



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4/8/09 TIME 11:55

SERVED BY D. Paulman

RECEIVED BY S. Garcia

AMENDED

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2009 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2009 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
March 10, 2009
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
- F. COMMUNICATIONS
 - 1. Rules and Procedures for City Committees.
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
 - 1. Case #H-08-144. Santa Fe Plaza. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements to include installation of street lights on the north side, National Historic Landmark plaque, irrigation mechanical boxes, electrical outlets, and four options for the electrical panels. (Chip Lilienthal)
- I. OLD BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-09-007. 1226 B. Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architecture, agent for Stacey Neff & Jeff Nelson, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 4'6" and construct an entry portal to a non-contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
 - 2. Case #H-09-012B. 526 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent from Ms. Ortiz, proposes to meet the Board condition for lighting, brick coping and pedestrian gate on a previous approval of a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)
- J. NEW BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-09-010. 855A Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Farrell, agent for David & Ruth Arthur, proposes to construct an approximately 5,798 sq. ft. single family residence with attached garage to a height of 16' midpoint on the street elevation and 18' 4" at the highest point where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5". (Marissa Barrett)

2. Case #H-09-016. 300 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area. Andy Lyons, agent for Ray Heideman, proposes to remodel a contributing property by constructing interior yardwalls to approximately 4' high and a coyote fence to 6' high, removing a non-historic vehicle gate, restuccoing the existing structures to match, and replacing a non-historic garage door, and resurfacing the driveway. (David Rasch)
3. Case #H-09-017. 645 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Robert and Kelli Glazier, proposes to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 4'6" to a contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)
4. Case #H-09-015. 137 Elena Street. Don Gaspar Area. Richard Trujillo, agent for Maura Studie, proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing historic windows on primary and non-primary elevations, resurface a walkway and stoop, construct buttresses on a streetscape yardwall, and restucco all as needed. An exception is requested to replace historic material (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch)
5. Case #H-08-095B. Southwest corner of Palace Avenue and Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for DSW Santa Fe, LLC, proposes to assign primary elevations to contributing structures and to restore historic character on a significant building, remodel two contributing buildings by removing non-contributing additions and constructing 39,000 sq. ft. of additions, as well as constructing approximately 62,000 sq. ft. of additional buildings and site improvements. The maximum allowable height for streetscape structures is 16'9" and interior lot structures is 18'8". New structures are proposed at 25'9" and 44'4". Four types of exceptions are requested: height (14-5.2(D)(9)); roof pitch (14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); Santa Fe Style (14-5.2(E)); and creating openings on primary elevations (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Vote on nominations for Preservation Awards.

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice. If you wish to attend the April 14, 2009 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, April 14, 2009.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 14, 2009

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes		
March 10, 2009	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusion of Law	None.	2
Communications	Discussion	2-3
1. Rules & Procedures for City Committees		
Business from the Floor	Marilyn Bane thank you	3
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>Case #H-08-144</u>	Discussion	3-7
Santa Fe Plaza		
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 098-007</u>	Postponed	7-10
1226B Cerro Gordo		
2. <u>Case #H 09-012B</u>	Approved as recommended	10-12
526 Galisteo Street		
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 09-010</u>	Postponed with instructions	12-16
855A Camino Ranchitos		
2. <u>Case #H 09-016</u>	Approved with conditions	16-17
300 E. Berger Street		
3. <u>Case #H 09-017</u>	Approved as recommended	17-18
645 Camino del Monte Sol		
4. <u>Case #H 09-015</u>	Approved with conditions	18-21
137 Elena Street		
5. <u>Case #H 08-095B</u>	Postponed	21-22
Palace Ave & Paseo de Peralta		
Matters from the Board	Vote on Preservation Awards	22
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:05 p.m.	22

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 14, 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. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Dr. John Kantner
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Deborah Shapiro
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Asst. City Attorney
Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Historic Planner
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 noted that Case #H 08-095 B, the Drury Project, was postponed by the applicant.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended with Case #H 08-095 B postponed. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 10, 2009

Ms. Shapiro requested two changes to the minutes:

On page 14 in the middle of the page: "Ms. Shapiro suggested he could ~~you~~ use a different texture."

On page 15 in the motion, condition #10: "The stucco on the new addition would be painted with a different texture than existing."

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of March 10, 2009 as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

None.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

1. Rules and Procedures for City Committees.

Mr. Rasch said the Rules and Procedures were in the packet.

Ms. Brennan said the change was to Article 11, Section 2-B and noted that the Chair could vote when the vote would affect the action. She explained it and gave an example. It was not just in case of a tie.

Ms. Walker asked if this was the amendment of Feb 11th. Ms. Brennan agreed.

Mr. Rasch shared a memo from Tony Sylvester regarding the Santa Fe Depot. The Rail Runner needed some electrical boxes to be installed north and south of the Depot. The question was whether it could be done administratively. He felt it was not sufficiently near the Depot to affect its landmark status. The purpose was for the Rail runner to send signals about arrival time.

Ms. Mather asked how this compared with the Plaza.

Mr. Rasch clarified it was a city landmark and the Board could rule when changes might affect its

status.

Ms. Walker moved that the Board look at the plans. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Rasch next reported the trip to UAE and showed some pictures taken on the trip. The mosques were dwarfed by skyscrapers. There was a picture of the delegation in the palace. The trip was to show what Bahrain does in HP and compare with what Santa Fe does. They also shared gifts. They had palm leaf fences that were similar to coyote fences.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Marilyn Bane, 622½ B Canyon Road, on behalf of OSFA, thanked the Board formally for the hard work and good decisions it made. She encouraged the Board to continue doing that and preserve the fabric of our community.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Case #H-08-144.** Santa Fe Plaza. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Public Works Department proposes Plaza Improvements to include installation of street lights on the north side, National Historic Landmark plaque, irrigation mechanical boxes, electrical outlets, and four options for the electrical panels. (Chip Lilienthal)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case. He noted that Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Trujillo were present and there was a memo in the packet that addressed the issues regarding the electric boxes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Lilienthal reviewed the options with the Board and sought the Board's direction. The lights, the irrigation, anything listed in the memo, they could put together as a package. Once he received the recommendations from the Board he would go forward to SHPO and if there were other things he needed to bring back, he would.

Option #1 would reduce the size of the electrical panel to 24 by 48 inches by 48 inches. There was a rendition in the packet and it was the least expensive at \$40,200. Also there was a picture of what it replaced. What used to be on the plaza - 7 x 24 x 48 tall. So the new proposed would be smaller than that one.

Option #2 was a panel near the stage with the smaller box discussed and also the transformer and meter box. He showed a rendition and said the total cost would be \$175,000.

Option #3 would reduce the size and put it under the stage. The main problem would be excavation into a basement with a trap door and a cost of about \$400,000.

Option #4 would reduce the size and move it across the street on Washington. It would get everything off the plaza to this area. It would leave a flat surface with a J box and a splice box that would both be buried and show only a flat surface. It would cost about \$345,000.

He also showed the plans for street lights along Palace Avenue. Those would replace the ones previously approved at a cost of \$20,400.

For the radio control boxes and backfill preventer boxes, Councilor Bushee suggested they be moved closer to the sidewalk. To do that they would need to move the water meter main off the plaza and work with Sangre de Cristo. They would negotiate with the architect on design. Councilor Bushee had suggested they consider a single box or make them smaller.

For the plaque, the SHPO and NPS staff had a specific one that they use and it was not available to show at this meeting. It might be placed in front of the bank and staff didn't know if it was flat or raised.

The irrigation boxes were as specified on the plans and drawings and were recommended by Marilyn Bane. They would paint them green.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Bane was sworn and thanked Mr. Lilienthal for his hard work. She was also grateful for the Cultural Landscape Report. She strongly suggested Board members get a copy of it on disk or hard copy. It was wonderful reading and well thought through. It was put together by Mr. Lilienthal, SHPO, Landscape Architects. It had been pretty well vetted. It was an extraordinary report. She said it anticipated many of these problems and gave direction. There were two parts of it. It was thick. Section on reduction of color - ground should be as free from color as possible. So that was a direction.

It had recommendations on electrical boxes; that they should be placed in an unobtrusive location, possibly underground. The cost then was \$40,000. Even then when there were electrical boxes, the recommendation was that it be moved off the plaza or put underground. One option was instead of making it vertical to have it be horizontal (on its side).

It was primarily important when there was turf (also recommended in the report). Two considerations were time and cost. She proposed that the City go ahead with the size reduction down to the 48" and leave it where it was with having it reviewed every six months and if the economy turned around to move it off the plaza.

Mr. John Dressman, representing Downtown Merchants Association, was sworn. Their point of view was that best solution was under the bandstand. They came up with a revenue stream if the City wanted to collect tax from the organizations that used the Plaza. It was available to the City and would help pay for it through the taxes collected.

The little electric boxes were a genuine hazard. With children chasing the pigeons there, it was a

lawsuit waiting to happen. He said he had given some information to the Public Works Department but didn't have it with him at this meeting. They were not cheap but could help avoid injuries and lawsuits.

He said in a 2001 Master Plan there was a proposal to lower the utility boxes to grade at an estimated cost of \$500,000. He was not sure when that was discarded. It was a concern to the merchants and they thought the best solution was the least clutter. The water controls could also be located under the bandstand.

Mr. Rad Acton was sworn and said he was present to discuss an option not presented and hopefully include one. According to Tim Maxwell the City could go down 24" or slightly more and it would not trigger an archaeology requirement in the Plaza area. He concurred with putting it under the bandstand. He proposed to put it 30" below grade and have it pushed to the end of the gazebo with a trap door that would be closed except for maintenance times. It would also allow it to ventilate to outdoors at the exterior space. It would provide shelter and access.

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

Chair Woods felt they could not engineer this tonight but could give their preference on what should happen with it.

Ms. Walker thanked staff for their work. What stood out in the four options were the estimated expenses. She asked if staff had gotten a bid from an electrician or where these numbers came from.

Mr. Lilienthal said they used the electrician hired before, People's Electric and they had their electrician discuss it with PNM. No one would give him a written bid until the City decided which option. They started looking at Option 1 soon after this one was installed. The increased costs were for covering the J box and burying wires to the location. Under the trap door, PNM would require 6' 6" under that stage. The other numbers came from PNM.

Ms. Walker asked about the \$5,000 for new design.

Mr. Lilienthal explained that the lower box would have to have access from two sides. The rest was the back flow prevention and moving the control for irrigation. .

Ms. Rios thanked him for coming. Because this was a landmark property she thought they should keep it the least cluttered. She appreciated Mr. Dressman's mention of the hazard of electrical boxes.

Mr. Lilienthal agreed. He said they could be buried but was expensive. He said they had 63 of them.

Ms. Rios asked if moving the backflow and irrigation closer to the sidewalk was that the best place.

Mr. Rasch felt at the perimeter was less intrusive.

Mr. Lilienthal clarified that the height of the backflow must be higher than any part on the plaza.

Ms. Rios asked about the street light fixtures.

Mr. Rasch said this design was approved by the Board. Mr. Lilienthal agreed.

Ms. Shapiro thought the existing box could it be buried right where it was with a trap door. They still would have to have 3' access to the panel. She asked if it would be possible to have the 40" box dropped 30" and have 12" above ground.

Mr. Lilienthal thought that would be possible - it could be done.

Ms. Shapiro thought the best thing was not to see it at all either under the bandstand or across the street. She asked if it was possible to put all the irrigation controls in one box.

Mr. Fabian Chávez said they could not put them all in one box but they could move the valve to the sidewalk. He explained that the water had to go through the backflow preventer to keep contaminated water out of the water system. The individual valve boxes could be reduced in number and size but if they had them all in one box they would have to shut down all the water with any break. It was not good practice. Secondly, they could reduce the size significantly. They were not as visible after sod was laid there. If there was a problem, they had to dig out the sod and dirt to repair it.

Ms. Rios asked about the two options on the plaque.

Mr. Lilienthal said there were actually more than that. It was a standard plaque. He didn't have the language - It could be flat, at an angle, upright, on the wall, etc.

Chair Woods asked what the purpose was in providing all this electrical service.

Mr. Lilienthal said the main reason was for safety.

Mr. Chávez said the expectation of the public was that the City provided electricity for all major events. You could see all the electrical cables now stapled into the trees and extra wires running through the trees. The demand for electrical service over the years for major events had increased and it had to meet code. And recently lighting up the whole Plaza. They just responded to that demand for more electrical power. The direction was given to staff who worked with the designer to make it meet code. He was not going to staple any wires to the trees any more.

Chair Woods asked if it was the events that caused them to have to have that big panel there.

Mr. Lilienthal said the existing panel was not compliant with code. So they had to bring it up to code. Once they had the contractor on board, they were able to add the increased service. It was a 200 amp service before. When more outlets were added, the requirement automatically jumped to 400 amps.

Chair Woods noted that as Mr. Dressman had mentioned, if the City got the revenue back, maybe the City could do what was best. They paid the architect to do the Cultural Property Report and no one pays attention to it. She was at the Council meeting when Councilor Calvert asked what The City needed for the 400th anniversary and urged the Council to do the right thing. This was remanded to the HDRB. So that was where they were now.

She didn't want to leave that box on the plaza as it clearly took away from its character. All the Board could do was make a recommendation. Perhaps no specific recommendation but to give direction. It was a huge task these staff members have had to go through. The Board needed to make it right.

She suggested each item be mentioned in the motion and reminded the Board it was a recommendation to the Governing Body on the direction to go.

Ms. Walker moved to recommend to the Governing Body regarding mitigation of the electrical panels on the Plaza to make the electrical boxes disappear as soon as possible, particularly in light of the 400th anniversary; to recommend the street lights as staff recommended; to recommend that the backflow preventer and irrigation control box be moved as proposed by Councilor Bushee closer to the sidewalk; to recommend a reduction in the size of the irrigation boxes; to recommend that the plaque be upright; and to recommend that the electrical outlets be as close to flush as possible. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rios and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios asked when the work could be done.

Mr. Lilienthal said there was never a good time to do this work but the best time would be after Fiesta.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 09-007.** 1226B Cerro Gordo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architecture, agent for Stacey Neff & Jeff Nelson, proposes to replace a coyote fence with a yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 4' 6" and construct an entry portal to 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 1226 B was constructed in 1995 and is listed on the Official Map as non-contributing.

This application was heard at the Feb. 24, 2009 HDRB hearing where the Board approved the construct an approximately 875 square foot Spanish Pueblo Revival style guesthouse to a height of 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 13' 8". Also approved was an approximately 40 square foot

storage structure and outdoor fireplace located to the non-publicly visible rear of the main residence in an existing patio area. The structure was approved at a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 13' 8".

The Board conditions included redesign of the proposed portal entry in the wall by addressing the overhang and massing and that more detailed drawings of this element are brought back to the Board for approval. The applicant has revised the drawings and proposes the following:

Remove the existing coyote fence along the north elevation and construct a yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 4' 6". The wall will be stuccoed to match the building and will include a new entry portal. The portal entry will be located west of the new guesthouse and to a height of 8'6" from the street grade and 11' from the interior grade. The overhang on the south elevation has been eliminated with the addition of a post and beam. A wood pedestrian door will be located on the west elevation. The overall massing of the structure has not been altered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that the massing is reduced as the Board recommended in the previous approval. 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. Brendon Campbell who reiterated Trey Jordan's comments from last meeting regarding massing. They intended to create a third building in a sense as an entry structure. It was not a freestanding gate and it was set back and down from the street. They were attempting to be more in compliance with the massing of the historic district.

Ms. Walker asked staff if they had the photos taken earlier in the day. Mr. Rasch showed them.

Ms. Rios asked him for a comparison with this picture.

Mr. Campbell said it was not as high. You could see all three elements from the street. It read as a compound instead of something big.

Ms. Rios asked how far from the street it was.

Mr. Campbell said it was 10-15' from the property edge.

Ms. Walker asked if they had found any similar third structures in the streetscape.

Mr. Campbell said not in that area.

Ms. Walker concluded that it would not be in harmony with the streetscape.

Mr. Campbell thought it was more in harmony than just a front door.

Ms. Walker said the Board looked very hard at the streetscape and saw nothing like this.

Ms. Mather asked if he thought the massing was in harmony with the buildings and not the streetscape.

Mr. Campbell felt it was in harmony with both.

Ms. Mather said they didn't see anything else close. They saw one with an arch.

Mr. Campbell said it was not so much the gate but it was a piece of architecture. Their understanding was to integrate it into the fabric - small pieces of building.

Ms. Rios asked for its depth.

Mr. Campbell said it was 7' 6". He said it was like a small building - a piece of architecture.

Chair Woods asked for its height.

Ms. Barrett said from grade it was 11'.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner said it was obvious the Board didn't feel it was in harmony with the streetscape. He asked if they could work with him to reduce the massing or reduce the proportion of the entry way as an alternative.

Mr. Campbell said they could take a look at it.

Mr. Featheringill asked if a person on the street could see the top of the house. Mr. Campbell agreed.

Mr. Featheringill thought it worked well with the structure itself.

Ms. Rios was trying to see what impact it had on the streetscape itself. It was further back and lower.

Mr. Featheringill agreed and said the height was in the gate. He referred to page 12. The line there was the street elevation and you would be almost as high as the gate. He thought it was a well thought out design but they might need to match the gates on the street.

Chair Woods read Section 14-5.(2 D 9 e) on scale and asked if it was in harmony with entries in the streetscape. She agreed it worked well with that structure. The massing and setbacks were also to be in harmony with the streetscape. She asked if, in light of the ordinance, Mr. Campbell believed this feature was in keeping with the ordinance.

Mr. Campbell said he did.

Chair Woods asked him how and he did not reply.

Mr. Featheringill said it was a gate with a top on it and the Board did allow that gate feature.

Chair Woods said it was that height and that width. It wasn't just a gate but would become a structure. She asked if the structure was in keeping with the streetscape.

Mr. Featheringill said if it was 7.5' deep then it probably was not.

Chair Woods asked if they could come to some compromise with it that would bring it in conformance with the ordinance.

Mr. Campbell said it was not on the street; it was lower; and it did not face the street.

Ms. Walker felt he could still be creative and not have this deep huge mass. The Board told Mr. Jordan last time that they would like it reduced.

Chair Woods thought he was reading the depth from the street.

Mr. Campbell explained that it was at an angle.

Ms. Rios noted there was also a wall in front of it. She asked how high the wall was.

Ms. Barrett said it was a maximum of four feet.

Dr. Kantner asked if it would be possible to reduce the front elevation itself. It had dimensionality no matter how you look at it. If he could reduce that one dimension it would help.

Ms. Mather agreed. She recommended to reduce it perhaps a third and eliminate the back part. That would make it more in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Campbell asked if the Board could approve the guest house -

Ms. Barrett said this was solely a consideration of the entry. The guest house was already approved.

Ms. Walker read the motion from last time had conditions and he responded to the conditions. So the only issue was the mass of the structure.

Chair Woods said there was a philosophical difference here. The Board was trying to approve a gate and the applicant wanted a structure.

Mr. Featheringill moved to postpone Case #H 09-007. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it

passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 09-012B.** 526 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Ms. Ortiz, proposes to meet the Board condition for lighting, brick coping and pedestrian gate on a previous approval of a non-contributing building. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

526 Galisteo Street is a contributing commercial building with the east and south elevations as primary and a non-contributing accessory structure. The property has two street frontages in the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

The HDRB conditionally approved an application to remodel the property on March 10, 2009. Now, the applicant seeks approval for the remaining three conditions.

1. The addition to the contributing structure will have a simplified 2-course brick parapet to distinguish it from the existing parapet.
2. The existing metal pedestrian gate near the casita will be removed and replaced with a wooden pedestrian gate in the same opening.
3. Four types of lighting are proposed: a hemispherical sconce; a rectangular wedge sconce; 22" high landscaping lamps, and spotlighting cans for the sign.

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 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, 225 E Palace Avenue, who said he had nothing to add.

Ms. Walker asked about the exterior lighting.

Mr. Purvis said they were low voltage and low height so no light would escape the premises.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to describe the brick.

Mr. Purvis said the existing had a single lateral course so he was turning them at an angle and go with the taller exposed stucco wall using the same color brick.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 09-012B per staff recommendations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 09-010.** 855A Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Farrell, agent for David & Ruth Arthur, proposes to construct an approximately 5,798 sq. ft. single family residence with attached garage to a height of 16' midpoint on the street elevation and 18' 4" at the highest point where the maximum allowable height was 17' 5". (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

855 Camino Ranchitos is a .3227 acres lot located on the edge of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposed construction of an approximately 5,798 square foot single family residence to a height of 16' measured midpoint on the street facing elevation where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5". The highest point of the building on the streetscape elevation is at the garage where the height is 18' 4". There is not a 2' slope change over the footprint of the proposed building.

The heated footprint of the building is 4,416 square feet with a heated second story of 525 square feet and approximately 335 square feet of portals. A second story deck area is proposed which will be accesses from the second story living space. An approximately 780 square foot attached garage is proposed on the street facing west elevation. Garage doors will be natural cedar.

The building will be Territorial Revival in style which includes sharper corners and buckskin and red brick coping. Windows will be true divided lights in a Buckskin color. Portals will be simple and include a wood beam and posts finished in the color Fruitwood. The building will be stuccoed with El Rey Kokanee. Five skylights are indicated on the plans. No exterior light fixtures were submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition that the height not exceed 17' 5" at any point, that skylights or rooftop appurtenances are not publicly visible, and that exterior light fixtures are approved by staff before a building permit is submitted.

Ms. Rios asked if 17' 5" was the maximum but there were no exceptions. Ms. Barrett agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if she received a sample of stucco color. Ms. Barrett agreed.

Present and sworn was Ms. Dolores Vigil who said they would lower the height to 17' and they had a revised drawing for the Board. [Exhibit B]

Chair Woods said they needed to see the street elevation without the fence.

Ms. Vigil explained that the fence was existing.

Ms. Barrett added that there were two elevations.

Ms. Vigil said that from the finished floor to the top of the parapet was 17' 2".

Chair Woods asked if the second story was on top of garage or behind the garage.

Ms. Vigil said it was on top. The west elevation was the best one to look at. It was set back from the front at least ten feet. They planned to use the second floor for an office and a gym.

Ms. Rios asked for the ceiling height.

Ms. Vigil said it was 7' 10".

Ms. Walker said the living space on the second floor might interfere with the neighbor's spaces.

Chair Woods said they had to go down where the garage door met the grade to measure the height.

Ms. Barrett said that was correct.

Chair Woods tried to add up the heights of each section and could not come up with a height that was under the maximum allowable height. She did see how it could physically be done.

Mr. Robert Farrell, the contractor, was sworn. He said they would build it at 17' 3½". He said that Santa Fe Door would provide garage doors at 7'.

The Board discussed it with him and went back over the measurements. In the end, he said he could build it at that height.

Chair Woods - give us the numbers - we were real close here.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Robin West, 853 Camino Ranchitos, was sworn. She said she didn't know all the proper terminology to use but just about how she felt about the neighborhood. It was a very low key neighborhood and a lovely small street with no massive structures. Her objection was the second floor. She thought it

was so they could have a deck which took away the privacy and she also objected to the sheer mass. There were two interior courtyards open to the sky so it looked much bigger. The mass on such a small lot seemed inappropriate. The streetscape was affected by this mass on this small lot.

She said it seemed out of character. She thought second stories were a zoning thing and were not used since the 1990s. They made shadows on the small street and invaded neighbors' privacy. There was really no reason for them.

Ms. Dale Takeshita was sworn. She was looking at a house up the street that was her family home and in which she grew up since 1957. She said she had concerns about it. There were not many huge houses there now. There was a large one next door built 25 years ago. A second floor was built onto it on the east side and her parents felt people were always looking into her house. They had a ten foot wall put in and it made her parents feel closed in.

She didn't expect it to be this massive. It was pretty large, especially with the second floor. So she had a concern about it. She felt the second story would affect several of the neighbors there.

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

Ms. Vigil said they rechecked their measurements and it measured 17' 3". She reviewed them again for the Board.

Ms. Rios asked what the lot coverage was.

Ms. Vigil said it was 30%.

Ms. Rios asked if they considered a one-story design.

Mr. Farrell said they did consider it and they wanted two stories.

Ms. Rios asked if they were proposing a deck and what the details of it were.

Mr. Farrell said it was a regular deck using 2x6 redwood.

Mr. Rasch pointed out the deck on the east elevation and showed where the access was.

Ms. Barrett pointed out the garage and the second floor area and the deck area.

Mr. Farrell stated again that it would be under the 17' 5".

Chair Woods thought the windows were almost as high on the high part of the one story.

Ms. Vigil pointed out that the building was set back 98' from the road.

Ms. Walker asked who designed this house.

Ms. Vigil said Mr. Farrell and the client designed the house. Mr. Farrell was the contractor.

Ms. Walker told the Board that there was no way she would ever vote for a second floor living space in the core district because it was too much of a disruption for everyone around. She preferred that they eliminate the second floor living area and move the deck to the center of the east lot line so it would not impinge on the neighbors on the north and south.

Ms. Rios asked about the fence.

Ms. Vigil said they were proposing a coyote fence on the north side of the property to the maximum allowable height.

Ms. Rios asked about the one on the west elevation.

Ms. Vigil said the fence on the west elevation was existing.

Ms. Barrett said the maximum allowable wall height was six feet.

Ms. Vigil said she put together a small map for the record showing all the two-story structures. [It was attached as Exhibit C]

Ms. Walker pointed out that the corner of Abeyta was the Historic Review District.

Chair Woods asked her to point out those that were in the Eastside and Downtown Historic District.

Ms. Vigil - 832 El Caminito 601, 603 and 605 El Caminito, 854 Camino Ranchitos.

Ms. Walker said 854 Camino Ranchitos was outside the district.

Ms. Walker said 601 was set down below the street level and 832 predated the height ordinance.

Ms. Vigil said 830 Camino Ranchitos was also a two story building.

Chair Woods asked if she was seeing the front door or a gate on the west elevation.

Ms. Vigil said it was the front door.

Chair Woods felt their first story was high as well. The windows were also adding to the height. It was not just the height of the second story but other things they were adding that could be modified to alleviate some of the concern.

Ms. Vigil said they could look at the Board's suggestions and bring it back to the Board

Ms. Rios moved to postponement to give applicant opportunity to reduce massing and if possible to eliminate the second story. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 09-016.** 300 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area. Andy Lyons, agent for Ray Heideman, proposes to remodel a contributing property by constructing interior yardwalls to approximately 4' high and a coyote fence to 6' high, removing a non-historic vehicle gate, restuccoing the existing structures to match, and replacing a non-historic garage door and resurfacing the driveway. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

300 East Berger Street is a single family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style during the first half of the 1930s. The building is contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District and the north and west elevations may be considered as primary.

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

1. The non-historic plywood carriage doors on the north elevation of the garage will be removed and replaced with a steel overhead door that is finished with a wooden "carriage-style" veneer. The opening dimension will be retained as exists.
2. The residence and the north and west lotline walls will be restuccoed to match the existing material and color, El Rey "La Luz."
3. The brick, concrete, flagstone, and stone driveway and adjacent walkway surfacing on the north will be removed and replaced with concrete and gravel.

A stuccoed yardwall will be constructed to a height of 3' 8" along the west side of the north driveway. The design includes planters, an iron pedestrian gate that is similar to an existing gate, and flanking pilasters. A 6" gap will be retained between the primary elevation and the new wall.

4. The existing non-historic vehicle gates on the west will be removed and not replaced with other gates.

A stuccoed yardwall will be constructed to a height of 4' 2" along the north side of the west driveway. The design includes an iron pedestrian gate that is similar to an existing gate and flanking pilasters. A 6" gap will be retained between the primary elevation and the new wall.

5. A portion of the concrete driveway and the concrete stoop on the west will be removed and replaced

with a brick courtyard. The new courtyard will be enclosed with a 6' high coyote fence and gates.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that all new concrete be earth-toned or stained to match retained concrete. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Andy Lyons, PO Box 8858, who added that they were going to stain the concrete.

Ms. Rios asked if they would use cementitious stucco. Mr. Lyons agreed.

Ms. Rios asked about the garage doors.

Mr. Lyons said they would use steel door with wood overlay, painted to match the existing door.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they would have exterior lighting.

Mr. Lyons said they were only replacing the light by the caretaker's apt. he would submit the design to staff.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 09-016 per staff recommendation and conditions that the concrete be stained to match existing concrete and that exterior lighting be taken to staff for approval. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 09-017.** 645 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Robert and Kelli Glazier, proposes to construct a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 4' 6" to a contributing property. (Marissa Barrett)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

The 1,945 square foot Stamm building located at 645 Camino del Monte Sol is Spanish Pueblo Revival style and was built by 1949 according to the 2005 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI). The HDRB reviewed the status of this building at the January 23, 2007 hearing and upgraded the historic status from non-contributing to contributing.

At the April 10, 2007 hearing the Board conditionally approved (see attached letter) remodeling of the

building which included removal of non-historic portions, additions, window replacement, and height increase to below the maximum allowable height of 14' 9". The front yard wall was to be eliminated and the guesthouse was to be redesigned. At the August 28, 2007 (see attached letter) hearing the Board approved an amendment to the original approval to include minor alterations to the main residence as well as the construction of an approximately 850 square foot freestanding guesthouse to a height of 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 2". No yard wall or fence was proposed at that time.

The applicant now proposes the construction of a coyote fence along the streetscape of Camino del Monte Sol. The fence will be to a height of 4' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 4' 8". The fence will have irregular height tops and the stringers will face the interior of the property. There will be an opening for vehicles. No gate is proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval on the condition of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulations for Contributing Structures, Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis who said he had *nothing* to add.

Chair Woods thought it- it looks very nice.

Ms. Shapiro asked if this would require that they cut down any trees.

Mr. Purvis said it would not.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 09-017 per staff recommendations. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 4. Case #H 09-015.** 137 Elena Street. Don Gaspar Area. Richard Trujillo, agent for Maura Studie, proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing historic windows on primary and non-primary elevations, resurface a walkway and stoop, construct buttresses on a streetscape yardwall and restucco all as needed. An exception is requested to replace historic material (14-5.2(D)(t)(a)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

137 Elena Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in the 1920s or 1930s in the vernacular manner. Examination of aerial photographs reveals that the northwest corner addition was

constructed in or before 1959 and that the east addition is non-historic. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District and the west and south elevations may be considered as primary.

The applicant began to remodel the property without approvals or a building permit and was issued a stop work order. Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following five items.

1. Historic wood and steel casement windows on the primary south and west elevations and on the non-primary north and east elevations will be removed and replaced with new windows in the existing opening dimensions. An exception is requested to remove historic material on primary elevations (Section 15-5.2 (D)(5)(a)) and the required criteria responses are attached.
2. The existing concrete front door stoop will be repaired and finished with ceramic tile.
3. The front walkway in the courtyard will be surfaced with brick.
4. The streetscape yardwall and side lot yardwall will be repaired. Supporting buttresses will be added to the front side of the front yardwall.
5. Existing stucco cracks and damage will be repaired and the building and walls will be restuccoed to match existing El Rey "Buckskin."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception request to replace historic windows on primary elevations unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to grant the exception. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Chair Woods asked what was in front of the window there.

Mr. Rasch said it was a storm window. They wanted to replace five windows and one on the east was historic. One casement was on the primary elevation and the ones on the south and west they didn't want to replace. The historic window was divided light.

Ms. Rios asked how many of those that were replaced were historic.

Mr. Rasch explained that at the stop work order, one on the south, one on the east and one casement on the west. Besides those three, there were two on the north that were replaced.

Ms. Rios asked about the historic window that was replaced.

Mr. Rasch said when he saw it, it looked to be in good condition. It had multiple lights but the applicant should clarify it.

Ms. Mather asked about the wall.

Mr. Rasch didn't know the construction date. In the packet on page 24 it was shown. The owner and contractor said it was about to fall over, hence the buttresses. He said it was adobe and might be two courses thick.

Ms. Walker didn't find the responses to the exception criteria.

Mr. Rasch said they were on page 8.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Trujillo, 1565 San Jose Drive.

Ms. Rios asked if he was planning to stucco the entire building.

Mr. Trujillo said he was. There were lots of cracks so he would stucco to match existing stucco.

Ms. Mather asked him to tell her about the wall.

Mr. Trujillo said it was 3' block pen tile with no rebar. It was splitting apart so they repaired and strengthened it. It would be fine now.

Ms. Rios asked for a description of that historic window.

Mr. Trujillo said it was one light on top and three on bottom and were in pretty bad shape. They still have the windows. The one to the left was a single pane window and in good shape. The owner didn't want to change it. The replacements had snap-in muntins.

Chair Woods said she was confused about the windows and why they started work on the windows.

Mr. Trujillo said a lot of it was in really bad shape.

Chair Woods asked if he understood this was an historic area and it was important that the Board work with him and keep the fabric.

Mr. Trujillo briefly reviewed each of the windows. The first was on the south side was in pretty bad shape. We also changed one on the west side that was metal frame, not very efficient and had lots of condensation.

Mr. Rasch pointed it out on page 27. And on the north were two casement windows like that one. Then on page 28 was the narrow 8 light window that was replaced.

Mr. Trujillo said the window on the east side pretty much matched what was taken.

Mr. Rasch said they didn't have a picture of it but this one was slightly larger although not visible on the back side.

Mr. Trujillo said he didn't change any dimensions.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he was going to have a reveal.

Mr. Trujillo agreed he would match existing reveal with conventional stucco. The windows were thicker but they were setting them in to keep same reveal.

Chair Woods asked if there were any historic windows not to be replaced.

Mr. Trujillo said on the west elevation there were storm windows so they were in good shape.

Mr. Rasch said also on the south elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Mary Stewart, 113 Arroyo Hondo Trail. She wanted to thank the Board for allowing her to speak. She said she had owned this house since 1989 and liked the old style house so her intent was not to alter the appearance but it was old and had some heating concerns. She thought it would be nice to just change the windows in the bedrooms which were very inefficient.

She explained that she lived in the house previously until her family got too large but she intended to move back to it or have her mother move into it.

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

Chair Woods asked if any of the work compromised the historic status.

Mr. Rasch said the status was kind of borderline because of the addition on the rear. It had mixed integrity. The steel casement windows and one historic window on west elevation would not have changed dimensions so he didn't think this would affect the status.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 09-015, citing that the applicant had met the exception criteria on page 8 with the conditions that the window reveal match existing and sizes not change, that the stucco match existing and that muntins follow the existing style. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Case #H 08-095B.** Southwest corner of Palace Avenue and Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for DSW Santa Fe, LLC, proposes to assign primary elevations to contributing structures and to restore historic character on a significant

building, remodel two contributing buildings by removing non-contributing additions and constructing 39,000 sq. ft. of additions, as well as constructing approximately 62,000 sq. ft. of additional building and site improvements. The maximum allowable height for streetscape structures was 16' 9" and interior lot structures were 18' 8". New structures were proposed at 25' 9" and 44' 4". Four types of exceptions are request: height (14-5.2(D)(9)); roof pitch (14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); Santa Fe Style (14-5.2(#)); and creating openings on primary elevations (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)). (David Rasch)

This case was postponed at the request of the applicant under Approval of the Agenda.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

The Board briefly discussed the scheduling of the Drury project hearings.

The Board discussed the dinner on April 22 at 6 p.m. at Vanessie.

1. Vote on nominations for Preservation Awards.

Mr. Rasch handed out the official ballots for the preservation awards. Each Board member submitted a ballot for the vote on the preservation awards.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer