



# Agenda

DATE 1/29/09 TIME 3:40 pm

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2009 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2009 – 5:30 PM

### CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
January 13, 2009
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
  - 1. A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND THE LAND USE DEPARTMENT TO WORK COOPERATIVELY WITH THE STATE CAPITOL BUILDING PLANNING COMMISSION IN TO INITIATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE CAPITOL CAMPUS HISTORIC DISTRICT WITH RELATED STANDARDS.
- H. OLD BUSINESS
  - 1. Case #H-06-001. 142 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agents for Storic Development, proposes to amend a previous approval by increasing the height of portals by 1.5' and deleting second-story balustrades on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)
- I. NEW BUSINESS
  - 1. Case #H-09-004. 963 Camino Santander. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Karen Rogers, proposes to construct approximately 2,208 sq. ft. of additions to a non-contributing building, replace doors and windows, construct an approximately 1,287 sq. ft. freestanding guesthouse to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16'6", and construct a yardwall to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height is 6'. (Marissa Barrett)
  - 2. Case #H-09-005. 211 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Lorretto Associates, LLC, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a 4 story addition with a 13,175 sq. ft. footprint at 41' 4" high or 17' below the maximum height of the existing non-contributing structure by reducing the scale to 3 stories at 36' high. (David Rasch)

- \* \*
3. Case #H-09-006. 320 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Courtenay Mathey, agent for Ruth Dillingham, proposes to repair historic primary elevation windows and install storm windows, replace non-primary elevation windows to match or to meet ingress/egress sizes, construct a wooden deck on the rear, and apply exterior insulation on a contributing building. (David Rasch)
  4. Case #H-08-139. 440 Galisteo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael L. Maxwell, agent/owner, proposes to construct an ADA-access ramp on a contributing property. Exceptions are requested to remove historic material to create a new opening on the front porch (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(ii)) and to construct an addition less than ten feet back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

**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 February 10, 2009 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, February 10, 2008.

\*  
.  
.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
February 10, 2009

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes		
January 13, 2009	Approved as amended	2
Communications	None	2
Business from the Floor	Beninato on 610 Galisteo	2-3
Administrative Matters		
1. State Capitol District	Approved	3-6
Old Business		
1. <b><u>Case #H 06-001</u></b>	Postponed by Applicant	6-7
142 Lincoln Avenue		
New Business		
1. <b><u>Case #H 09-004</u></b>	Approved with conditions	7-11,
963 Camino Santander	18-19	
2. <b><u>Case #H 09-005</u></b>	Postponed with directions	11-14
211 Old Santa Fe Trail		
3. <b><u>Case #H 09-006</u></b>	Approved with conditions	14-16
320 Delgado Street		
4. <b><u>Case #H 08-139</u></b>	Approved with conditions	16-18
440 Galisteo Street		
Matters from the Board	None	19
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:10 p.m.	19

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FE**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**February 10, 2009**

**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. Christine Mather  
Ms. Cecilia Rios  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mr. Dan Featheringill  
Dr. John Kantner  
Ms. Deborah Shapiro

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner  
Ms. Kelley Brennan, City Associate Attorney  
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Ms. Jeanne Price, Code Writer  
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 announced that Case #H 06-001 (under Old Business) was postponed by the applicant to the last meeting in February

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the agenda as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 13, 2009**

Ms. Rios requested the following corrections to the minutes:

Page 3, last sentence should say, "Ms. Rios stated that she had contacted staff regarding the concerns at 610 Galisteo and was assured it was as approved."

Page 23, six lines from the bottom, "She asked if the project would have..."

Ms. Walker requested the following changes to the minutes:

Page 5 in the middle - Lois Pena's last name was not Pena.

Page 17 at the bottom, "There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case."

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of January 13, 2009 as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Chair Woods informed the public about the appeal procedures.

#### **E. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato was sworn. She accused staff of changing conditions that the HDRB made in their motions. She reminded the Board members they had talked about having a standardized application form. It would have been helpful for 610 Galisteo. Over a year and a half ago there was a subcommittee set up to deal with the standardized application. She asked what the status of it was.

Secondly, there was almost no one currently on the Board that was on it when 610 Galisteo was approved. The skylights were not low profile but were shielded instead. In September 2008 the shed roof was changed to a flat roof with parapet by the staff.

She proposed that when conditions were imposed in an approval by the Board that the applicant be required to come back to the Board and the public be allowed to speak to the conditions so it was not just up to staff to enforce the conditions because they were not doing that. She suggested that for everyone's benefit the HDRB have some review of those conditions to make sure it they were not violated.

Ms. Woods said the standardized application was being worked on through the process of the rewrite of Chapter 14. She acknowledged they were not going as fast as they would like.

Ms. Rios noted that Ms. Beninato continued to bring up the skylights and the shed roof. She asked Mr. Rasch to comment.

Mr. Rasch said the skylights were shown by the manufacturer and were called out as low profile. He had spoken with the City attorney about that. Also, it still has a shed roof to the north. The Board allowed the roof; not staff.

## **G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

### **1. A Resolution Directing the City Attorney's Office and the Land Use Department to Work Cooperatively with the State Capitol Building Planning Commission to initiate the development of a state capitol campus historic district with Related Standards.**

Mr. Rasch handed out copies of the map [Exhibit A]. It was the County Courthouse proposal that started the consideration of the Board's jurisdiction. Then when the state parking garage started, a collaborative process was used to make it more in keeping with the standards. The task was to reach an agreement for working with other governing bodies.

This resolution was to adopt a State Capitol Campus Historic District – A district where they could amend the standards to fit more with the State's needs. This resolution would direct staff and City Attorney to work with the State on the standards for it. The three issues were: 1) height; 2) style architecture; 3) costs. For the garage by getting the State to lower the garage one story, it cost them \$3 million more.

Zoning standards and underlying issues on this map would be part of the talking points. The yellow line represented the boundaries for the new district. The dotted line represented historic district boundaries (all in Downtown & Eastside except a little square). The blue lines were the BCD boundaries. All the properties within this boundary were State buildings.

Ms. Woods asked if this height was only for state buildings and not anything else in that area.

Mr. Rasch agreed and said it was one of their issues. He thought the major focus would be what the height standard was and should only be for State buildings.

Ms. Woods asked if it would also help to show the historic status of each. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Woods asked what would happen if they took away jurisdiction.

Mr. Rasch said if HB 360 was approved this would take the place of the consultation. If it failed, this would show the City's good intention. This district did not include all properties within the historic district so they might have language for all government buildings.

Ms. Woods asked if they would also be specific on remodeling so as to not lose historic status. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Rios asked what the status of HB 360 was.

Mr. Rasch heard it failed this morning in committee by a 2-5 vote.

Ms. Rios asked if the Building Commission was against it.

Mr. Rasch agreed and added that they were the ones who drafted the 360 bill. It was a big discussion item.

Ms. Walker proposed it should say, "owned and used by the State."

Ms. Mather asked why the garage cost more.

Mr. Rasch explained it was the cost of burying one of the floors.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Peter Komis (Don Gaspar Neighborhood Association President) was sworn. He read the resolution and was concerned. He asked what guarantee the neighbors had that this would be the boundary. He was also concerned about government property vs. private property. Who was to say west De Vargas would not expand to Santa Fe Village and the owner enter an agreement with the State to expand the Supreme Court Building. It could be 5 stories tall. Parking would be a nightmare. So he was concerned with this title that it could be disastrous for the neighbors.

He said his family home was on the capitol site and they were ordered to leave and move down Don Gaspar. State properties that were in existence were fine but what was next to the AG's office. It was private property and significant and could be destroyed and rebuilt.

Ms. Woods explained the intent was to keep this under the City HDRB and the ordinance would be written for it. On the other hand, if the bill passed they would have no jurisdiction. Under this plan she would see no problem with protection of the historic integrity of it. It was an effort to say, let's work together on this and make it work."

Ms. Mather said the State could purchase more property or sell property so if it came into being,

adding and /or subtracting land could be an issue.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Komis if he was in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Komis was not sure but just wanted to bring these issues to the Board's attention. He agreed with Ms. Mather that the State could buy or sell and build a five-story structure but he couldn't do that and even if he could, he would not. He asked the Board to make sure it was written so there was protection for all who wanted to stay in the neighborhood

Ms. Karen Heldmeyer was sworn. She thought Mr. Komis did a good job of identifying the issues for the neighborhood. This might be baby steps but it was steps and it was on for Council tomorrow night. Depending on the exact wording, a state capitol historic district would be nice. But the problem was that there were questions about private/public developments in this area. There was one suggested around the PERA building and another across from the Supreme Court on the other side of the river.

Whatever this ends up being would be very important. As it gets worked on, the boundaries might shift. There has been tremendous pressure for high level commercial development in this neighborhood. It was really scary to people. Some people said Don Gaspar would be a good place to put amenities for the government.

Her suggestion was to recommend to Council that there be language in it for entities with a background in historic preservation. She said it would get dumped in Council's lap at the last moment. The more people with their eyes on it, the better and less likely that bad things would happen.

Ms. Marilyn Bane was sworn. She considered it good that two members of this legislative committee actually voted against it. Speaker Luján introduced it and that could be intimidating. It was a thoughtful committee and they seemed very concerned about who the authorizing body would be. One of her concerns was that it had no HP official from city or state on it. It seemed to come back to the GSD and Capitol Planning Commission.

One of the biggest concerns she had was that the City Attorney said the City was in support but she believe he misspoke because the Council had not voted on it. It was damaging to the effort. There were a lot of people there.

The OSFA supported this resolution and in fact, originated the concept for it. Their vote to support was very general.

Ms. Woods thanked Ms. Bane for all she had done regarding HB 360. It was inspiring and she appreciated it.

Ms. Beninato said she was an analyst for the bill and thought the Board had a pessimistic view of it. The financial limits were taken out so they could comply with the historic ordinance. She was not opposed to it. But liked the idea of a collaborative process. It was probably good to do a district like this for the



collaboration process. It would give the board members an idea of what was important and what the characteristics should be; so that work should go on, no matter what.

As an alternative, she thought the HDRB might offer that the CPRC would have to weigh in on the project, particularly when involving demolition of a historic building.

She agreed with Mr. Komis and Ms. Walker about what would happen with the Don Gaspar Area Historic District and about when a tall building no longer was a state building. Although the Board was rushing to do this, it was a resolution and wouldn't be as powerful as a statute with the legislature. She suggested the HDRB might think of other ways to deal with Historic Preservation review in the bill that might pass.

Ms. Rios asked if she said that in HB 360 the state was going to comply with the city ordinance.

Ms. Beninato agreed. They took the budget constraints out. But it was a state agency who would decide if they were in compliance. There were two times the state would come to the city for review and even another public input separately. So there was public input and hopefully people would be concerned enough that it would be collaborative.

Ms. Rios said it was a good comment about this just being a resolution.

Ms. Beninato said the Board might also ask the sponsor to add a historic review to the bill.

Ms. Bane noted that the strongest words in the bill were "generally compatible for compliance." As of 5:00 it was still listed as still in the committee today. It had not been scheduled.

Ms. Rios suggested that Historic Preservation be included in it.

Ms. Woods summarized the discussion that it be state owned and occupied and have historic preservation involvement.

**Ms. Walker moved to recommend approval of the resolution to the Governing Body with additions that 1) it be state owned and occupied, 2) no demolition of any historic structure in the district be permitted, 3) no demolition or renovations to historic buildings. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Ms. Woods asked if a Board member should be there tomorrow night.

Mr. Rasch agreed it would be advisable.

Ms. Woods asked if he could email an agenda to the Board.

Mr. Rasch said it was on the 7:00 p.m. agenda.

## **H. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Case #H0-6-001.** 142 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agents for Storic Development, propose to amend a previous approval by increasing the height of portals by 1.5' and deleting second-story balustrades on a non-contributing building (David Rasch)

This case was postponed by the applicant.

## **I. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Case #H 09-004.** 963 Camino Santander. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Karen Rogers, proposes to construct approximately 2,208 sq. ft. of additions to a non-contributing building, replace doors and windows, construct an approximately 1,287 sq. ft. freestanding guesthouse to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height was 16' 6", and construct a yardwall to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height was 6'. (Marissa Barrett)

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

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

The approximately 3,310 square foot Spanish-Pueblo Revival style single family residence located at 963 Camino Santander was constructed by 1947 and has received major alterations which include large additions on the southeast and north elevations, portal additions, and window and door alterations. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposed remodeling the building with the following alterations:

Remove two existing, non-compliant, non-historic temporary storage sheds northeast of the building, along the property line.

Construct an approximately 140 square foot addition on the south elevation to a height of 11' 6" where the existing height is 12' 6". The addition will include divided light French doors. An approximately 73 square foot pergola will attach to the addition and the existing front yard wall.

Construct an approximately 243 square foot portal to the west elevation. The portal will include wood posts, beams, and exposed viga ends and will match the existing height. Also on the west elevation a new exterior hatch and stairwell will be constructed for entry into the existing basement.

Construct an approximately 137 square foot portal on the north elevation to a height of 11' 4' where the existing height is 14' 6". The portal will include wood posts, beams, and exposed vigas. A 5' high courtyard wall will be constructed in front of the portal where the maximum allowable height is 6'. The wall

will include a wood pedestrian gate.

Expand the east elevation portal by 6'. The remodeled portal will include the construction of an outdoor fireplace at the northeast corner and a new portal yard wall along the east elevation. The portal will also include wood beams, posts, and exposed viga beams.

Construct an approximately 100 square foot addition to the northeast elevation. Also on the east elevation a new 108 square foot covered walkway will be constructed and match the other wood beam, post, and exposed viga portals. The walkway will connect to the proposed garage.

Construct an approximately 642 square foot attached garage. The garage will be constructed on the northeast corner of the building and will match the existing height of 13' 4". The garage will include wood garage doors with exposed headers. Also proposed on the roof of the garage are 6 photovoltaic panels which will be concealed by the parapet. A 4' 6" high yard wall will be constructed east of the garage. The wall is below the maximum allowable height of 6' and will include a wood pedestrian gate.

All doors and windows will be replaced, including some locations and dimensions. Windows will be aluminum clad divided light in the color "Sea Green" and will have a consistent muntin pattern throughout the building.

Eleven skylights are proposed for the building and will all be concealed by the parapet. Stucco will be El Rey "Sandalwood" and exterior light fixtures were not submitted. All wood work on the building will be finished with Sherwin Williams "Fruitwood" stain.

Construct an approximately 1,287 square foot freestanding guesthouse to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height is 16' 6". The new guesthouse will be located at the northwestern corner of the property and will be Spanish Pueblo Revival in style. The heated square feet will be approximately 1,122 and the entry portal located on the south elevation will be approximately 165 square feet. Windows will be divided light aluminum clad in the color "Sea Green". The portal will be inset and include wood posts, beams, and exposed viga ends. A stuccoed wall will be located at the front portal as well. Exterior wood finishes will be stained with Sherwin Williams "Fruitwood" and the stucco will be El Rey "Sandalwood". Exterior light fixtures were not submitted.

Lastly proposed is a new 5' height stuccoed yard wall along the northeast property line where the maximum allowable height is 6'. A new drive way and parking area will be constructed at the northeast section of the lot.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends approval on the condition that there are no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances and exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a building permit application is submitted. Otherwise 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.

Ms. Rios asked her to indicate public visibility.

Ms. Barrett referred to page 14 on the height calculation map, where you could see how large the lot was. There was a wall and vehicular gate. Closer to the house, there was a courtyard wall. She concluded that perhaps it could be seen

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, who said apparently neighbors came in today and expressed concerns. The application was a mouthful. They were remodeling the interior of the house. There were several types of windows. The owner wanted to use the old doors and grills. They were going to refurbish the four windows and relocate them to the east side.

They also asked the Board to allow them to work with the neighbor on the north side on that wall. He pointed out the shared wall and the wall proposed on the north side by the guest house. They would work with the neighbor on the exact character of the wall.

The owner also wanted to change the window color to mist blue. He showed the color chip of that color. He also handed out a larger site plan [Exhibit B] and said the parapet would be six inches at the garage and 12 at the dining room. He wished to propose raising it six inches higher so the solar panels wouldn't exceed the height of the parapet.

Ms. Woods asked how high the garage doors were.

Mr. Enfield said they were 8 feet.

Ms. Woods was concerned with the parapet making this huge forehead over the doors. It already was high. She said she would be willing to keep 13' 6". It was on the back of the house.

Ms. Walker commented that in the Wall Street Journal yesterday was a big article about the new solar film that was easier to use and less expensive.

Mr. Enfield said he would use low profile panels and could even go down to 13'.

He said the north neighbor expressed concerns about the location of the guest house. So he agreed 30 minutes ago to move it ten feet from the property line and put in some trees. They were agreeable to ten feet and screening trees. He apologized to the neighbor that he hadn't felt it was controversial. That could be put that as a condition of approval.

Mr. Enfield said on the roof no skylights would be visible and it would have a non-visible rooftop A/C on the master bedroom. It was as flat as could be. He said he had not picked it yet but assured them it would be hidden by the parapet.

Ms. Woods asked that it come back to staff. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Ms. Woods said the window lights on the north elevation were more vertical and she would want the ones on the north similar to them. She proposed cutting them down from 8 to six lights.

Mr. Enfield agreed.

In response to Ms. Rios, he said they were adding about 2,200 of roofed area to the main house. The garage was 642 and was less than 5,000 sq feet altogether.

Ms. Rios asked if skylights were low profile. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if stucco was cementitious. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Ms. Woods asked about the grill.

Mr. Enfield said it was not yet determined but probably stainless steel. They would prefer to keep options open.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Peter Schoenfeld who was the President of San Acacio Neighborhood Association but appearing with a hat on as neighbor. His house was directly to the east. They were grateful for Mr. Enfield and Ms. Rogers and happy with their project. But he and his wife were concerned with visibility of solar panels from their back porch. The property sloped to the west. Mr. Enfield suggested the parapets were high enough and panels low enough that they would not see the panels. He wanted to make sure they would not be visible from their back porch.

With Hat #2 for the Association, he took notice over the last two weeks that the property was posted with notice of HDRB proceedings but unfortunately with the wrong date. It said February 20 and they came to talk with Mr. Rasch about the plans beforehand. He was concerned that others might be coming on Friday the 20<sup>th</sup>. They had no quarrel with the plans but didn't think he could make that representation.

Mr. Rasch agreed that he did bring it to staff's attention. He thought it was one of those odd ones.

Mr. Schoenfeld said they didn't want to stand in the way of the project but it was important to those who might show up on Friday the 20<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Brennan said it was hard to tell. Mr. Rasch didn't think so, but with general confusion about it, it could be an issue.

Mr. Schoenfeld said he took a picture of it this afternoon after the poster had been changed. He shared the picture and said he was finished.

Mr. Enfield responded that he got the call from Mr. Rasch about the confusion and sent a staff member

down there. He took a picture. Apparently two neighbors called to ask about it. He asked him to make sure it was clearly a one and not a two.

Ms. Brennan thought it seemed to her to be a one. But if it looked like a two to some, it should be postponed.

Present and sworn was Mr. Peter Bryant, 521 Don Miguel who said they also expected the date was the 20<sup>th</sup> but discovered otherwise. When they found out, they rearranged their schedule. He explained they were the owners on the north side. The guest house was the only place where there was open space. There were trees there right now. He appreciated the applicant's willingness to move it back ten feet and trees would provide some cover. Right now there was just a six-foot latilla wall there and fruit trees on the owner's property. They wanted to make sure the wall was aesthetically pleasing and had some green component to it. Some of the trees there were about 70-110 years old. He wanted to make sure nothing was done to them during construction. They were open and agreeable to the set back.

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

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Enfield about the landscaping for the wall and if he would put up vines.

Mr. Enfield said they did not intend to cut down the trees. They were part of the property line. They needed to discuss the wall with the neighbor. The vines were the existing vines and would be kept.

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Barrett if the proposal met the wall and fence guidelines. Ms. Barrett agreed.

Ms. Rios asked about postponing the case because of the notice.

Mr. Enfield said it would be a hardship for the owner who came from out of state. He knew the newspaper posted it accurately but understood if there was a problem. He offered to get a photo from his office of the sign before it was changed.

**Ms. Walker moved to table Case #H 09-004 to the end of the agenda. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

2. **Case #H 09-005.** 211 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural alliance, agent for Loretto Associates, LLC, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a 4-story addition with a 13,175 sq. ft. footprint at 41' 4" high or 17' below the maximum height of the existing non-contributing structure by reducing the scale to 3 stories at 36' high. (David Rasch)

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

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

211 Old Santa Fe Trail, known as the Inn and Spa at Loretto, is a multi-storied hotel that was

constructed in the late 1970s in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The 60,394 square foot building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. A low, free-standing building at the southeast corner of the property was constructed at approximately 1920 with non-historic later additions. This building is listed as contributing to the District.

In 2006 the Historic Design Review Board conditionally approved plans to construct additions on the main structure at the north and east elevations that were four stories tall and to remodel the contributing structure at the southeast corner of the property and the perimeter walls on the east and north sides of the property.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the previous approval for an addition to the east elevation with the following two items.

1. The 7,984 square foot meeting room to 25' high and underground parking garage on the north elevation has been deleted.

2. The 13,175 square foot 4-story addition at 41' high on the east elevation has been reduced to a 3-story addition at 36' high.

The addition features stepped massing that mimics the existing structure with portals. The areas of upper story balustrades have been changed to stuccoed walls. Multiple pedestrian gates are proposed in the courtyard wall for each unit on the ground floor east elevation. The interior courtyard elevation will have a fence at ground level on the west elevation and there are transom windows over French doors on the south elevation that do not meet the 30' rule. It is unclear if these transom windows are existing or proposed and this should be discussed. All finishes will match the existing finishes.

The previous approval to remodel the contributing structures at the southeast corner is not changed and will be carried forward with this application. The previous approval to remodel perimeter walls and the interior courtyard near the existing pool should be discussed.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Mr. Enfield thanked the staff and Board for looking at it again. There was change of ownership and they revised to three floors and reduced from 85,416 square feet to 32,799 with 6,200 of portals.

They put the height at 36' to allow for the ground variation around the building as opposed to the previous approval at 41' 4". They attempted to maintain the aesthetics and style stepped. They completed renderings in digital but fairly accurate rendering. [Exhibit C].

They had the model done before the yard walls were revised. The owner did not include the hot tub and fire pit that were part of original approval.

The Board took a five-minute recess to look at the model.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Enfield if he felt it now offered relief on the east elevation -

Mr. Enfield said he did. They would follow the step in the building with the portal and reduce the length on the second floor. Also they would transition into a wood rail to break up the stucco there.

Ms. Woods noted it was anchored in masonry at the corners. It was a big building but has been a successful building but the parapet was very high and on the end he should bring down the corner instead of having all the horizontal across. It was a suggestion. At the ends, it should be anchored. They looked like little toothpicks holding up this building.

Mr. Enfield said he could see that and it also would make the top feel a little bit lighter.

Ms. Woods added that this was a major elevation publicly visible. She was just a little concerned about that. Basically, she was thrilled with what he did. But they needed to alleviate the long horizontals.

Mr. Enfield recalled the Board did a similar thing in his previous presentation with a condition to soften those portals. He agreed that would make it feel more solid. He thanked the Board for their input that always had made better buildings.

Ms. Walker said on the east façade, as remodeled, brought wall down and the wrought iron didn't show.

Mr. Enfield said looking southeast way down at the end of the wall you could see the railing. You could see the rail in that gate.

Ms. Walker said it was not there on the drawing.

Mr. Enfield explained that was because the brick wall was about eight feet high. He added that they would divide all those windows.

Ms. Mather thought there were more posts on that elevation than on the north elevation on the second floor. There were so many of them.

Mr. Enfield counted them.

Ms. Mather said she saw 14.

Mr. Enfield said he would look at those portals and present more detailed drawings. He wanted to stay



with realistic spacing of about 12 feet. But it could be reduced with thickening of the portals.

Ms. Woods said on the rendering, second page, both portals had massing on the end and liked how long the vigas extended. Some extended and some were cut back. That was a charming thing on this building. Those things helped.

Ms. Rios thought instead of conditional approval, they should postpone the case. There have been many suggestions.

**Ms. Rios moved to postpone Case #H 09-005 to give the applicant an opportunity to resubmit with the changes suggested by the Board, trying to emulate the existing step backs, stepping the portals on the east side, stepping the portals, anchoring the masonry corners with hand rails to the horizontal portions. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

3. **Case #H 09-006.** 320 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Courtenay Mathey, agent for Ruth Dillingham, proposes to repair historic primary elevation windows and install storm windows, replace non-primary elevation windows to match or to meet ingress/egress sizes, construct a wooden deck on the rear, and apply exterior insulation on a contributing building. (David Rasch)

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

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

320 Delgado Street is a single-family residence that was constructed with Pen Tile before 1928 in a vernacular manner. Historic windows, 3-over-1 double-hung, with stuccoed concrete sills are relatively consistent on the original building. Since the 1970s, additions have been constructed at the rear, flush with the south and north elevations. Also, a Spanish-Pueblo Revival portal was constructed on the front in the late 1980s or 1990s. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The east, street-facing elevation may be considered as primary.

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

1. The two pairs of historic windows on the primary east elevation will be repaired and storm windows will be installed to increase thermal capacity and preserve historic material.
2. All other single-pane windows will be removed and replaced with double-pane windows to match light-pattern, operation, and opening dimension and location, except for two windows on the north elevation which will be slightly enlarged as casements to meet ingress/egress code requirements.
3. Non-historic French doors on the west elevation and the southwest elevation will be removed and replaced with similar doors.

4. A low wooden deck will be constructed over the smaller rear brick deck and steps with a simple metal guardrail and steps.

5. The exterior walls will be insulated with 1.5" of spray-foam. The projecting window sill dimensions will be retained. All finishes will match existing blue trim and earth-tone stucco colors.

6. Some minor repairs to the non-historic portal include replacing one rotten viga and placing all vigas on 8" high bases with copper collars. Copper finish was not identified.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Ms. Woods asked if there were any historic windows.

Mr. Rasch said all but one were historic and in good condition but were single pane windows.

Ms. Woods asked how double pane would affect the status.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the standard said that for primary elevations, they would be repaired as much as possible. Thermal pane glass would be permitted. The east was primary. There would be no visual change but loss of historic material. They could also have storm windows.

Ms. Rios said they could discuss it with the applicant.

Present and sworn was Mr. Courtenay Mathey, 2 Camino Pequeño, Santa Fe. He said on the existing south elevation were the three original windows. The other half was added later. The owner would like to replace all of them. They didn't operate well at all but in meeting with Mr. Rasch, he understood it was a contributing building and the east was primary.

On the south side it was very inconsistent and the back part was not historical. Those were some of their concerns about replacing wherever they could. The building was built of pentile and was old. On the north side they had to replace two bedroom windows for egress. The north side was the least visible and the west.

Mr. Rasch added that there was a state program where one could get historic windows rehabilitated and also get a tax credit.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ruth Dillingham, the owner. She said the windows were in fairly good shape. But there were separate screens and storms that had to be removed twice a year. They were very heavy and she was almost 80. If they could repair with thermal panes in the same profile, it would really help her. President Obama talked about tax credits for thermal pane and insulation. It would sure be nice to not have to deal with the heavy storms.

Mr. Mathey said they had to pull out the windows to repair them. They planned to do metal windows with wood on the inside since it was a painted finish. That was for low maintenance. With the existing wood windows, and how they came down to meet the sill this would make it easier for waterproofing them.

Ms. Woods asked that they keep the spacer in between the two windows.

Mr. Mathey said they would keep the post and slide the new windows in. They had that profile. They really wanted to retain that character.

Ms. Woods had a hard time imagining cladding against that and seeing that detail.

Mr. Mathey said the builder was Mark Hopkins. He was an expert. It was achievable. They could match any color but might have to repaint the middle post. It would all be painted the same color. With double pane windows they would not even need storm windows. So one would see more of the window itself. He agreed it was part of the unique style of this house.

Ms. Walker felt that in kind meant wood for wood. She was sure he could find someone to repaint that. She would prefer wood. She was concerned with the applicant having to deal with storm windows, especially on the north side. Perhaps they could look at replacing on the north side.

Ms. Woods heard the applicant dealing with heavy storms and liked the way they proposed keeping the center post. So she was not jumping up and down about the fabric. She would like the primary to be restored.

Ms. Rios felt the Chair's suggestion was worthy - they were replacing as closely as possible.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 09-006 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:**

- 1) That the east elevation retain the historic windows as repaired;**
- 2) That the windows for egress on the north elevation be replaced.**

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

- 4. Case #H 08-139.** 440 Galisteo Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael L. Maxwell, agent/owner, proposes to construct an ADA-access ramp on a contributing property. Exceptions were requested to remove historic material to create a new opening on the front porch (Section 14-5.2 (D) (5) (a) (ii)) and to construct an addition less than ten feet back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D) (2) (d)). (David Rasch).

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

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

440 Galisteo Street is a commercial building, known as the Pflueger Family House, which was

originally constructed as a residence in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style at approximately the 1920s. The structure is notable on the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory from 1984 as a good early example of this architectural style and it is in a good state of preservation. The undulating parapets and wooden windows and portal details have been retained, but the pebbledash stucco finish is lost. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The east and south elevations may be considered as primary.

The applicant constructed a silver-grey metal ADA access ramp to the front portal on the north side of the building without approval or a building permit. A 40" wide section of the north porch wall was removed and the ramp attached there. An exception is requested to remove historic material to cut an opening where an opening does not exist and the required responses are attached. The ramp is less than 10' back from the east primary elevation. An exception is requested to construct the ramp at the front of the primary elevation and the required responses are attached.

A more sensitive installation may be considered as having the ramp lead to the west rear parking area rather than to the east street-frontage parking and also paint the ramp materials to match the stucco color. The reference to a ramp on the building on Sandoval is slightly different in that the request was approved by the Board before permitting, no historic material was removed, and the ramp is not attached to the primary elevation.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends denial of the exception requests to remove historic material and create a new opening on the front porch (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(ii)) and to construct an addition within 10' of a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)) unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exceptions.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Maxwell who shared how they got here. He purchased it in 2004 and did extensive remodeling on the interior and replaced a window as staff recommended. Now it looked like it did when it was constructed.

He had his art gallery in the building in 2004 and in 2005 decided to close the gallery and rent it out. The state and county said it was great building but it had to have a ramp. The property had been rented since 1961. He and his wife decided to put the ramp on the property and misunderstood the historic ordinance. The ADA was very specific on what they had to do. He listed those on the exception responses. There was a door on the rear. The front was 37" high and at the back was 66" high and made a right turn. He started researching ramps and found this ramp. It met all the ADA specifications. So he bought the ramp and his wife and son helped him install it. It required one cut in the front wall. It was a logical place. Going from the south, one could not see the ramp at all. On the other side was a coyote fence so it was not viewable except right in front. This ramp was stainless steel. You could paint it but it wouldn't stay on the ramp. It would have to be done with a heat process.

At the back there was a row of trees that would have to be removed and he wanted to retain the trees. And it required a five foot turnaround at the base of the ramp.

He thought he had addressed both exceptions in the packet. No handicap ramp was pretty but without it he could not rent it. Maybe a coyote fence in front would help.

Ms. Walker said she showed this property to clients and she never even noticed it. She thought a coyote fence would be in keeping or more plantings there.

Mr. Maxwell said he would do what the Board wanted. He would prefer landscaping. It had a basement and a good foundation and was waterproof. Access was the only problem.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Woods was okay with it and it appeared it could be removed if necessary.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 08-139, granting the exceptions and referencing the responses that were on page 9 line b, 10, 11 and with the condition that the owner do more landscaping. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

1. **Case #H 09-004.** 963 Camino Santander. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agent for Karen Rogers, proposes to construct approximately 2,208 sq. ft. of additions to a non-contributing building, replace doors and windows, construct an approximately 1,287 sq. ft. freestanding guesthouse to a height of 14' where the maximum allowable height was 16' 6", and construct a yardwall to a height of 5' where the maximum allowable height was 6'.

**Ms. Rios moved to remove Case #H 09-004 from the table. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Ms. Woods noted Mr. Enfield had proposed moving the guest house ten feet away from the lot line. She was concerned about the wall and not taking down the trees. Conditions would include that there be no rooftop and the applicant would come back to staff on the A/C unit and exterior lights.

Mr. Enfield said the wall would be with the agreement of the adjacent neighbor. He explained that his client had been talking with this young couple for weeks and it never came up. He would work with neighbors on both sides to make sure there were no issues. The conditions should also include the color change from sea green to mist blue.

He didn't want to be limited to six solar panels and they would make sure they were not visible.

Ms. Brennan asked them to address the sign.

Ms. Rios said it looked like a "one" to her.

Ms. Brennan agreed.

The Board determined that the sign was okay.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 09-004 with the following conditions:**

- 1) That they could reuse grills and other pieces the architect mentioned;
- 2) That the guesthouse be set back ten feet from the north side and the applicant work with the neighbors on the fence and wall on the north side;
- 3) That there be no visible rooftop appurtenances;
- 4) That all solar panels be not visible;
- 5) That the garage be at 13' height;
- 6) That there would be six lights on the windows on the north side;
- 7) That the window color be approved as mist blue/Ms. Walker.
- 8) That exterior light fixtures be reviewed by staff;
- 9) That stucco be cementitious;
- 10) That if an A/C was added that it come back to staff for review and approval;
- 11) That the trees not be cut down on that wall;
- 12) That the wall have vines;
- 13) That the outdoor kitchen be taken to staff for approval.

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

#### **J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

None.

#### **K. ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Rios moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Approved by:

---

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer