and read the letter. The owner wanted to move her 86 year old mother into the garage after upgrading it but without any kitchen.

Ms. Shapiro reminded him that right now they were not discussing what was to be done to the property.

Ms. Walker supported non-contributing. The garage was part of the streetscape only if one had good eyes.

Mr. Featheringill agreed with Ms. Walker.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve in Case #H 08-113A that a non-contributing status be retained for both residence and garage. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H 08-113B. 508 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lom Tryk Architects, agent for Ron & Susan Blankenship, proposes to remodel the residential building and the garage by replacing windows and doors and to alter opening dimensions and locations. An exception is requested to change openings on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

508 Calle Corvo is a single-family residence and free-standing garage that are non-contributing. Now,

the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following two items.

1. All windows and doors on the residence will be removed and replaced except for the front pedestrian door. The window dimensions will follow the divided light rule.

There are three opening dimension alterations which include a slight shift in location of one window on the west elevation while maintaining the size and replacement of two large windows on the south elevation with shorter windows in the same location.

2. The garage will be converted to a guest house. The remodel will include removing the north elevation, street-facing vehicle door and replacing it with French doors in a smaller opening.

The west elevation historic materials will be removed and the opening dimensions will be altered to create French doors and two larger windows.

In addition, the stepped parapet on the west and east elevations will be infilled for a raised ceiling height without raising the maximum height of the parapet. The stepped parapet may be seen as a character-defining element.

A mechanical room door will be placed on the rear, south elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Tryk said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker asked if he was putting French doors on the west and north elevation of the garage.

Mr. Tryk agreed. The west was behind a wall and the north was 90' back from the street and they needed more light in there.

Ms. Walker asked if he could maintain the roofline.

Mr. Tryk agreed they could if they raised all the parapets. They would raise the front by a foot to maintain the step. The garage was much lower than the house.

Ms. Shapiro asked what the ceiling height was.

Mr. Tryk said they would like at least 8' in the back.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the parapet would be three feet above that.

Mr. Tryk said no. Raising it to 10.5' would make it 11' at the front.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 08-113B with conditions to maintain the step in the parapet with no visible skylights and light fixtures be taken to staff. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods returned to the bench after the vote was taken.

- 7. Case #H 08-119.** 1139 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning Services, agent for E. Alameda, LLC, proposes to construct a 3,182 sq. ft. residence to a height of 16' where the maximum allowable height is 15', a 5' high stuccoed courtyard wall, and a 3' 8" high stuccoed yardwall at the east lotline. A 1' height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)

Ms. Walker recused herself from consideration of this case and left the room.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1139 East Alameda Street Lot 1 is a vacant 9,480 square foot lot that fronts the private dirt road off of Alameda in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct a 3,182 square foot single family residence with attached garage in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style to a height of approximately 14' 6" on the midpoint of the east elevation, where the maximum allowable height is 15'. The east elevation plan indicates "fill grade line" and the Board should clarify that the maximum height does not exceed 15' when measured from natural or finished grade whichever is more restrictive. The applicant states that a height exception is not required, as was posted by staff.

The design features adobe construction with wall-dominated stepped massing that is insulated on the exterior with sprayed foam, exposed wooden headers, and viga posts and carved corbels on three portals and one lattice-roofed portal. In addition, there will be corbel-supported eyebrows on the east and north elevations. Windows and doors will have true divided-lights. Sand-finish cement stucco, trim, and woodwork colors are cited as medium brown, weathered brown, and stained brown.

Stuccoed yardwalls are proposed as a 5' high courtyard wall that curves and meets the building and as a 3' 8" high lotline wall. Brick-surfaced walkways and portals are proposed, color not supplied. Antique wooden pedestrian gates will be flanked by stuccoed pilasters with an 18" high brown river rock wainscot. A similar pilaster with the street number will terminate the yardwall at the driveway entrance. Light fixtures appear to be simple down-pointed hemispherical sconces. Sconce material was not supplied, but they will match the stucco color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the clarification of compliance to height restrictions and that the application complies with Sections 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Ms. Dolores Vigil, 206 McKenzie G-1, who added that they submitted some additional drawings that showed the height to be below the maximum allowed so they felt they did not need exceptions.

Mr. Rasch said they still needed an exception.

Ms. Vigil said there were grading issues and some infill would be needed.

Chair Woods said that on the east elevation it looked like the filled grade was 18" higher but the measurement should be from existing grade.

Ms. Brennan read the code.

Ms. Vigil said she understood and said her client didn't want to exceed the height restrictions but they had to cut and fill. They also have to put in extra engineering because it was in a flood zone. They were trying to make a residence that worked for everyone.

Mr. Rasch said after examining the drawings again that it was over by one foot. He added that there was no response to the exception criteria.

Ms. Shapiro asked if she could lower that section of the house.

Ms. Vigil said she could not answer that but knew that Jay Parks was willing to work with the Board on whatever needed to happen. She noted that the Board had already approved the other two on that lot.

Chair Woods thought all they would need to do was to lower the parapet.

Ms. Vigil explained the need for fill was because it was in a flood plain area and required cisterns.

Chair Woods felt it would not be a big deal to approve the exception. It was 15' 6" and they could lower the parapet six inches.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were any skylights that would be seen.

Ms. Vigil said no and there were no rooftop appurtenances.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 08-119 with staff recommendations and the following

conditions:

- 1. That no skylights would be visible,**
 - 2. That exterior light fixtures be provided to staff for review and approval,**
 - 3. That the exceptions to the height at 15' 6" be approved, according to Section 14-5.2 (C,5,i-vi).**
- Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Ms. Walker returned to the bench after the vote was taken.

- 8. Case #H 08-123.** 624 E. Alameda #10. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Steve Varela, agent for C. Jan Friedlander & Cindy Kristensen, proposes to construct an approximately 197 sq. ft. portal not to exceed the existing height, construct an outside fireplace, install a brick patio, and replace doors and windows on a non-contributing building. An exception is requested to exceed the 30" window rule (Section 14-5.2 (E, 1, c)). (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The Spanish Pueblo Revival style single family residence was constructed in the 1980s and is part of the Canyon Road Condominiums. The building includes windows that do not meet the 30" rule but are consistent with the other buildings within the homeowners association. The Official Map list the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 197 square foot portal on the west elevation. The portal will not exceed the existing height of 10' 8". The portal will match the existing portal on the east elevation which includes wood posts and beams and a stuccoed parapet with a canale. The woodwork will be finished with a natural stain, the stucco will match the existing in color, texture, and type and the canale will be wood lined with a galvanized metal. Two skylights are proposed for the portal addition.

The portal will have a brick floor (laid in a herringbone pattern) and will include an exterior kiva fireplace.

Also proposed is the replacement of five windows and two sliding doors to match the existing dimension and color. The sliding doors will be replaced with French doors. Even though the windows are being replaced in-kind, they do not meet the 30" window rule. An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2 (E,1,c). As required by code the applicant has answered Section 14-5.2 (C, 5, c, i-iv). [Please see the attached letter] The doors and windows under the proposed portal will not require an exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends denial of the exception unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to allow windows that do not meet the 30" window rule. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic

District Design Standards on the condition that the skylights are not publicly visible.

Ms. Barrett also noted the letter in the packet.

Present and sworn was Mr. Steve Varela. Regarding the windows, he said that all the houses around there had the same type window they wanted to install. Since they had it already, they just wanted to match what was there.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-123 per staff recommendations and grant the exception for the windows to exceed the 30" rule. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer