



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3-8-11 TIME 3:30

SERVED BY Camille Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, March 22 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, March 22, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES March 8, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-008 427 Apodaca Hill
Case #H-11-013 638 Old Santa Fe Trail

- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1. Case #H-11-015. 1050 Old Pecos Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. New Mexico Army National Guard, agent/owner, proposes to remodel the front yard area of the non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

I. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Case #h-10-036. 1120 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cristo Rey Catholic Church, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to replace existing metal caps on protruding vigas on a significant building. (David Rasch).
- 2. Case #H-11-009. 635 Alto Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Vahid Mojarrah, agent for the City of Santa Fe, owner, proposes to construct a multi-family compound composed of five residences at a total of 4,208 sq. ft. on a sloping vacant lot to a maximum height of 24' where the allowable height is 19'. A height exception is requested (Chapter 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).
- 3. Case #H-11-084. 403 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marisa Wolf, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval by requesting an exception to replace historic windows on a primary elevation of a contributing residence. (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-016. 1155 Camino Delora. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for Devin McShane, owner, proposes to construct a 165 sq. ft. addition on a contributing residence and to increase the height of an existing yardwall to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 55". Two exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)) and to exceed the yardwall height (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (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 March 22, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, March 22, 2011.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
March 22, 2011

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes		
March 8, 2011	Approved as amended	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2-3
Communications	Discussion	3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Administrative Matters		
1. <u>Case #H-11-015</u>	Recommendations offered	3-5
1050 Old Pecos Trail		
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H-10-036</u>	Approved with conditions	5-6
1120 Canyon Road		
2. <u>Case #H-11-009</u>	Approved as recommended	6-12
635 Alto Street		
3. <u>Case #H-10-084</u>	Approved with conditions	12-15
403 E. Alameda		
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 11-016</u>	Postponed	15
1155 Camino Delora		
Matters from the Board	Discussion	15
Adjournment	Adjourned at 6:45 p.m.	15

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

March 22, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé 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 Avenue, Santa Fé, 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. Rad Acton
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dr. John Kantner [excused]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assistant 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

Mr. Rasch said the first case under New Business, Case #H 11-016, was postponed.

Mr. Rasch also noted that the landscape document for the first case was at the back of the second case in the packet.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the agenda as amended with Case #H 11-016 postponed. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 8, 2011

Ms. Walker asked for the following amendments to the minutes:

On page 8 at the top, Item # 4 should say the pilasters would be retained but the narrowing part should be deleted.

On page 12 near the bottom it should say, "Ms. Walker requested a status review on the old National Park Service building on Old Pecos Trail and the Hollenbeck House on San Acacio."

Ms. Rios asked for the following amendments to the minutes:

On page 9, second sentence should say, "She personally felt the awnings ~~would detract~~ detracted from the building..."

On page 11, fifth paragraph should say "Ms. Rios asked what the language was on the plaques."

Mr. Rasch requested a change on page 8 in the motion, #7 should say that the height would not exceed 16' 7" anywhere on the house.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of March 8 2011 as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-008 427 Apodaca Hill

Case #H-11-013 638 Old Santa Fé Trail

Ms. Walker noted that on Case #H 11-008 under the Conclusions should have said that the grade would be lowered two feet. It was not an option.

Mr. Rasch agreed that it would read "shall" not "may."

Ms. Rios said the 15' 7" should be 16' 7".

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as amended. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch announced the New Mexico Heritage Preservation Conference to take place in Las Vegas on April 6-9.

Chair Woods asked that anyone who wanted to attend to contact Mr. Rasch.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board had 30 days after approval of the Findings of Fact to file their appeal to the Governing Body.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. **Case #H-11-015.** 1050 Old Pecos Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. New Mexico Army National Guard, agent/owner, proposes to remodel the front yard area of the non-contributing property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1050 Old Pecos Trail, formerly known as the National Guard Armory and the Armory for the Arts and now known as the Bataan Memorial Military Museum, was constructed before 1933 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. John Gaw Meem remodeled the building in 1933 and 1938 and additional remodeling occurred in the 1980s. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The 2002 Historic Cultural Property Inventory recommends contributing status, although there are numerous historic and non-historic alterations. The building was recently placed on the State Register of Cultural Properties.

The applicant has confirmed that the project does not need State Capitol Buildings Planning

Commission approval and therefore this project does not fall under HB360 jurisdiction. However, the applicant has also confirmed that federal funds are used for the project so the HDRB can review the project for input, not jurisdiction, under a Section 106 hearing.

During Phase 1, the Museum constructed an approximately 6-7' high black wrought iron fence at the street frontage to enclose the front courtyard which is presently surfaced with asphalt and concrete paving and gravel. Now, the applicant proposes to remove the paving to create a meditative garden. Phase 2 for the garden includes installation of plantings with paths and bancos. The bancos will match the color of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which is harmonious to the building and the streetscape with the request that the fence be painted the color of the stucco or the trim on the building.

Ms. Rios asked if the Board's suggestions were to be in the form of a motion.

Mr. Rasch said he would put them in a letter and no approval motion was to be made.

Present and sworn was Captain Elizabeth Foote, 47 Bataan Blvd., who thanked the Board for the opportunity to come before the Board for input and recommendations. This building was near and dear to our heart. A lot of deployments had happened here over the past decade. The purpose was for a monument for veterans to commemorate the deployments. They realized there were concerns from the community when they first installed the fence. Now they were moving asphalt and putting in trees and landscaping and cleaning up the appearance.

Mr. Katz was concerned with the abruptness of it. The Board supported the purpose and anything to make it less formidable.

Captain Foote said they were not opposed to painting it and thought they would use a brown color. Part of our plans was to plant vines there to alleviate some of the harshness.

Ms. Rios suggested painting the fence the color of the building. Landscaping would also improve it.

Mr. Acton suggested they consider having perennial shrubs just outside the fence on the street side since there were a couple of feet there that could be reached by drip irrigation.

Captain Foote said they would be planting just inside the fence but were concerned about easements on the outside of it. The plantings would be up against the fence as much as possible. There was a sidewalk just outside the fence.

Mr. Acton understood. He thanked them for coming before the Board. The Board was grateful that HB 360 created an avenue for the Board to interact with groups that otherwise didn't feel beholden to the Board.

Captain Foote said they did want the Board to be involved.

Ms. Mather agreed with all that was said and the suggestions for softer stucco color to reduce the harshness.

Chair Woods asked what material they would use for the walkways.

Captain Foote said they would use either concrete or keep strips of the existing asphalt. Flagstone didn't hold up very well and they had many visitors with wheelchairs or walkers.

Chair Woods recommended they install colored concrete.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods summarized the recommendations and thanked Captain Foote for coming to the Board.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-10-036.** 1120 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cristo Rey Catholic Church, agent for Archdiocese of Santa Fé, owner, proposes to replace existing metal caps on protruding vigas on a significant building. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1120 Canyon Road, known as Cristo Rey Church and Rectory, were designed by John Gaw Meem and constructed in 1939 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The church is listed as significant and the rectory is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The HDRB approved maintenance and repair to the exposed and deteriorated woodwork on April 27, 2010. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the project by requesting that the partial metal viga caps be replaced with full metal viga caps to eliminate the problem of more frequent maintenance.

The caps presently cover only approximately 1/3 of the vigas which caused serious deterioration. The replacement caps will be painted to match the brown viga color, as existing, or left nonpainted. Also, the caps could either remain as top covers only (Option 2) or also partially extend over the front end of the viga (Option 1).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. John Raders, 27 Tano Road who thought Mr. Rasch showed clearly what they were looking for.

Their first option with sheet metal caps with the cover on the end to protect the viga ends. Most of them had rotted out and they had replaced them already but had not put the caps on yet. They were trying to spend the church's money wisely.

Ms. Rios noted there were some vigas on the chapel side and asked if that was their first proposal.

Mr. Raders agreed and they were copper. Now they would put on sheet metal.

Ms. Rios asked if there were vigas on upper story too.

Mr. Raders said those vigas were pointed on the ends so a standard half cap would be used on those.

Mr. Acton thought option 1 on the traditional flat end vigas was best because it prevented horizontal rain from getting in. The same thing would apply to the larger vigas and one way to solve that on the nave vigas was to create a 2" flange to cover the exposed edge. It would keep horizontal rain from getting underneath the copper. He appreciated the need for custom measurements to get them made but that would forestall some of the need for flashing. Water in there would create rot.

Mr. Raders understood. He asked Mr. Acton if it should have a drip on it or straight down.

Ms. Walker asked if they were not doing copper.

Mr. Raders said Mr. Rasch suggested they stay with sheet metal which was the original material and paint them.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H 10-036 with Option #1 on cylindrical vigas and the option on the large vigas to use a 2" lip.

Ms. Rios seconded the motion and asked for a friendly amendment that they could use sheet metal painted or copper. Mr. Acton agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-11-009.** 635 Alto Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Vahid Mojarab, agent for the City of Santa Fé, owner, proposes to construct a multi-family compound composed of five residences at a total of 4,208 sq. ft. on a sloping vacant lot to a maximum height of 24' where the allowable height was 19'. A height exception was requested (Chapter 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

635 Alto Street is a 10,910 square foot vacant lot in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct a multi-family compound consisting of five residences in two free-standing building blocks totaling a footprint of 4,208 square feet on a vacant sloping lot to a maximum height of approximately 13' on the south street frontage and 24' on the north street frontage where the maximum allowable height is 15' at the south street frontage and potentially 19' at the north street frontage at the lower side of the slope. Four of the units are designed as two story buildings. An exception to exceed the maximum allowable height is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)).

On February 22, 2011, the H-Board postponed action on this application pending submittal of proof of legal access to the property from Lower Alto Street. The right to access the property has been confirmed by the Land Use Property Manager and the Land Use Attorney as shown in the attached email.

The buildings are designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with wall-dominated stepped massing, rounded corners, and wooden vigas posts, carved corbels, and exposed headers at portals. Stuccoed and rock-finished yardwalls, planters, and steps along with ground surface treatments are also proposed. The yardwalls at the Agua Fria Street frontage are proposed at 3' 6" high but the driveway visibility triangle standards may require them to be reduced to 3' high.

(i) – Do not damage the character of the streetscape:

The north elevation, which requires the height variance, will be in harmony with the existing streetscape. Both neighbors to the west and east are two story buildings. The proposed height is more than 10 feet lower than the neighbor to the east and compatible with the neighbor to the west. As a matter of fact, most structures along lower Alto Street on the Santa Fe River are two story buildings of similar height. The proposed design respects the one story elevation appearance along Alto Street and remains lower than the historic District's allowable height. Therefore, the proposed design will respect both streetscapes.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

(ii) – Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare:

The proposed design is based on the standard ceiling height for typical residential buildings: 9 foot ceiling on the first floor and 8 foot ceiling on the second floor. The 24 foot height, with 22 feet used in the building structure and the other 2 feet as the distance to the natural grade, is the minimum height required to achieve a two story building in this type of construction. Since the objective of this project is to bring affordable housing to downtown Santa Fe, the needed square footage (the needed second floor) plays a direct role in the feasibility of this project. Without this variance, we will not be able to bring this much needed and highly desirable affordable housing project to downtown Santa Fe.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

(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 District:

This proposal respects the initial intent of the City of Santa Fe's vision to bring affordable housing within the city's core Historic District. This project consists of 60% affordable housing, 3 units, and 2 market rate units. This project will be a perfect example

of families with diverse incomes living side by side in beautiful downtown Santa Fe.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

(iv) -- are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not applicable to other lands or structures in related streetscape:

The topography of this site makes for a challenging project in the Historic District. There is a 13 foot elevation drop from the south side of the property along Alto Street to the north boundary of the site along the Santa Fe River; all within the approximate 112 foot depth of this lot. Although the parapet height of this project is lower than allowable height along the south side of the property (along Alto Street), we need a height variance along the north side (along Santa Fe River) to realize this project. The topography of the land allows this project to be perceived as a one story building along the main road, Alto Street. This project is almost a foot lower than allowable height along Alto Street and the two story portion of the building is two feet lower than allowable height along Alto Street.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

(v) -- are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant:

The finish floor of the building at the northwest corner has to be 18 inches above natural grade because of the drainage and the 24 inch cross slope of the site. This design condition, based on the existing site conditions, adds to the height of the building.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

(vi) -- Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in 14-5,2(A)(1):

There are two street fronts to this project, Alto Street above and the 'Lower Alto' along the Santa Fe River. This project should and does address both streetscapes, lower and upper Alto Street. This project is not only within harmony of the neighborhood style, form, color, proportion, texture and material, but also respects the existing connectivity of the neighborhood to the Santa Fe River.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this statement.

In conclusion, we feel this exception will be in harmony with the existing neighborhood. It is very difficult for a project with two street fronts to follow only one side's height restriction. We believe that if this project is perceived as two projects, one at upper Alto and the other along the Santa Fe River, each massing is clearly in harmony with its respective streetscape.

Ms. Mather asked if the yard walls were on Agua Fria.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the yard walls were on Alto Street, not on Agua Fria Street.

Chair Woods asked if legal access was determined by the City.

Ms. Brennan agreed and added that access was not a jurisdictional issue of the Board.

Present and sworn was Mr. Vahid Mojarab, 147 Gonzales Road 12, who explained the project briefly. He provided two handouts on the project and showed pictures of the site. There were 25 residences along Alto Street there and 18 had access from lower Alto Street. He pointed them out at the display.

They were proposing to have three parking spaces above and 9 on lower Alto Street. He showed where there was parking would be located along the river including a large parking lot. So it was in keeping with the fabric of neighborhood. Also there was a two story building and that was where they would have a two story portion.

They met with neighbors and had showed the plan for six units. The neighbors asked them to reduce the project to 5 and he agreed. The neighbors also wanted the unit at upper Alto to be single story and he agreed. So along Alto they were all one story and the back two story.

They had pedestrian connections to the park like setting on the east side that continued to the river. They tried to come up with a plan that did not isolate the neighbors' access to the river.

They were 60% Affordable units (3 of 5).

Ms. Melisa Dailey, Affordable Housing Coordinator for the City n, addressed what was asked of her at the last meeting. She was asked to look at the access on the lower road and Ms. Brennan addressed that. There were questions about streetscape and parking and a second parking option was in the packet. After the field trip today, if the Board didn't like it there was another option.

There was also a question on density. She pointed out that this space was one of the three largest lots and to the east were 5 units on that lot.

Mr. Mojarrab hoped the Board would consider this design for approval but knew there was concern of the parking. They were not doing anything unusual or changing the fabric.

At the neighbors' request they provided more parking. They could take away 2 parking places that existed now. The option would be to have parking parallel to the road behind the wall and two tandem parking spaces for one unit. The first proposal had two extra parking places for guests.

If the Board feels that was not acceptable they had the alternative.

Ms. Rios asked if the alternate parking met zoning. Mr. Mojarrab agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Brennan clarified that the Board's jurisdiction was over the streetscape or appearance but not over parking.

Chair Woods asked if that meant they couldn't address traffic increases. Ms. Brennan agreed.

Chair Woods explained the limits to the public and asked that people not talk about issues not under the Board's jurisdiction She said there were other avenues for addressing those issues.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Utton, 675 Alto Street, which was two lots to the west from this

project. Their house was one story on Alto Street and 2-story on lower Alto. He was in favor of the height exception and mentioned some of the heights of nearby homes. The height restriction should not be an impediment because it was compatible with surrounding structures.

Present and sworn was Ms. Jennifer Jenkins, 130 Grant Suite 101 on behalf of a resident to the east. She respected the limits on purview that Ms. Brennan stated but as at the last time Chair Woods said the Board had purview over streetscape and site plan. Those two things were dependent on access. There were still unresolved issues there so she questioned the Board spending time on this.

Chair Woods said that was a decision she could make and decided to go ahead and hear the case. She asked Ms. Jenkins to stick to the issues the Board had jurisdiction over.

Ms. Jenkins said with respect to the streetscape, she understood that variances must be obtained prior to coming to the Board. Mr. Rasch disagreed.

Ms. Jenkins said regarding density and the neighborhood character the property owner to the east had 3 units and to the west about same lot size with four units. So she asked the Board to consider less than 5 units on this parcel.

Present and sworn was Mr. David Raney, 624 Alto Street, said he respected the Board's limits. He had heard separate things and maybe should address them at a different place. Traffic would be affected with this streetscape.

From the Alto Street one could see that the City had trimmed the trees on the Alto side and the height was very evident. This height was not attractive.

Ms. Rios asked where he lived.

Mr. Raney said he lived across the street.

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

Ms. Rios asked if there would be any rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Mojarrab said there were none at this point.

Ms. Rios asked what colors they would use.

Mr. Mojarrab said the stucco was Buckskin as indicated in the packet.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch to indicate where the wall would be for the alternate parking design.

Mr. Mojarrab provided a handout [attached as Exhibit A].

Ms. Rios asked him what the wall height would be but his response was not audible.

Mr. Acton asked what the lot coverage would be.

Mr. Mojarab said they were below the allowable 40% at about 38% including all portals.

Mr. Acton asked if this project was originally a competition.

Mr. Mojarab agreed. It was an international competition in 2009 and his company was one of the co first place winners for the design in that competition.

Mr. Acton asked if one of the requests in that competition was to maximize density.

Mr. Mojarab agreed. They asked for maximum density and zoning would have allowed them to build six units but the neighbors wanted five so they reduced the plans to five.

Mr. Acton asked if they had 12 parking spaces for 5 units. Mr. Mojarab agreed.

Mr. Acton noted in the original application there was guest parking but now there were none. Mr. Mojarab agreed.

Mr. Mojarab handed out another showing the locations of the parking units [attached as Exhibit B].

Mr. Acton felt the streetscape could be affected by uncontrolled parking along the street. In the original scheme trees were shown on the site plan and it looked like an existing tree or clump of elms at the base.

Mr. Mojarab agreed and said they would replace the trees. The one shown was a Chinese Elm and would be replaced with something better.

Mr. Katz asked what the parking surface would be.

Mr. Mojarab said they would use gravel so it would be pervious. They were not paving any of them.

Mr. Katz thought either alternative would work. He suggested the preferred alternative be allowed.

Ms. Walker asked if this would still have the HOP requirements to qualify for housing. If so, those families might need the extra parking.

Ms. Dailey clarified that a 2 bedroom home could have 2-3 people and 3 bedroom could have 3-4 and a single person could have 1 or 2 bedroom home but not a 3 bedroom.

Chair Woods referred to the elevation from lower Alto for Unit C. On the lower left she asked if there was a setback at the second story.

Mr. Mojarab said they were careful on massing. There was a setback on second story on the back

and on the side. It was more like Pueblo style.

Chair Woods thought the project had the appearance of strip mall parking and she was more comfortable with the second alternative.

Ms. Mather asked if the parking would be designated in the second option. Mr. Mojarrab agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if the walkways would all be unpaved also.

Mr. Mojarrab agreed. They would use brick on walkways and gravel on parking.

Ms. Mather asked if the walls around the parking would be stuccoed. Mr. Mojarrab agreed.

Mr. Mojarrab said the buildings would be high energy green and very energy efficient. They would function with small electrical heat with R-100 above and R-50 in the walls.

Mr. Acton asked how far the windows were set back.

Mr. Mojarrab said they would be about 10".

Ms. Rios complimented Mr. Mojarrab for working with the neighbors and changing from 6 to 5 units and also for the alternative parking.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-009 per staff's recommendations, that the exception criteria were accepted and using the second parking alternative. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Acton asked if they needed to have the parking plan in a separate motion. Chair Woods didn't think so.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-10-084.** 403 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marisa Wolf, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval by requesting an exception to replace historic windows on a primary elevation of a contributing residence. (Section 14-5.2 (D) (5) (a) (I)). (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

403 East Alameda Street is a two-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner in the late 1920s. There is a zero-line line with the south and east elevations. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the west elevation shall be considered as

primary.

On September 28, 2010, the H-Board approved a remodeling project that retained the historic windows. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the project by requesting an exception to replace the historic windows (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)) and the required exception criteria are below. The new windows will match the existing windows in location, dimension, operation, and material.

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

The existing windows are beyond repair and/or restoration. Ray Patterson was hired for his expert opinion and advice on the existing windows. He concluded that the windows need to be replaced with new, in kind windows. He will be contracted by me to do the work for replacing the new windows. The character will not be damaged.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

The new windows will not injure the public welfare and there is no hardship to me, as the applicant.

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.

I will keep the design and proportions to the heterogeneous character of the city to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts. I am working with Ray Patterson who will also make sure that all proportions and design stay in the heterogeneous character. I have attached his bid, which shows all new windows and their dimensions. All windows will be replaced in kind.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to replace historic windows in-kind because they are deemed beyond repair. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Ms. Marisa Wolf, 1070 Calle Alto, who said Mr. Ra Patterson come to examine the windows. He said they were beyond repair. She then got a bid from him to actually repair them. She intended to hire him and hoped to get through this.

Ms. Mather asked what window color she had chosen.

Ms. Wolf said she originally in September asked for white trim and the Board approved it. She said she

could go ahead with that or do a natural wood color.

Ms. Mather asked if that was just for the windows and not the doors.

Ms. Wolf said she was just referring to the windows.

Mr. Acton thought they might lose the wall above each one of those windows. We have to be cognizant of that. Some of them have a wood frame around the jamb. If that wood frame were preserved the wall could also be preserved. On page 21 it showed one of the larger windows that might not have that frame.

Ms. Wolf said once they pulled the roof off, the adobe there was crumbling. So they were putting a bond beam there prior to the windows being done. Her dad's company was pretty good at that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Ray Herrera, 279 Hillside Avenue, who apologized for not being at the previous meeting. On his walk he saw this and was shocked. That was one of the remaining original little adobe houses that had character in itself. He didn't know if what was left was worth saving but hoped the design was comparable to what was there. He lamented that they were cloning the neighborhoods. Every house was looking like the next one and they were losing the focus of the historic character. They had lost a gem right there. So he hoped what was built would match what was there before.

Mr. Acton asked if the window would be blue.

Ms. Wolf said they were approved with white but she was willing to do something else.

She said she totally understand what Mr. Herrera was saying. She bought it because there was a sweetness in the character but asked him to remember it was completely falling apart. She offered to meet with him and show him the pictures. It needed a lot of work and was trashed on the inside.

She reminded the Board that the approved stucco color was Ash and hoped it was still in the packet. It was not as yellow as what was shown. Mr. Rasch showed it to the Board.

Mr. Rasch didn't know the original color.

Ms. Rios suggested she try to find the original window color and taking that to staff for approval. Ms. Wolf agreed.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 10-084 as recommended and accepting the exception criteria responses and the condition that the applicant try to match the original color of the windows and submit it to staff for review and approval.

Mr. Acton reminded her that the window jamb was thicker on some than others and sometimes it could get buried by stucco. He strongly suggested that the dimension be replicated in the new window.

Ms. Mather added the condition that the size of the window jambs be replicated.

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

Ms. Wolf asked if the portal needed to be the same color as the windows.

Mr. Rasch said it was approved with white. She explained that she was cutting off the vigas that were rotted.

Chair Woods asked her to take that to Mr. Rasch for approval and make an appointment with Mr. Rasch with a color board. It might come back to us then.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-11-016.** 1155 Camino Delora. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for Devin McShane, owner, proposes to construct a 165 sq. ft. addition on a contributing residence and to increase the height of an existing yardwall to 72" where the maximum allowable height was 55". Two exceptions were requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D) (2) (d)) and to exceed the yardwall height (Section 14-5.2 (D) (9)). (David Rasch)

This case was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer