



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 2/19/10 TIME 1:00 pm

SERVED BY David Rasch

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

AMENDED

MEETING LOCATION

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2010 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2010 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCILORS' CONFERENCE ROOM

1ST FLOOR, CITY HALL, 200 LINCOLN AVENUE

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 12, 2010

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-001. 110 Don Gaspar Avenue

Case #H-10-004. 50 E. San Francisco Street

Case #H-10-005. 1330B Cerro Gordo Road.

Case #H-10-006. 234 Irvine Street

Case #H-10-002. 634 Canyon Road

Case #H-10-007. 1623 Camino Cruz Blanca

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Discussion- Certified Local Government Grant

a. HCPI forms for Canyon Road annexation and as needed for HDRB.

b. Staff educational training NMHPA and NAPC.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-09-012. 526 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent from Ms. Ortiz, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing commercial building including the construction of two 10'8" high 414 sq. ft. portals in the rear yard. (David Rasch)

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-10-015. 703 Galiseto Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David & Francis Pittman, owner/agent, proposes to remodel a non-contributing property to include replacing the non-historic windows, restucco the building, repair and stucco over a stone wall and increase height to the maximum allowable height of 56" with a coyote fence extension, and construct a 3' high coyote fence on the north street frontage. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-10-014. 877 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Casey, agent for Harry Shades, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential building to include enclosing the front portal with an exception request (Section 14-5.2 (D)(4)) and reusing a non-conforming window that exceeds the 30" rule with an exception request (Section 14-5.2 (E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch)

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the February 23, 2010 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, February 23, 2010.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
February 23, 2010

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published	1
Approval of Minutes - January 12, 2010	Approved as amended	1-2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law Case #H 10-001, 110 Don Gaspar Ave. Case #H 10-004, 50 E. San Francisco Case #H 10-005, 1330B Cerro Gordo Case #H 10-006, 234 Irvine Street Case #H 10-002, 634 Canyon Road Case #H 10-007, 1623 Cam. Cruz Blanca	Approved as presented	2
Communications	None	2
Business from the Floor	None	2
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>CLGC Grants</u> a. Canyon Road Annexation b. Staff Training	Discussion	2-4
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 09-012.</u> 526 Galisteo Street	Approved as recommended	5-6
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 10-015</u> 703 Galisteo Street	Approved with conditions	6-8
2. <u>Case #H 10-014</u> 877 E. Palace Avenue	Approved with conditions	8-11
Matters from the Board	Discussion	11
Adjournment	Adjourned at 6:15 p.m.	11

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

February 23, 2010

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Vice Chair Cecilia Rios 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:

H Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
H Dr. John Kantner
H Ms. Christine Mather
H Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assoc. City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 12, 2010

Vice Chair Rios - page 10 should say, "Ms. Rios asked if he felt his project reflected what was historically there."

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of January 12, 2010 as corrected. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDING OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H 10-001 110 Don Gaspar Avenue

Case #H 10-004 50 E. San Francisco Street

Case #H 10-005 1330B Cerro Gordo Road

Case #H 10-006 234 Irvine Street

Case #H 10-002 634 Canyon Road

Case #H 10-007 1623 Camino Cruz Blanca

There were no changes requested to any of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Case #H 10-001, Case #H 10-004, Case #H 10-005, Case #H 10-006, Case #H 10-002 and Case #H 10-007 as presented. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Discussion of Certified Local Government Grant

a. HCPI forms for Canyon Road annexation and as needed for HDRB

b. Staff educational training NMHPA and NAPC

Mr. Rasch explained that because Santa Fe was one of nine Certified Local Governments that could get grants for certain projects. The City got grant money through the state from the federal government to send staff to the New Mexico Heritage Preservation Alliance. They paid for travel, food and lodging while the City paid for registration. It was usually in March and would be in Albuquerque this year. He hadn't seen a registration form yet.

Ms. Mather said she got an email to renew her membership.

Mr. Rasch said the State also gave money for posters and other educational materials. They also got other training money. The National Historic Trust conference was larger and more expensive. The other one was the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions which was geared to board members. Staff really loved that conference. This was a little more intimate and he had gone to them in Indianapolis, Baltimore and New Orleans. It was to be in Grand Rapids in July this year. He agreed to email the dates to the Board. It was good to get out of the southwest region for them. People were always shocked by Santa Fe's height ordinance.

Ms. Mather asked if the National Alliance had board training.

Mr. Rasch said they did in a pre-conference specifically for commissioners.

Ms. Walker asked about the HCPI funding.

Mr. Rasch said Richard Ellenberg had agreed to be present to address it but was not present. He explained that this was to cover the inventories in the Upper Canyon area that was being considered for annexation into the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Area 18 was being considered for city annexation in phase three. The annexation was adjacent to their historic districts and he was asked by the Board to look into expanding the district into that area. They had decided just to extend the Downtown and Eastside District but not the Historic Review District. He got CLGC money to do those inventories. There were about 18 properties and 30 structures. So now the City could hire a consultant to do them.

He added that the State Historic District boundaries did not even include the eastern part of the Downtown and Eastside District. He thought they just never had put that on an agenda for consideration. Their boundary ended at Cristo Rey. Those not in it were not eligible for tax credits unless the City nominated that they expand it. He didn't think the state wanted to do the inventories.

Ms. Walker felt the tax credit would be a palliative for upper canyon folks.

Mr. Rasch agreed to work on that. He added that individual properties outside the district could be listed and be eligible. Any significant building and any contributing building could be made eligible.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the Board could make a recommendation to the governing Body on this.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He said the City historic district was done in 1957 and light blue area was done in 1974.

The other two issues were that the General Plan of 1999 called for expanding the districts to the south and west and didn't identify the east. So that meant they would have to do a General Plan amendment. The amendment would include rezoning as the properties came into the City since the County had zoning proposed for that area.

He said first he was just doing the inventories and if the extension of the historic district didn't happen, the Board could landmark the Randall Davey property.

Ms. Walker said rezoning needed to be zoned appropriate to what was there.

Mr. Rasch thought the zoning was on the website now.

He said the CLGC proposals were due March 1st and the programs would go through the fall so the inventories could be done this summer.

Vice Chair Rios announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board to the Governing Body had a limited time to do so and should contact staff for the procedure involved.

Mr. Rasch explained that the new ordinance now gave 30 days for an appeal and it was from the date the Board approved the findings of fact. The appeal language was amended last year.

Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Rasch had said earlier that the findings could be done at the same meeting.

Mr. Rasch explained that many thought that was leading the hearing and they decided not to do that because it could delay permits. They were looking at shortening it and looking at final instead of waiting until the findings of fact were presented.

Vice Chair Rios thought builders would be upset at that time delay.

Mr. Rasch said the logic was that the City didn't want to release a permit if an irreversible action was being taken like removal of windows. But that wouldn't be the case for building a wall. So they were looking at 30 days for irreversible matters. They were addressing it this week at a meeting on Thursday at 3:00 to

deal with it.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 09-012** 526 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Ms. Ortiz, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing commercial building including the construction of two 10'8" high 414 sq. ft. portals in the rear yard. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

526 Galisteo Street is a commercial contributing 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.

On March 10, 2009, the Historic Design Review Board approved remodeling on the property which includes the construction of an 869 square foot addition with a 240 square foot ramada on the west, non-primary elevation of the contributing building, along with switching the front door and a front window, and replacing a sliding glass door on the rear with a window, replacing the vehicle door infills on the accessory building with doors and windows repairing and extending the existing streetscape yardwalls.

On July 14, 2009, The Historic Design Review Board approved an amendment to the remodeling project that included altering the front door, restored the off-white color, installing an outdoor freezer located to the west of the addition on the principal building with a 7' high white board fence screen applied to the previously approved pergola, retaining the shed-roof porch on the accessory building north elevation, reducing the vehicle door infill on the accessory building east elevation from previously approved triple door/window installations to paired door/window installations, applying a temporary wood board screen to the iron gate during remodeling, and altering the site paving to include more asphalt in the front and significantly more flagstone in the rear with a random-cut pattern.

Now, the applicant proposes to construct two portals at the west side of the rear yard. The portals will be 414 square feet at 10' 8" high where the maximum allowable height is 15' 11" high as determined by a radial calculation. The roofing material will be metallic gray and the structural elements will be painted white.

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.

Vice Chair Rios asked about the letter of opposition.

Mr. Rasch said it was included as the last page of the packet for this case. A neighbor filed a letter of opposition that said the metal structure that the Board knew as the freezer was not Board approved but it was approved by the Board.

The letter talked about parking problems on the applicant's property where customers to the restaurant were parking illegally.

Vice Chair Rios said that was not under the Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Rasch said it also mentioned a hazard for left turns into the subject property and that also was not in the Board's jurisdiction.

Vice Chair Rios added for the record, that the applicant had to go through the City to meet all regulations pertaining to the application before a permit could be issued.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, 227 E. Palace Avenue, who said he met with the metal expert today and was told there was a weathering process that would work in a couple of months. He said the material was seam locked metal.

Ms. Mather asked what material he would use for flooring of portals. Mr. Purvis said it would be flagstone. He also clarified there would be no awnings.

Vice Chair Rios thanked him for the definition on ramada.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

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

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 10-015.** 703 Galisteo Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David & Francis Pittman, owner/agents, propose to remodel a non-contributing property to include replacing the non-historic windows, restucco the building, repair and stucco over a stone wall and increase height to the maximum allowable height of 56" with a coyote fence extension and construct a 3' high coyote fence on the north street frontage. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

703 Galisteo Street is a single-family residence that was constructed before 1912 in the Territorial style. The building was significantly remodeled in 1983 which removed historic material including brick

coping and window moldings, constructed a pitched roof, constructed a laundry room at the northeast covered portal, and replaced historic windows with aluminum sliders. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. The aluminum slider windows will be replaced with similar vinyl Energy Star-rated windows from Don's Windows and Doors. Designs appear to represent that sliders will be installed.

2. The building will be restuccoed with El Rey cementitious "Adobe."

3. The existing brick and stone wall along Galisteo Street will be repaired and stuccoed over. The wall will be extended in height with a coyote fence to the maximum allowable height of 56" or 4'8" high from the sidewalk.

4. A 3' high coyote fence will be constructed on top of the sloping grade along West Buena Vista Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Dr. Kantner asked if the conclusion was that the wall had no historic integrity.

Mr. Rasch didn't know. The brick had an old method of construction. It was not listed with the building's HCPI. He recommended the entire property be non-contributing.

Ms. Walker thought it was a charming property.

Present and sworn was Mr. David Pittman, 703 Galisteo, who explained that the wall was deteriorating and falling apart. The plaster put in was coming out. The steps to the front door were all messed up. He pointed out that they could see the top of the wall in the picture and it was coming off.

His wife wanted it to be not fully private but so they could sit out there. They would just match the height of the coyote fence.

Vice Chair Rios asked if he was going to renovate it.

Mr. Pittman agreed. He thought he could put a solid mortar cap on it to keep moisture from going through. The coyote would be on the inside and not on the top of the wall.

Ms. Walker said he would also save some money on it by not applying stucco. Stuccoing was expensive. So stabilizing the façade would be sufficient. She added that the top of the coyote fence should

be staggered.

Ms. Mather asked if the windows would be sliders.

Mr. Pittman said he could have either sliders or double hung and didn't care which. He just wanted to get rid of the single panes.

Ms. Mather asked if they would be the same size as were there now. Mr. Pittman agreed.

Ms. Mather asked what color the windows would be.

Mr. Pittman said they would be tan. They only made them in white and tan.

Ms. Walker felt double hung windows would be more attractive.

Mr. Pittman agreed to use double-hung windows.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H10-015 per staff recommendations with the conditions that windows be double hung either in tan or white and the coyote fence be uneven at top and that the applicant attempt to repair the wall rather than stucco it. Ms. Walker seconded the motion with the added condition that any exterior lighting be taken to staff for review and approval. Ms. Mather agreed to the condition and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 10-014.** 877 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Robert Casey, agent for Harry Shades, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential building to include enclosing the front portal with an exception request (Section 14-5.2 (D)(4)) and reusing a non-conforming window that exceeds the 30" rule with an exception request (Section 14-5.2 (E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

877 East Palace Avenue is a single-family two-story residence in a triple-family residential building that was constructed around 1982 or 1988 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The existing windows are non-conforming to the 30" rule and there are existing non-traditional overhangs and eyebrows. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The existing 52 square foot front portal will be enclosed. An exception is requested to Section

14-5.2(D)(4) which disallows portal enclosures. The applicant has responded to the required criteria and they are presented at the end of this report.

The partial step-design stuccoed wall infill on the south will be completely infilled with wall and the front door will be moved to the exterior west elevation. A copper standing-seam shed roof will be constructed over the door and supported with a corbel.

2. An existing non-conforming window from the residence west elevation will be reused in the portal enclosure on the south elevation. An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) which requires glazing not to exceed 30" in the diagonal. The applicant has responded to the required criteria and they are presented at the end of this report.

3. An existing wooden yardwall gate will be rebuilt with a steel frame.

PORTAL ENCLOSURE

(I) Do not damage the character of the district

The structure, located at 877 East Palace and built in 1982, is classified as non-contributing. The architectural look of the proposed portal enclosure would be specific to and harmonious with the existing structure and the three townhouse complex. The proposed enclosure is under the existing roof and does not expand the structure's footprint.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare

The proposed portal enclosure would allow for a vestibule or protective entry area to better isolate the owner's art and collectibles from the elements.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts

The proposed enclosure does not impact the look of the Alameda District as other examples of enclosed front portals exist. No new roof square footage is added to the structure or complex.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

WINDOW – RELOCATION WITHIN PORTAL ENCLOSURE

(I) Do not damage the character of the district

The window to be relocated is an existing window within the portal area. It has a diagonal glass

measurement exceeding 30 inches. To reuse this window in its' relocated position within the enclosed portal would continue to match not only the existing windows in the residence but also the other windows in the three townhouse complex, all exceeding 30 inches diagonal.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare

To require a compliant window would require increased energy resources involved with its' manufacturing - rather than recycling an existing, matching construct within the proposed project.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts

The three East Palace townhouse, units 877, 875, 873, and the existing window constructs are unique to those addresses and do not impact the Historical District.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the two exception requests to enclose the front portal and to reuse a non-conforming window as submitted; otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Vice Chair Rios asked about copper standing seam roof.

Mr. Rasch said it would be on the front elevation above the portal over the doorway and said the side would be seen. He said there were other ones with copper on the building. He referred to pages 23 and 24 in the packet for existing.

Present and sworn was Mr. Rob Casey who explained that the copper roof element was existing on the south and east sides so this one would match everything on the building now.

Mr. Rasch said the others were cantilevered but this one would use a corbel.

Ms. Walker recalled that on this property before the three units were built, horses inhabited that corner.

Mr. Casey remembered that when he came to Santa Fe these units were just being built. It was a charming area. He had built in the district before and had experience with Mr. Rasch and James before him.

Dr. Kantner asked if the window and door would be recycled there.

Mr. Casey agreed and pointed out where the door and window were and would be located.

Ms. Mather asked if he would move the exterior lighting.

Mr. Casey pointed out the floodlights on it that didn't conform with the ordinance. He would remove them and have down lighting under the portal using a can that would not be visible.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H10-014 - based on staff recommendations and accepting the criteria responses on page 3-4 for granting the exception and request that the exterior light fixture be reviewed and approved by staff.

Mr. Casey said the light design was shown on page 7. It would be the same color as the existing wood.

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

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Rasch announced that March 4 at 3 pm was the next review of Chapter 14.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Walker moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Approved by:

Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer