



Agenda

DATE 4/20/11 TIME 1:10p
SERVED BY Camille Vigil
RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, April 26 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, April 26, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES April 12, 2011

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-09-009 528 Abeyta Street
Case #H-11-018 653 Canyon Road
Case #H-11-019 904 Galisteo Street
Case #H-11-020 409 W. Water Street

Case #H-11-021 607 Agua Fria #2
Case #H-11-022 803B Acequia Madre
Case #H-11-023 431 Camino de las Animas
Case #H-10-033B-I 801 Griffin Street

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-10-021. 824 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc. agent for Igor Chovomanski & Min King, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a significant and contributing property by changing a yardwall to a coyote fence and changing flat roof pergolas to slope. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-09-028. 852 Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gail A. Takeshita, agent/owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by replacing a carport with a 625 sq. ft. garage, replacing a rear deck, replacing all windows, restuccoing and reroofing. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-016A. 1155 + 1155 ½ Camino Delora. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of three non-statused structures. (David Rasch).

Case #H-11-016B. 1155 and 1155 ½ 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 to replace a non-historic window with changes in a dimension to meet ingress/egress requirements, and to increase the height of an existing yardwall to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 55" and to alter a mechanical room. Three exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)) to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(i)), and to exceed the yardwall height (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-030. 1100 Old Santa Fe Trail. Historic Review District. Southwest Regional Office, Staff, aka, National Park Service proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-031. 901 Camino San Acacio. Historic Review District. Staff, aka, the Hollenbeck House, proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Walsky, agent for Nurit Walsky, owner, proposes to remodel an existing non-contributing residence and casita at approximately 1500 sq. ft. with additions and character changes to approximately 2600 sq. ft. with a height increase from 14'8" to approximately 19', where the maximum allowable height is 15'2", with a request to exceed the allowable height due to sloping ground. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-017. 109 Jimenez Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Earl Kessler and Shari Kessler, owners proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a vehicular gate and constructing 221 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-025. 940 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Joshua Cooper Ramo, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a portal, installing French doors, altering walls and gates, and installing hardscaping elements with landscaping. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-026. 427 W. Water Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Turner Lechner & Romero, LLC, agent for Water Street Inn, LLC, owner, proposes to remodel three non-contributing properties with door and window changes, a façade character change at 436, and construction of yardwalls. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-027. 313 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Ford Ruthling, owner, proposes to construct a 993 sq. ft. garage and stair to a roofdeck to the maximum allowable height of 14'11". (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-029A. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Casey Mickelson, proposes an historic status review of this contributing property. (David Rasch).

Case #H-11-029B. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Casey Mickelson, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 315 sq. ft. addition to a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-028. 133 W. Houghton Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Greg Dye, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 180 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-11-024. 713 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Charles Smith, agent for Ann Garcia, owner, proposes to repair existing historic windows, replace the front door, and replace an historic tin sconce on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (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 April 26, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, April 26, 2011.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4/14/11 TIME 2:40 PM

SERVED BY Camille Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, April 26 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, April 26, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES April 12, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-09-009 528 Abeyta Street
Case #H-11-018 653 Canyon Road
Case #H-11-019 904 Galisteo Street
Case #H-11-020 409 W. Water Street

Case #H-11-021 607 Agua Fria #2
Case #H-11-022 803B Acequia Madre
Case #H-11-023 431 Camino de las Animas
Case #H-10-033A-I 801 Griffin Street

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

1. Case #H-10-021. 824 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc. agent for Igor Chovomanski & Min King, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a significant and contributing property by changing a yardwall to a coyote fence and changing flat roof pergolas to slope. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-09-028. 852 Camino Ranchitos. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gail A. Takeshita, agent/owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by replacing a carport with a 625 sq. ft. garage, replacing a rear deck, replacing all windows, restuccing and reroofing. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-016A. 1155 + 1155 ½ Camino Delora. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of three non-statused structures. (David Rasch).

Case #H-11-016B. 1155 and 1155 ½ 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 to replace a non-historic window with changes in a dimension to meet ingress/egress requirements, and to increase the height of an existing yardwall to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 55" and to alter a mechanical room. Three exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)) to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(i)), and to exceed the yardwall height (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-030. 1100 Old Santa Fe Trail. Historic Review District. Southwest Regional Office, Staff, aka, National Park Service proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-031. 901 Camino San Acacio. Historic Review District. Staff, aka, the Hollenbeck House, proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Walsky, agent for Nurit Walsky, owner, proposes to remodel an existing non-contributing residence and casita at approximately 1500 sq. ft. with additions and character changes to approximately 2600 sq. ft. with a height increase from 14'8" to approximately 19', where the maximum allowable height is 15'2", with a request to exceed the allowable height due to sloping ground. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-017. 109 Jimenez Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Earl Kessler and Shari Kessler, owners proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a vehicular gate and constructing 221 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-025. 940 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Joshua Cooper Ramo, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a portal, installing French doors, altering walls and gates, and installing hardscaping elements with landscaping. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-026. 427 W. Water Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Turner Lechner & Romero, LLC, agent for Water Street Inn, LLC, owner, proposes to remodel three non-contributing properties with door and window changes, a façade character change at 436, and construction of yardwalls. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-027. 313 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Ford Ruthling, owner, proposes to construct a 993 sq. ft. garage and stair to a roofdeck to the maximum allowable height of 14'11". (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-029A. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of this contributing property. (David Rasch).

Case #H-11-029B. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Casey Mickelson, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 315 sq. ft. addition to a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-028. 133 W. Houghton Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Greg Dye, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 180 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-11-024. 713 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Charles Smith, agent for Ann Garcia, owner, proposes to repair existing historic windows, replace the front door, and replace an historic tin sconce on the primary elevation of a contributing, residential structure. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (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 April 26, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, April 26, 2011.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 26, 2011

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes April 12, 2011	Approved as amended	2-3
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	3
Communications	Discussion	3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Administrative Matters	None	4
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H-10-021</u> 824 Canyon Road	Approved with Conditions	4-6
2. <u>Case #H-09-028</u> 852 Camino Ranchitos	Approved with Conditions	6-8
3. <u>Case #H-11-016A</u> 1155/1155½ Camino Delora	Approved as Contributing	8-9
<u>Case #H-11-016B</u> 1155/1155½ Camino Delora	Approved with Conditions	9-14
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 11-030</u> 1100 Old Santa Fé Trail	Approved as Significant	14-15
2. <u>Case #H 11-031</u> 901 Camino San Acacio	Approved as Significant	16-18
3. <u>Case #H 11-014</u> 208A Gonzales Road	Postponed	18-23
4. <u>Case #H 11-017</u> 109 Jimenez Street	Approved as recommended	23-24
5. <u>Case #H 11-025</u> 940 Acequia Madre	Approved with Conditions	24-30
6. <u>Case #H 11-026</u> 427 W. Water Street	Approved with Conditions	30-32
7. <u>Case #H 11-027</u> 313 E. Berger Street	Approved with Conditions	32-35
8. <u>Case #H-11-029A</u> 131 Lorenzo Road	Downgraded to Non-contributing	35
<u>Case #H-11-029B</u> 131 Lorenzo Road	Approved with Conditions	35-36
9. <u>Case #H-11-028</u> 133 W. Houghton Street	Approved as presented	36-37

10. <u>Case #H-11-024</u> 713 Agua Fria Street	Approved with conditions	37-41
Matters from the Board	Discussion	41-42
Adjournment	Adjourned at 9:00 p.m.	42

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 26, 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
Dr. John Kantner
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

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 noted that the Findings of Fact for 801 Griffin were not in the packet.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 12, 2011

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

On page 9, second paragraph should read, "He said his building was more than just a building to his family."

On page 15, 5th paragraph from the bottom should read, "Ms. Rios asked if by applying the spray foam the building would retain the crisp edges."

On page 25, sixth paragraph, the last sentence should read, "She knew many Indians and Hispanics attended St. Katherine's School and asked if any Blacks attended."

On page 45, 4th from bottom should add at end of the sentence, "That didn't make sense to her because the headstone identified the person who was buried there."

Ms. Mather asked for the following change to the minutes:

On page 25, it should say, "Ms. Mather said she dealt with many ~~books~~ works of art."

Mr. Katz requested the following changes to the minutes:

Katherine Drexel was spelled with a K, not C.

On page 22, Je should be He

On page 35, "Mr. Polk said the plan recommended demolition of anything ~~about #8~~ above age."

On page 30, last paragraph, "She had worked with tribal entities where the BIA had recommended ~~defoliation~~ demolition."

Dr. Kantner requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 13 at the top should say, "Dr. Kantner asked what the difference was between a pitched and a flat roof."

On page 19, the part shown as inaudible was a question if the ordinance provided more guidance on the standards for demolition.

On page 52, 3rd paragraph, the question about St. John's, the second sentence should include that the changed windows designs were an issue as well.

Ms. Rios moved to approve the minutes of the April 12, 2011 HDRB meeting as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-09-009	528 Abeyta Street	Case #H-11-021	607 Agua Fria #2
Case #H-11-018	653 Canyon Road	Case #H-11-022	803B Acequia Madre
Case #H-11-019	904 Galisteo	Case #H-11-023	431 Cam De las Animas
Case #H-11-020	409 W. Water Street		

Mr. Katz corrected in Case #H 11- 018 that the applicant was not present.

Dr. Kantner asked for a correction in "Case 11-118 [sic] in the conclusions of law, last sentence, "panted" should be "painted."

Mr. Boaz asked him to restate the case number.

Dr. Kantner said it was Case 11-008 (which Mr. Boaz didn't have on his agenda either).

Ms. Rios asked in Case #H 11-020 on page 2, remove "there shall be no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances."

Ms. Rios moved to approve the Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch called attention to 4 handouts. One of them was on the second case to provide two pages missing from the packet.

A second handout was the nomination form for historic preservation awards. He was not sure on date and location. It would be late May. He made one correction on the second page for award categories to add the Sara Melton Award which was listed in the letter but not on the nomination form.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

There were no administrative matters.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone who wished to protest a decision of the Board had 15 days from approval of findings and conclusions to file an appeal to the Governing Body.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-10-021. 824 Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc. agent for Igor Chovomanski & Min King, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a significant and contributing property by changing a yardwall to a coyote fence and changing flat roof pergolas to slope. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

824 ½ Canyon Road is a group of two building wings that are attached to other properties off Camino del Monte Sol and Canyon Road. The buildings were constructed before 1940 in a vernacular manner that typifies early Santa Fe construction with long and low structures. The 1993 HCPI form suggests significant status for both buildings although remodeling has occurred, especially in the north wing. The south wing is listed as significant and the north wing is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. All elevations are primary on the south wing and the south elevation is primary on the north wing.

On March 23, 2010, the HDRB granted an exception to construct an addition on the north, primary elevation of the south wing. On June 8, 2010, the HDRB approved additional remodeling including the repair of historic windows, replacement of non-historic doors and windows, construction of three free-standing pergolas, and alteration of the street-frontage yardwall to include a pedestrian gate.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the approval for the following three items.

1. Part of the approved 6' high stuccoed yardwall will be changed to a 6' high coyote fence with irregular tops.
2. Two of the three pergolas will be changed to sloped roof. Sloping pergolas are not a traditional form and therefore are not appropriate for these significant and contributing historic buildings.

Additionally, since the lot coverage is at 38% where only 40% is allowed without a variance, the pergolas cannot be solidly roofed.

3. One of the three pergolas will be increased in height from 7' 6" to 8'0" which is still lower than the adjacent height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the condition that the pergolas remain flat-roofed. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked if those changes would negatively impact its historic status.

Mr. Rasch said it would not since pergolas were easily removed.

Ms. Mather said there was some question about whether the pergolas had been brought before the Board with shed roofs and the case was denied.

Mr. Rasch didn't remember the case and thought probably it was a portal at that point.

Ms. Walker asked Mr. Rasch if by being easily removed he meant easily dismantled. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fé Trail. He said there were 2 pergolas his client wanted to change to a sloped roof. He showed the drawing of them. The intent was not to roof them but to put a slight slope on the pergolas. He disagreed with Mr. Rasch about the reasoning. He pointed out that a viga that was bigger on one end and smaller on the other had a natural slope inherently. Their slope was about six inches. He wanted to break up the monotony of them by making them sloped.

The fence was necessitated because his client was forced to increase the width of the area in front of the unit that was graveled and outside. He thought instead of having a stuccoed wall, he would put in a coyote fence instead to lighten up the little courtyard where the apricot tree was. Page 18 showed the area where we want to switched from stuccoed wall to coyote fence and showed the fruit tree and they would plant vines had have them grow on the fence.

The raising of pergolas was just to get a six inch slope. Coincidentally the roofs were sloped on both structures so it didn't appear to affect the historic status. He thought it was a reasonable request.

His client brought his window schedule to Mr. Enfield's office. He wanted to replace the previously approved double hung window shown as J in the drawings with this style shown. He apologized for not having it in the letter but his client asked him to propose it. He also promised to recondition and save the historic windows.

Ms. Rios asked if he was changing the window dimensions. Mr. Enfield said he was not.

Ms. Rios asked if the fenestration also was the same. Mr. Enfield said they went from a four light to an eight light window and it was true divided. It was on the contributing building. On the significant building he was keeping all windows.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that the muntin presented a horizontal light pattern and that was not good.

Mr. Rasch didn't think the drawing was inaccurate because the vigas were 90 degrees out. Mr. Enfield agreed and they were correct in his own drawings.

Chair Woods asked why they wanted to change the window light pattern.

Present and sworn was Mr. Igor Chovomanski who said they wanted to change it for functionality. These windows were wooden and He thought there would be rotting from water. There was a shower inside.

Chair Woods suggested he could keep a double hung window but not change the light pattern. On the one shown, if you took out the two horizontal muntins it would work.

Mr. Chovomanski said that was fine.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods' only concern was that this proposal having a little bit of shed would seem more in keeping with beams than vigas.

Mr. Enfield said there was a good example of it in the building across from Kaunes with sloped vigas. They created an L shaped compound for Stetson properties. It was just like this.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-021 as recommended by staff with the condition that the pergolas remain flat as consistent with this kind of building and the window retaining the light pattern as agreed upon. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-09-028. 852 Camino Ranchitos.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gail A. Takeshita, agent/owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by replacing a carport with a 625 sq. ft. garage, replacing a rear deck, replacing all windows, restuccoing and reroofing. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The Historic Design Review Board heard an application to remodel the non-contributing residential building at 852 Camino Ranchitos in 2009. Now, the applicant proposes to amend the approval by significantly down-scaling the proposed changes with the following five items.

1. The attached carport at the north side of the building will be removed and replaced with a 625 square foot garage at approximately 10' 3" high and lower than the adjacent parapet. The two-car wood veneer door is designed with a herringbone pattern.
2. All windows will be removed and replaced with 30" rule compliant windows with trim color in white.
3. The rear deck will be removed and replaced with a 200 square foot deck with stuccoed CMU walls below for storage. All exposed woodwork will be painted white and the deck will be finished with brick pavers.
4. The protruding vigas will be restored and capped with unidentified metal.
5. The building will be restuccoed in cementitious "Buckskin" and reroofed with unidentified metal lined canales.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Gail Takeshita who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker asked if she had identified the metal to use on the capping.

Ms. Takeshita said they would probably use tin or maybe copper.

Ms. Mather referred to the back portal where she had indicated that trim would all be white. She asked if that included corbels and beam.

Ms. Takeshita said those were natural as approved two years ago.

Ms. Rios asked if she planned to have anything on the roof. Ms. Takeshita said no.

Mr. Acton noted that the muntin pattern seemed to be old style. Ms. Takeshita agreed.

Mr. Acton said the existing drawings didn't show the horizontal muntins in the windows on the east elevation. Ms. Takeshita said the drawing should have shown that.

Chair Woods asked if she was you replacing all or some windows.

Ms. Takeshita thought probably every window.

Chair Woods said the application said double hung windows but that wasn't shown in the elevation. Most were shown as casement windows.

Ms. Takeshita said she wanted double hung windows.

Chair Woods suggested that the windows go to staff then because it wasn't shown properly.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 09-028 with the condition that the metal used would be tin and double hung windows used throughout and drawings be brought to staff. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-11-016A. 1155 + 1155 ½ Camino Delora.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of three non-statused structures. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1155 Camino Delora, known as the Duran Family Compound, is a group of four residential structures located in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The primary structure, located at the southwest corner of the lot with street-frontage was constructed between 1942 and 1948 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. It is listed as contributing to the District and the south and east elevations may be considered as primary. The three other buildings do not have historic status assignments.

1155B at the southeast corner with street-frontage was constructed by 1948 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The original building mass was added to on the west by 1958. After 1998 an addition was constructed on the rear, north elevation and some historic steel casement windows were removed and replaced with thermal pane wood windows. The non-historic remodel was sensitive to the original massing and the street-facing elevations have integrity.

1155½ at the northwest corner of the lot was constructed between 1942 and 1948 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The original wood casement windows are in good condition. A small mechanical room addition was constructed on the south elevation in a sensitive manner.

1155 at the northeast corner of the lot was constructed as a garage before 1958 in a vernacular manner. A site-built wood awning window is retained on the west elevation. The garage was converted to a studio at an unknown non-historic date. The south elevation, at the vehicle entrance, has no indication of the original entrance which has been infilled with a non-historic door and window. The aluminum slider

window is non-conforming to the 30" window rule. There does not appear to be substantial historic integrity or architectural character to merit historic status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends assignment of contributing historic status for the two residential structures (SE with the south and east elevations considered as primary and NW with the east elevation considered as primary) and non-contributing historic status for the studio.

Ms. Mather asked if on 1155½ the east façade was primary. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Mather noted they wanted to make changes to that elevation.

Present and sworn was Mr. Harvey Monroe, P.O. 1183. He concurred with Mr. Rasch that the studio was probably not worthy of historic designation considering the number of changes made to it. He pointed out on 1155½ on the lower left was a boiler room. That utility closet was added around 2000. In 1999 there was no utility shed there. They wanted to diminish its size to provide more of a separation.

Chair Woods asked him to keep that for the next case.

Mr. Monroe said he agreed with the status except for the utility closet.

Ms. Rios moved to approve staff recommendation for Case #H 11-016A to a contributing status and adopting the primary elevations as recommended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H-11-016B. 1155 and 1155 ½ 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 to replace a non-historic window with changes in a dimension to meet ingress/egress requirements, and to increase the height of an existing yardwall to 72" where the maximum allowable height was 55" and to alter a mechanical room. Three exceptions were requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)) to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(I)), and to exceed the yardwall height (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1155 and 1155½ Camino Delora is a family compound of four buildings in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District with the two buildings in question for this case listed as contributing.

The applicant proposes to remodel the two buildings with the following four items.

(1155)

1. A 165 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear, non-primary elevation. The addition will match the adjacent height and it will feature windows that match existing thermal pane windows on the north elevation and French doors with sidelights on the east elevation. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required criteria responses are below.
2. A non-historic window on the primary, east elevation will be removed and the opening enlarged to meet ingress/egress standards. An exception is requested to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)) and the required criteria responses are below.
3. The front yardwall will be increased in height from 48" to 72" where the maximum allowable height is 55". A height exception (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) is requested and the required criteria responses are below. Also, a pedestrian gate will be installed in the existing opening and a header with stepped massing will be constructed.

(1155½)

4. To avoid setback problems between the new addition at 1155 and a mechanical room at 1155½, the mechanical room will be redesigned. The mechanical room door will shift from the south elevation to the east elevation.

Exception to exceed the 50% footprint:

- (i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

The addition will be at the rear of the building and will not change the character of the streetscape. The scale and massing as seen from the street will remain unchanged. The addition will be on the portions of the home which were recently modified and thus the "non contributing portion of the structure"

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

The building addition will render the building much more usable and utile for the owner. The addition will not be visible from the street and thus not be a detriment to the public welfare.

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 unique heterogeneous character of the City will be enhanced by updating the residence giving the building more useable space and allowing the owner to continue to reside in the historic district and the eastside neighborhood which she greatly desires.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

- (iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

The home is one of the few buildings on the street which have not been upgraded to modern standards of usable space.

Staff response: Staff is unsure if this statement is true.

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

The owner has only been in possession of the property for less than two years and has not been a party to early work on the property. She desires to make the home more livable and have better upkeep.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

- (vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

The northside addition would make the residence more usable with special flow, circulation, more furnishing options and enhancement of views which are currently limited.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

Exception to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation:

- (i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

The primary reason for the window replacement is for life safety in a bedroom. The IBC requires that a primary point of egress to the exterior through a door or window be provided.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

The enlarged window will render the building much safer and usable for the owner. The window is not historic and thus not be a detriment to the public welfare.

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 unique heterogeneous character of the City will be enhanced by updating the residence giving the building safer and useable space and allowing the owner to continue to reside in the historic district and the eastside neighborhood which she greatly desires.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

The home is one of the few buildings on the street which have not been upgraded to modern standards.

Staff response: Staff is unsure if this statement is true.

v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant;

The owner has only been in possession of the property for less than two years and has not been a party to early work on the property. She desires to make the home more livable and have better upkeep.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

The window additions would make the residence more usable with proper emergency exits.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

Exception to exceed maximum allowable height:

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

The primary reason for the wall height increase is for safety and security for the owner, a single woman. A majority of buildings street façade is right on the property line and the street. This would raise the wall from the existing 48 inches to 72 inches and continue that same line. The court yard faces directly onto the street and has no visual or physical control or height. It is outside a primary bedroom window which intruders have walked directly up to. Fifty-inches is not adequate to deter a intruder from jumping the wall. The exception is for only 22 feet of the 122 street frontage.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, since there is valid argument that an intruder has more opportunity to hide behind a taller a wall.

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

The wall height increase will render the building much safer and usable for the owner. The elevation of the yard is lower than the street and the courtyard façade would be visible through a window opening and thus not be a detriment to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response because the drawings show that the contributing building will be partially blocked from view for public appreciation.

- (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 unique heterogeneous character of the City will be enhanced by updating the residence giving the building safer and useable space and allowing the owner to continue to reside in the historic district and the eastside neighborhood which she greatly desires.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

- (iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;

The home is one of the few buildings on the street which have not been upgraded to modern standards of with yard walls and fences. Many of the neighbors have walls in excess of 72 inches.

Staff response: Staff is unsure if this response is true and there are also lower walls/fences in the streetscape.

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

The owner has only been in possession of the property for less than two years and has not been a party to early work on the property. She desires to make the home more livable and have better upkeep.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

- (vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

The wall increase additions would make the residence more usable with private outdoor open space, visual privacy and physical security.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, since the taller wall will not necessarily provide physical security. An intruder can easily walk around the building or jump over the wall to gain access.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to alter an opening dimension on a primary elevation as having met the exception criteria and staff recommends denial to exceed the maximum allowable height for a yardwall as not meeting the exception criteria. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Woods clarified that there were three exceptions requested: window opening, wall and 50% footprint.

Ms. Rios asked about wall height.

Mr. Rasch said the maximum was 55" and the Board could go to 66" (20% increase)

Mr. Monroe (previously sworn) said in general he agreed with Mr. Rasch. The point on the wall needed to be considered for two reasons. He understood the way it was calculated but the adjacent buildings had 72 inch walls and those further down might be lower but immediate to the house were 72". It was a privacy and security issue. The owner was a single woman and the wall would face the street.

Ms. Rios asked him to describe the grade of street compared to courtyard. She asked if it didn't step down.

Mr. Monroe said it was probably 6-12 inches lower. He showed pictures to the Board. To the east it was level but to the west it sloped up. The window dimensions were enlarged for meeting the egress requirements. It had to be 3x5 minimum. It would match the same muntin pattern and be true divided light.

Mr. Rasch referred to page 9 where the Board could see the other wall heights and what caused this average. One at was at 78" and one at 100".

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 11-016B as recommended by staff, granting the exception to exceed 50%, enlarging the window dimensions for egress and for raising the wall all of which had been met. Mr. Acton seconded the motion.

Ms. Rios asked for a friendly amendment that the window would be painted and be true divided light matching the existing muntin pattern. Ms. Mather accepted the amendment and the motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Dr. Kantner who voted against.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-11-030. 1100 Old Santa Fé Trail. Historic Review District. Southwest Regional Office, Staff, aka, National Park Service proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1100 Old Santa Fe Trail, known as the Southwest Regional Office Building of the National Park Service (NPS), was designed by Cecil Doty, NPS Architect in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1937. The building was constructed with adobe in 1939 using local materials and CCC labor. There appear to be no alterations. The building was listed on the State Register of Cultural Places in 1971 and nominated to the National Register in 1970 with final status as a National Historic Landmark in 1987. The property is located within the Historic Review Historic District and it is listed as non-statused.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends assigning an historic status of significant to the property due to historic date of construction, good historic integrity, little or no alteration, and association to important events such as the local employment opportunities through the CCC.

Mr. Acton asked what the Board should do in the future when a property came before the Board when they said a single pane glass window.

Mr. Rasch explained that properties in the Historic Review District were all staff approved unless the changes didn't meet code. Only things that could affect status or not meeting code would be brought to the Board. If that was not the original, we could always go back to the original.

Ms. Walker agreed it was clearly significant. If the owners wanted to discuss a change, that was the time to address it.

Chair Woods asked if they would still come before the Board.

Mr. Rasch said the National Park Service property was not under the City's jurisdiction but hoped they would come with information and ask for the Board's advice.

Present and sworn was Mr. Paul Chatee, property manager for the National Park Service. He said the City was a Certified Local Government so the NPS had taken a stand that they would come to the Board and ask for your comment in what we want to do. The NPS took its ownership and heritage with that building very serious. There was a lot that needed to be done and they had no money for it in the past. They would have a cost assessment done on roof and stucco which were in bad shape.

Mr. Acton appreciated his trust in the Board and mentioned that the Board was looking for a location for its award ceremony. NPS had a very nice courtyard there.

Mr. Chatee complimented them for their work.

Ms. Rios moved in regard to Case #H 11-030 to approve per staff recommendations a significant status for this property. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #H-11-031. 901 Camino San Acacio. Historic Review District. Staff, aka, the Hollenback House, proposes an historic status review of this non-statused property. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

901 Camino San Acacio, known as the Hollenbeck House, was designed by John Gaw Meem in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1932. The two-story residence was constructed with adobe and recycled woodwork from important historic sites from around the State including Pueblos and Salinas National Monument. There appear to be no alterations. The property is located within the Historic Review Historic District and is listed as non-statused.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends assigning an historic status of significant to the residential structure due to historic date of construction, high integrity, little or no alteration, and local association to an important architect.

Ms. Mather asked why a building like this was so long in coming before the Board.

Mr. Rasch explained that the Historic Review District didn't have statuses for structures. His predecessor didn't do it but review of the ordinance allowed it so he had brought three this year.

Ms. Mather asked if there was a schedule for review of all buildings.

Mr. Rasch said there were three individuals who could do the reviews: staff, the Board, or the owner. Staff didn't intend to do so unless a change was proposed.

Mr. Acton asked if he was saying this building was unaltered since construction. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Present and sworn was Mr. Harry Gordon, 316 Artist Road, who said he had been asked to read a letter from a co trustee who lived in Maine and the operating co-trustee was out of town. He noted a typo and a conflict between what staff said and what the trustee had put in the letter as to the status of the building and in the spirit of what the Board did at the beginning in making corrections.

He said "Hollenback" was the correct spelling. The staff report said it had no status but the co-trustee

apparently thought it was already listed as contributing status and the Board was now considering significant status. That needed to be straightened out.

Mr. Rasch said he was not aware of any contributing status and wondered if the building was on the state register.

Mr. Gordon could not answer that.

He read the letter that said it would impose a severe financial hardship on the owners. The contributing status was adequate to preserve historic status. But that had already hindered their ability to sell it. He asked that they delay action until they had found the next steward for the house. He provided a copy of the letter.

Mr. Rasch said the HCPI used was a state form and it said contributing in the box so unfortunately this form said it was contributing. Katherine Colby did this in 2002 and her recommendation was Contributing. The person doing the HCPI didn't have the right to make it contributing. The state only listed it or not. It was in a district and he didn't check to see if it was.

Ms. Walker suspected it was on the register. And the tax credits for any changes were significant. If the buyer was a New Mexico resident, the tax advantage was great.

Dr. Kantner understood that significant vs. contributing was in the façades.

Mr. Rasch agreed. On significant, all elevations were primary and with contributing the primary elevations would be chosen by the Board. On alterations of significant structures, exceptions were required for all of the elevations. With contributing this building would have multiple facades anyway.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch to read the definitions for significant.

Mr. Rasch read the definitions.

Ms. Rios clearly thought it should be upgraded to significant. Ms. Walker agreed.

Ms. Mather added that the people associated with this building were very important too. This building met all the criteria for significant.

Mr. Gordon said what the trustee was asking for was a delay. He needed to sell the property and one potential sale fell through because of something that was related to the status. The owners were in assisted living and needed the funding that would come from selling it. His son-in law needed the delay so the trustees could sell it and subsequent owners might be interested in the historic status.

Chair Woods assumed that any buyer would want to know about the significant status possibility. So she did not agree with postponing. It was something that was already out there and that would have to be divulged to any potential buyer.

Mr. Gordon said he understood but a deal already fell through because of the burden of an owner taking on this to getting it in shape for the status.

Mr. Acton told Mr. Gordon that a prospective buyer should know that a proposal could be submitted to the Board as part of the purchase of the building. Even a significant status didn't mean changes could not be done as a condition for purchase.

Mr. Gordon said he understood and had gone as far as he could go.

Ms. Walker thought perhaps their broker was not experienced in historic status properties.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-031 as having a significant status. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods recused herself for the next case and left the room. Ms. Rios chaired the meeting for it.

3. **Case #H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Walsky, agent for Nurit Walsky, owner, proposes to remodel an existing non-contributing residence and casita at approximately 1500 sq. ft. with additions and character changes to approximately 2600 sq. ft. with a height increase from 14'8" to approximately 19', where the maximum allowable height was 15'2", with a request to exceed the allowable height due to sloping ground. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

208A Gonzales Road is a single-family residence and a casita that was constructed at an unknown date in a vernacular manner with non-historic alterations. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to significantly remodel the property. The square footage of the buildings will increase from 1500 square feet to 2600 square feet and the height will increase from approximately 15' to approximately 19' where the maximum allowable height is 15' 2". There is a request to increase the allowable height due to sloping ground shown on a topographic plan, which could be up to a maximum of 19' 2". So if the Board granted the additional height due to slope, that was what the applicant was requesting.

The buildings are designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with stepped massing, buttressed and tapered walls, undulating parapets, and exposed woodwork including protruding vigas.

Also, a perimeter yardwall will be constructed with adobe to the maximum allowable height of 6'.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application, if the Board grants the additional height due to slope. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Mather said in her packet she didn't see a proposed building on the lot so she had trouble reading where the new structure would be located.

Mr. Rasch pointed it out.

Ms. Mather asked where the second floor was. Mr. Rasch pointed it out.

Ms. Mather said it looked like underneath it was just an empty room. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if no part called for demolition. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Present was Mr. Mark DeFrancis, 208 Gonzales, who said when they bought the residence they had several builders come in and one of them said the adobe was deteriorating from moisture and tested it and the moisture was high. They needed to dig a French drain right away and did that on an emergency basis to keep water away from the wall.

The interior cement had water underneath and the wood floor was rotting. So there was some demolition to prepare for eventual remodeling and restoration.

Ms. Rios said it appeared to her eye that the lot was fairly level but he was asking for more height for slope.

Mr. DeFrancis said they had a survey and a county topo map and the topo map showed over two feet slope measured from the back of the house to the front of the house. It was 2.8' on the topo and 3 feet on the survey. The maps were from Rio Grande Survey.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if the Board "may" grant it but was not required to. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Walker noted on page 12 on the main southwest elevation clearly showed two stories.

Mr. DeFrancis agreed. The second story on the main house was only on top of a new structure below and the structure below was a storage room and above was a bedroom. But the top of the parapet would not exceed 19' 2". The storage had a 7' ceiling and one foot between stories. The parapet was either 8 or 12".

Ms. Walker asked if he considered the rendering to be accurate.

Mr. DeFrancis said it was not done by an architect so that was a hard question to answer.

Ms. Walker said if a second level was approved then sketches were required. A two-story façade was what it looked like.

Ms. Rios explained that a second story should have set backs.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The Board might require that upper floor levels be stepped back. He quoted from the code, "The Board shall also require that publicly visible facades be stepped back." In this case this was not publicly visible.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch about the winged parapets.

Mr. Rasch said there were undulating parapets in Santa Fé although that was more California Mission than Santa Fé style. They were seen frequently.

Mr. Katz was confused about what was being requested. Elevations were not properly labeled and he agreed with Ms. Walker that it was not very clear.

Mr. DeFrancis said they intended to go along with the letter of the law. They wanted to restore the pueblo style. He submitted a rendering that might not be accurate. If he needed to submit a more accurate rendering, he would.

Mr. Acton said he would actually recommend that. He was trying to coordinate it and noticed that the windows didn't correspond. Over the front door was the highest element of the house and there was not a second floor about that. They must be clerestories. He didn't understand that space above the front door.

Mr. DeFrancis said that space was clear between the two story and one story to bring air in the open foyer.

Mr. Acton thought not relying on a Google sketch up would be best.

Mr. Acton asked if the window was casement or double hung. There should be a north arrow on both site plan and floor plan. There were no measurements on vertical elevations. That might inform the applicant what was best to do.

Ms. Rios asked how soon this could be heard if postponed.

Mr. Rasch said either until May 10 or May 24th.

Ms. Mather was not pleased with the combination of buttresses and undulating parapets. That combination was not Santa Fé style and she didn't find it appropriate. She was concerned that the casita

had a two story also.

Mr. DeFrancis agreed that it did.

Ms. Mather said the east side of the casita appeared to have 18 windows on the east but that was not on the rendering. That was a disturbing element.

Dr. Kantner agreed with Ms. Mather. It was in need of redesign but he was not sure the Board could improve it here. Because of the tall narrow façades and buttresses and the angle, it was not what you would see in traditional style.

Mr. Acton said the buttresses should be visible on the floor plan as well but they were not there.

Mr. DeFrancis said he would look into that.

Mr. Acton clarified it was the corner buttresses.

Ms. Rios advised the applicant to take these comments seriously. She thought he should get together with Mr. Rasch and make the drawings very clear to make the job easier.

Public Comments

Present and sworn was Ms. Rose Casados Grants, 12 Gonzales Road. Regarding the original house and casita, it said the main house currently was a one bedroom and one and a half bathroom. But it was really a two bedroom and one bath. Whether that had an impact, she didn't know. The person who lived there before was a relative and she spent time there.

Ms. Rios said they were unaware if changes had been made to the interior of the house.

Ms. Grants said it looked like they knocked out the walls. It was a two-bedroom and it looked like they knocked out the wall.

Ms. Rios asked if she had another copy.

Mr. Rasch clarified that it was from the packet.

Ms. Grants said her concern was item #9 in the proposal regarding the carport.

Dr. Kantner clarified that it was page 8 from the applicant's letter.

Ms. Grants read from the letter and said she disagreed 100% with that carport. She didn't want that there because with an entrance there, people would be using her road. With snow, people slide and have to be hauled out of there. They had a fence there now. "That was our road, not theirs. Their road is on the other side." "They were trying to get an entrance through our road and I don't want that."

In November, she saw a backhoe come out and take out the fence. The backhoe was there for a month.

Present and sworn was Ms. Trinidad Garcia Shelton who said she agreed with Ms. Grants.

Present and sworn was Ms. Anna Catron who read her letter and provided a copy as Exhibit A. In her letter she had a concern how close the casita parking would be to her home and was concerned about losing their view of Atalaya Mountain.

Present and sworn was Ms. Rosalind Stone in Anna's guesthouse. She had concerns about things that didn't match in the drawings. Privacy was a huge issue. Her window faced their yard. Also she wondered if the chimney would stay and what the height was now. She asked if the slant was going to change and what the height of it was from the ground. Mr. DeFrancis said they had already done some destruction and she asked if that was part of their plan.

Regarding the short adobe walls she didn't see in any of the drawings and was not clear about what they were. The drawing was very confusing and things didn't match.

The extra traffic would be a burden. She said they were getting ready to have their road redone. It was a little lane and it couldn't handle the traffic on it. It was their lane and their house faced away from the lane. If the casita was to use Lorenzo Lane she didn't know why they would use her lane. They had room for 5 cement trucks in front of their house.

She was not sure if the trees, etc were going to be changed or other things that would obstruct more of the view. Those were her concerns.

Mr. DeFrancis responded that he had assumed that road was a public road.

Ms. Walker said it was a private road. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. DeFrancis said then they wouldn't pull in there.

He said the backhoe was brought in to do the French drain and then the back hoe left and the fence was put back up.

Regarding the bedrooms, he explained that to the right was a room that could not be closed so they called it a one bedroom. They had a separate room for shower and toilet from the lavatory.

As far as the carport went, he read the regulations and discussed this with Anna before they planned to do anything to ask if she would consider the carport without 20 feet of her house. It was not required but he understood he could do that if it was 20 feet away from her fence. That was in one of the designs.

Regarding the height they took both the topo map and the survey and had a design for that.

He brought an alternate design, knowing this might be a concern. He wanted to respect his neighbors. The alternate design height was 15' 2".

Ms. Rios said it would be a good idea to get with his neighbors. It was nice to get along with neighbors and iron out issues. She didn't know if the Board would grant those so the alternative plan sounded like a good idea to her.

Mr. DeFrancis said the chimney was over where the kitchen was and he would change it to the living room.

Ms. Rios said it seemed there were many question marks.

Ms. Mather said it was crucial to get a site plan for where the proposed buildings would be located on the site.

Ms. Mather moved to postpone Case #H 11-014 because the Board was not provided with sufficient and accurate site plans and floor plans and the Board would appreciate review of the alternate plan. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Acton asked Mr. Rasch whether it was customary to counsel an applicant on the adequacy of the plans.

Mr. Rasch agreed and said he had been coaching him along for about a month.

Mr. Acton urged Mr. DeFrancis to listen to Mr. Rasch's counsel. It was all about accuracy and correspondence of one part with the other and identification of materials. This had protruding vigas, vigas with eyebrows, metal cladding windows. If the Board had questions they were hamstrung and it produced a lot of neighbor anxiety.

The motion to postpone passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Grants how old the buildings were.

Ms. Grants said she thought it was built in 1935.

Chair Woods returned to chair the meeting.

4. Case #H-11-017. 109 Jimenez Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Earl Kessler and Shari Kessler, owners proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a vehicular gate and constructing 221 sq. ft. of additions. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

109 Jimenez Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style before 1958. The building has been considerably altered several times at non-historic dates with the loss of historic material and construction of additions. The property is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

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

1. Two small additions totaling approximately 221 square feet will be constructed at the southwest side of the residence. The additions will match the existing adjacent height and finish details.

2. The high vehicle gate at the front yardwall was removed and replaced without permission or a building permit. The new gate is similar to the former gate as being constructed of wooden slats and different with an irregular top where the original had a reverse arch top. The gate will be painted a bright purple color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (l) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Kessler and he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker acknowledged that there was a broad range of colors but asked if they could have a more delicate color.

Mr. Kessler commented that the gate across from him was Uranium Turquoise and Mexican Fiesta Purple was the color of his gate.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch about colors allowed in this district. She liked bright colors but this was very out there.

Mr. Rasch said the swatch was called it mystical purple. The Westside district allowed brighter colors.

Chair Woods asked if harmony still applied.

Mr. Rasch agreed and said the uranium turquoise was also bright in the streetscape.

Dr. Kantner asked how long ago it was painted.

Mr. Kessler said it was painted probably a year and a half ago.

Chair Woods asked why it was here now.

Mr. Rasch said the applicant got a notice of violation and they were out of the country at that time.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-017 as recommended by staff including the two small additions. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Walker who voted against.

- 5. Case #H-11-025. 940 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Joshua Cooper Ramo, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing property by replacing a portal, installing French doors, altering walls and gates, and installing hardscaping elements with landscaping. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

940 Acequia Madre is a single-family residence that was constructed before 1940 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style and there have been numerous alterations. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The west portal will be increased in depth from 6' to 10' and increased in height from approximately 10' to approximately 10' 8" with the installation of a parapet.
2. Existing windows on the west elevation will be removed and replaced with French doors and the existing door will be infilled with wall.
3. Existing perimeter walls, fences, and gates will be altered. The wall at the north side of the property will be slightly reconfigured and a 6' high by 16' wide vehicle gate will be installed between 7' high pilasters. The gate will feature wooden boards with clavos and a wire screen above on a metal framework. The vehicle gate at the west side of the property will be removed and replaced with a pedestrian gate. The gate will match the materials and details of the vehicle gate on Acequia Madre. The wall and fence along the private driveway will be changed to parking area with a wall located further into the property with a vehicle gate at the front of the parking and a pedestrian gate at the rear of the parking. These gates will be similar to the others. The interior pedestrian gate will be installed between a zaguan structures that will be approximately 8' high. The coyote fence at the southeast corner of the lot will be removed and replaced with a yardwall that is proposed to be 6-7' high. An exception (and a BOA variance) was not requested to exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'.

4. The interior garden will be redesigned with landscaping and hardscaping, including planters and an outdoor dining area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the yardwalls shall not exceed the allowable height of 6'. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Rios asked if the proposed garden gate was facing the acequia.

Mr. Rasch said it faced the private drive off Don Miguel.

Dr. Kantner asked if the six foot rule included the pilasters.

Mr. Rasch said the pilasters and archway were accents and not part of the allowable height.

Ms. Mather asked what the French doors looked like.

Mr. Rasch said there was no description but they were under a portal so divided lights were not required.

Ms. Mather said she had trouble reading the plans because they were so small. One page 14 she asked if the circles were trees that were proposed or to be removed.

Mr. Acton thought the circles with hatches were to be removed.

Chair Woods asked if pages 22 and 23 showed the large tall gate and structure around it and if it was the same gate.

Mr. Rasch said that showed two different gates with similar elements.

Ms. Rios asked how many vehicle gates there would be.

Mr. Rasch said there was one across the acequia and one being closed and a new one on the private drive.

Present and sworn were Mr. Mark Steinham and Mr. Estevan Trujillo, 523½ West San Francisco.

Mr. Steinham said the wall on the private drive would be six feet high.

Mr. Rasch said that was on page 22 and six feet were allowable on the private drive.

Mr. Steinham added that the vehicle gates were set back from walls on the property line.

Mr. Trujillo pointed out the various gates - the existing opening at the bridge would have a new wall set back with a gate. At the existing vehicle gate would be a pedestrian opening. And on Camino Don Miguel they would cut an opening in the wall with the vehicle gate for pedestrian access.

Ms. Rios asked if the existing gate at Don Miguel would remain.

Mr. Trujillo agreed and the pedestrian opening was about 30" by 6' 6".

Ms. Mather assumed then that the south gate was this 8' that was called the garden gate.

Mr. Trujillo agreed and said it was behind the other gate, set back behind the car parking lot.

Ms. Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Trujillo showed the elevation that faced Don Miguel.

Ms. Walker asked if the new vehicle gates were fenestrated. Mr. Steinham agreed.

Chair Woods n was concerned about the massiveness around the pedestrian gates. She asked how tall and wide the walls on the sides were.

Mr. Trujillo said that was on the garden gate. He apologized for the sizes of the drawings. The walls at the garden gate were 8' high and five feet wide on either side by 3 feet deep.

Mr. Rasch said there were three pedestrian gates.

Chair Woods found the garden gate quite massive. She asked how wide the vehicle gate was.

Mr. Steinham said it had two 10' leaves that would slide open so it would be a total of 20' wide.

Mr. Katz said the opening on the north side where they were proposing a gate allowed one to see the house now but with the gate it wouldn't provide any visual clue of what was inside. There was no window through the gate.

Mr. Trujillo said there was a screen at the top. It was six feet high.

Ms. Walker asked if he had considered fenestration of the gates.

Mr. Trujillo said Mr. Rasch suggested it there.

Ms. Walker didn't think privacy was a big issue but people blocked that road a lot. She would like to see more openings in the gate.

Mr. Steinham said they could do that to get approval.

Mr. Trujillo agreed.

Ms. Walker said fenestration of both of them would relieve the massing on the south gate.

Mr. Acton asked that the screen portion on top would be increased in its vertical dimension. He suggested adding to the bottom by lowering it two feet.

Chair Woods agreed the screen could be brought down lower.

Mr. Acton asked about exterior lighting.

Mr. Trujillo said there would not be any exterior lighting.

Ms. Mather asked if they would be removing all those trees in the hatched areas.

Mr. Trujillo said these were elms that were in poor shape and they wanted to replace them as per the planting plan.

Mr. Steinham said there was also a dead pine tree there.

Ms. Mather thought the cottonwoods contributed greatly to the streetscape.

Mr. Steinham said they wanted to add landscape to that property and wanted to work with the City to maintain that landscaping there.

Chair Woods asked how high the pilasters were for the gate on Acequia Madre.

Mr. Trujillo said they were about 7' high.

Chair Woods thought it looked higher than that. She was concerned with the massiveness of all the pilasters. This happened with the house on Alameda. It affected the streetscape with a six foot wall.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Steinham said he didn't perceive them to be massive but the interior gate in the garden was intentionally massive to make it like walking through a space. If there was an issue with the others, they could reduce the size.

Chair Woods said they were not pilasters. It was 8' of exterior wall and the ordinance didn't allow 8' walls.

Mr. Rasch said the Board could look at it as a structure.

Mr. Steinham said it was four feet deep.

Ms. Rios commented about living around the corner when growing up and the neighborhoods were very sedate with no gates. She asked that they discuss narrowing them and not making them so deep.

Mr. Steinham asked about having the pilasters be 18" square.

Chair Woods was concerned about height there along the acequia. These were about 2' by 2'. Mr. Steinham agreed.

Chair Woods was concerned about not being able to see the drawings.

Mr. Trujillo said they had dimensions on the larger drawings.

Ms. Mather was concerned about lower part on the left side.

Mr. Trujillo said that was part of the wall. The gate was 5' 10" and the right side needed to come down to six feet. They would lose the trellis if that was done.

Chair Woods said the Board did not want the pilasters start to overwhelm the wall.

Mr. Acton suggested at the front gate that the pilasters on either side could be just six inches above the wall. He liked the battered edges along Acequia Madre. That would allow at south gate for the zaguan to be reflected there and decrease width some amount. They had these little triptychs of windows that were a nice gesture to the street. The screened gate was also. Making things a little less formidable was what the Board was thinking.

Chair Woods said the Board would like it articulated on the vehicle gate; doubling the size of screening and with pilasters six inches above wall and no wall above six feet and on Acequia Madre, no pilasters and the last was this interior gate. She would like the project to keep the pilasters no higher than six inches above the gate.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-025 with the conditions that the vehicle gate be articulated, the screening size doubled, pilasters at six inches about the wall, all walls at or below six feet in height, no pilasters on Acequia Madre and the interior gate mass reduced as discussed. It was not seconded.

Mr. Steinham said the interior gate that was the garden gate was more like a structure as Mr. Rasch was saying and not really visible from the street with a really nice trellis to experience as a passage into the garden. Eliminating that element would take away from the romantic notion of stepping into the garden.

Ms. Roberta Ramo was sworn. She said their son could not be here. She knew that he would be happy

to follow the Board's suggestions about the outside. But the garden gate would not be seen publicly. We want some plant life to grow up through that and when people were walking by it would be the plantings there that would be seen. The landscape architect was working there. But not allowing that structure would have the reverse effect. It would be far more beautiful with the plant life.

Mr. Katz sensed that the Board didn't know that it was a structure but the gate might be closed a lot. While open it would look massive but didn't think people would see that.

Dr. Kantner moved a substitute motion to approve Case #H 11-025 as recommended by staff with the following conditions:

- 1. That the vehicular gates have the shaker screen doubled in size with gates being six feet in height,**
- 2. That the pilasters on either side of the vehicle gates be six inches above the gates;**
- 3. That no walls exceed six feet;**
- 4. That the gate on Acequia Madre not exceed six feet and the pilaster removed;**
- 5. That the garden gate be approved as designed.**

Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Rios thanked Dr. Ramo for his medical advice.

- 6. Case #H-11-026. 427 W. Water Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Turner Lechner & Romero, LLC, agent for Water Street Inn, LLC, owner, proposes to remodel three non-contributing properties with door and window changes, a façade character change at 436, and construction of yardwalls. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

427 West Water Street (Building 2) is a two-story commercial building that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1983. 422 West San Francisco Street (Building 1) is a two-story commercial building that was constructed in a vernacular manner and remodeled in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the 1980s. 436 West San Francisco Street (Building 3) is an accessory building that is undocumented in the HPD files. All three buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the three properties with the following seven items:

(422)

1. Existing windows will be replaced to meet ingress/egress code and existing security bars on windows will be removed. The trim color will be painted blue to match trim on 427.

2. Two windows on the south and west elevations will be removed and changed to doors. The doors and portals will be stained a tan color to match 427.
3. A 5' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed on the south and east side of the parking area where the maximum allowable height is 8'.

(427)

4. An additional door opening will be created and the existing door openings will be reconfigured and all doors will be stained the tan color.
5. An existing courtyard pedestrian gate will be altered.

(436)

6. A total makeover is proposed for the façade on the south. The façade is designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with a stepped parapet, a corbel supported wooden eyebrow, divided lite doors and windows, and stuccoed bancos. The trim will be blue and the wood will be tan.
7. All buildings will be stuccoed or repaired to match existing material, color, and texture.

Present and sworn was Mr. Thomas Lechner, 1524 Paseo de Peralta, who said any existing or future condensers on the roof would be screened from view.

Ms. Rios asked what type of windows they proposed.

Mr. Lechner said they would be clad wood window on south side of building 1 (422). The other windows were clad wood except the one window on San Francisco Street which was a wood casement window.

Chair Woods noted he showed undivided light patterns.

Mr. Lechner said they would be divided light windows similar to the windows in building 2.

Chair Woods asked if they would be architectural series.

Mr. Lechner agreed. They would be similar to those in Water Street building (427).

Chair Woods asked if they were the 9 over 9s. Mr. Lechner agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Acton asked if the Board was considering all three at once. Chair Woods agreed.

Mr. Acton asked for his rationale for the facade on building 3.

Mr. Lechner said it was to blend it in with Vanessies and 427 West Water Street - bringing in the parking lot as a grouping of the different properties.

Mr. Acton noted that building was non-contributing and asked if he considered it a detraction.

Mr. Lechner agreed. It was a converted garage and they wanted a scale more in character with the other buildings. It would screen it.

Mr. Acton commented that there was not an option to slope the parapet or wrap the stucco along the side of the building perhaps creating a little four-foot wainscot to make it more integrated into the building.

Mr. Lechner didn't think it was warranted at this point; not going around on the east or west side.

Mr. Acton said it was tough for him in looking at these great buildings with highest regard of historic tradition and then there was this little building with the facade sort of tacked on to it. He was wondering if there was some approach to make it more authentic with their historic nature.

Mr. Lechner said short of redoing the whole structure, he was not sure. It was a reception area for people at the bed and breakfast. It was a simple 2x4 structure with asphalt shingles. This was a simple solution without going to major expense.

Mr. Katz agreed with Mr. Acton. His concern was that the side was so visible that he thought just let it be "its honest little self."

Mr. Acton thought one of the Board's options would be to approve the two buildings and ask you to come back with an alternative for the little building.

Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H 11-026 to approve buildings 1 and 2 as submitted with the condition that the windows be provided with mullions as reflected on other buildings and that building 3 be postponed for further alternative considerations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 7. Case #H-11-027. 313 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Ford Ruthling, owner, proposes to construct a 993 sq. ft. garage and stair to a roof deck to the maximum allowable height of 14'11". (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

313 East Berger Street, known as the Ford Ruthling House, is a single-family residence and accessory buildings that were constructed in the Territorial style before 1912. The buildings are listed as significant to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

The applicant began to construct a two-story building without permission or a building permit and now requests approval for the construction of a garage with a roof deck. The garage is designed in the Territorial Revival style to the maximum allowable height of 14' 11". The building features brick coping on the south elevation and a roof balustrade on the north elevation that matches the balustrade on the adjacent significant garage. A roof deck will be accessed by exterior stairs on the south and east elevations.

He pointed out in the photograph displayed, the second story that was built without a permit and would be removed and not rebuilt.

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 with the condition that the balustrade should be differentiated from the historic balustrade in some manner.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch about the part he said that the part that extended over the historic structure would be removed. She asked if the whole frame would be removed.

Mr. Rasch agreed that the whole second story would be removed and a roof deck with appropriate balustrade would be built that was not connected to the garage.

Ms. Walker said that with the building being significant all façades were primary. She asked if he was saying that since not all were publicly visible they were not significant.

Mr. Rasch reminded the Board that primary elevations were not defined by public visibility. They were not visible but all were primary.

Present and sworn were Mr. Richard Martínez and Mr. Ford Ruthling.

Mr. Martínez said the garage was built without a permit and when the applicant started building the apartment above it, it was red tagged. It was stiffer that what it needed to be for a garage and was a reason for suggesting the deck on top of the garage. The back of the garage looked onto the garden. This was the tallest part of the structure and in the back the garden was more than half a story above so it was at the same level as the garage in the back.

The existing garage was being called a significant structure but the inside showed it was concrete block. So he didn't know why it would be significant. The house was significant, having been built in 1912, but the garage shouldn't be significant.

Mr. Rasch said that was a good point. He explained that typically in the past, all structures on the property received the same status.

Mr. Martinez believed Mr. Ruthling built the garage and the balustrade.

Mr. Ruthling said he built the garage since he had another vehicle and was sorry for doing it without a permit. He wanted to have a studio above because he was a painter. He said his property was long from Berger to Buena Vista and he sold off the part on Buena Vista side.

He didn't know what else the Board wanted to know.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Ms. Karen Heldmeyer, 325 E Berger, who felt shorter was definitely better in this case. It probably was once visible only to neighbors. The second story was visible to everyone. People were concerned and when she heard it was being built without a permit. She was very concerned about it.

The other problem was the casitas at Buena Vista had a garage that had been turned into another bedroom. So they wanted to make sure what was approved was what was built. The garage should be permitted as an accessory structure and only have what a garage had.

Her question on drawings was whether the height given was with or without the balustrade. She heard that a number of people called in. She believed one of them was Robert Frost who was out of state and was also concerned about it.

Present and sworn was Ms. Blair Cooper, 224 Buena Vista, who said there was one house in between his house and this house. She agreed with Ms. Walker. Two other neighbors within the neighborhood had told her they were concerned about the height of this structure.

Present and sworn was Mr. Russ Moss, 225 E Berger, who said the picture shown had a height for the existing garage but the statement said the garage would be built to a maximum height of 14' 11" and he wanted to know if that garage would extend higher than what was shown in the picture or if the existing garage was already at that height.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ellen Lefkowitz, 217 E. Berger, and agreed with what her neighbors had said.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public comment time was closed.

Mr. Martinez said the existing garage height at 14' 11" was with the parapets. It was the maximum height of the garage. The garage would have a roof and parapets but no more height. 14' 11" included all of that.

The property on Buena Vista was sold so Mr. Ruthling had no control over it any longer.

Ms. Rios asked if they were trying to replicate the balustrade and door which existed on the existing garage.

Mr. Martínez said they were not exactly replicating but the details would be the same with white trim and a pedimented lintel over the door and balustrade. He believed the balustrade there was historic from the old Capital building. Mr. Ruthling agreed.

Ms. Rios noticed that staff recommended that the proposed balustrade be different. She asked if he could differentiate it. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Chair Woods asked if it would only be used as a garage. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-027 per staff recommendations. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.

Chair Woods asked for a friendly amendment that it would not exceed 14' 11" including parapets. Ms. Rios agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. Case #H-11-029A. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Casey Mickelson, proposes an historic status review of this contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

131 Lorenzo Road is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1979 and 1981 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style as stated by the former owner, Douglas Johnson. The building was listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District after a windshield survey in the 1980s with no Historic Cultural Properties Inventory produced to substantiate the status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends an historic status downgrade from contributing to non-contributing due to a non-historic date of construction.

Mr. Rasch said windshield surveys were common during that time. His predecessor drove around the historic districts and visually determined a status while in the car so he called them windshield surveys.

Ms. Mather asked if he could determine which ones were windshield surveys.

Mr. Rasch said it was evident because there was no HCPI in the file and the GIS had a number in the 40,000s for the windshield surveys.

Present and sworn was Mr. Casey Mickleson, 131 Lorenzo Road, who had nothing to add to the staff report. The gentleman he bought it from said he built it in 1981.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-029A to downgrade it from contributing to non-contributing. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H-11-029B. 131 Lorenzo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Casey Mickelson, agent/owner, proposes to construct a 315 sq. ft. addition to a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

131 Lorenzo Road is a non-contributing residential property in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following item.

A 315 square foot addition will be constructed on the south elevation where an enclosed patio exists between the free-standing carport and the residence. The addition will match the adjacent height and finishes will match existing conditions.

A proposed 1-over-1 window on the west elevation does not meet the 30" window rule (Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(c)) and no exception was requested.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the west window be reduced in size or provided with true or simulated divided lites to meet the 30" window rule.

Mr. Acton noted there didn't seem to be a line indicating the plane change of the addition along the proposed addition in the floor plan.

Mr. Casey Mickelson (previously sworn) agreed. He said that the plan the architect drew didn't continue the projecting vigas and they would continue.

Chair Woods asked if he would be willing to add mullions to the window on the west. Mr. Mickelson agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-029B with staff conditions and that the west window have mullions. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 9. Case #H-11-028. 133 W. Houghton Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Estevan Trujillo, agent for Greg Dye, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 180 sq. ft. addition on a non-primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

133 West Houghton Street is a single-family residential building that was constructed in a vernacular manner by 1930. A Spanish-Pueblo Revival style portal was constructed along the east elevation at an unknown non-historic date. The building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District and the east elevation may be considered as primary.

The applicant proposes to construct a 180 square foot greenhouse addition on the south elevation to match existing adjacent height. The greenhouse will feature massive corners, seven windows for maximum solar gain on the south elevation, a flat roof, and a fireplace. Skylights will be hidden from public view by parapets and existing yardwalls. Finish details will match existing conditions.

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 previously sworn was Estevan Trujillo who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Walker asked if he had been in touch with Mr. Bové.

Mr. Trujillo agreed and said he gave the package to Mr. Rasch.

Mr. Acton asked him what size skylights and how many would be installed.

Mr. Trujillo said there would be three 2x4 skylights. They were trying to maximize the amount of light there. He was wrapping the parapet around so they were not visible. He showed where on the display.

Mr. Acton asked if they would be flat or domed skylights.

Mr. Trujillo said they would be flat.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H 11-028 as presented. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 10. Case #H-11-024. 713 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Charles Smith, agent for Ann Garcia, owner, proposes to repair existing historic windows, replace the front door, and replace an historic tin sconce on the primary elevation of a contributing residential structure. An exception was requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(5)). (David Rasch).**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

713 Agua Fria Street is a single-family residence that was constructed before approximately 1912 in a vernacular manner. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District and the south elevation may be considered as primary.

In 2010, Historic Preservation staff administratively approved maintenance and repair of the structure with the condition that the historic 6-over-6 wood double hung windows be repaired and maintained on the south elevation. During a building permit inspection, a few deviations from the plan were identified and now the applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following three items.

1. The historic windows appear to have had more than 30% of the historic materials removed. The restored windows have a 4-over-4 lite pattern with horizontally orientated snap-in muntins.
2. The 14-lite front door was removed and replaced without permission or a building permit with a simulated four-panel door and a semicircular top window.
3. The historic tin sconce beside the door was removed and replaced without permission or a building permit with a white metal lantern-style fixture.

An exception to remove historic materials was requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and the required responses are included below:

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

Applicant: We believe the repairs at 713 Agua Fria are consistent with other properties in the Guadalupe Historic District including, but not limited to, the property renovated at 532 Agua Fria. The property at 532 Agua Fria has 4 over 4, 2 over 2 and 9 over 9 divided lites, a solid front door and a similar light fixture and said renovations do not damage, but rather enhance, the character of said District.

Staff: Staff is in agreement that the streetscape character is varied, but the snap-in muntins are

not harmonious to an historic structure.

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

Applicant: Some of the windows did not lock and other windows were shut tight with coats of paint. With the rise in burglaries in Santa Fe we also felt that the door needed to be more resistant to break-ins as the existing 15-lite door could easily be kicked in. If there were a fire, occupants would not be able to open windows that were painted shut and would have a hard time exiting the home. In order to prevent harm to the occupants, the windows needed to have locks for safety, windows that could be opened in the event of a fire and a door more resistant to break-ins. The old light fixture was not working and needed to be replaced. For safety reasons, the area needs to be illuminated.

Staff: Staff is not in agreement that removal of historic material rather than repair prevented a hardship. For example, the owner could have applied for tax credits to repair the windows making them operable and secure and installed storm windows that would have provided additional security.

(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.

Applicant: The variety of repairs completed at 532 and 713 Agua Fria provide design options (a different type of door and light fixture) to strengthen the heterogeneous character of the City, as well as the Guadalupe Historic District. By making these installations, we further believe that they enhance and strengthen the character of the District by providing a unique and safe residence for persons to want to continue living within the Guadalupe Historic District and not feel that it is unsafe.

Staff: Staff is in agreement with this response.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape.

Applicant: The door is peculiar to the structure and not applicable to other structures in the related streetscape as it is a solid door with a window that is a half circle at the top of the door. The other doors in the related streetscape are either completely solid doors or divided lite doors. Again, it provides for various design options strengthening the heterogeneous character of the District. Also peculiar to the land is that the home is located between two (2) streets, Agua Fria on one side and Dunlap on the other side. Crime can occur more frequently with having two (2) escape routes which is another reason for better windows and doors.

Staff: Staff is not in agreement with this response because there are other properties within the streetscape with two street frontages and the door is not unique.

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

Applicant: The 15-lite door had cracked windows and broken wood. We attempted to repair the door in order to waterproof it and prevent further deterioration to the wood when it cracked and broke beyond repair. This was not the result of the actions of the applicant or the contractor.

Staff: Staff is not in agreement with this response because the attempt to waterproof the door which lead to its disintegration was a direct result of the action of the applicant. The historic windows and light fixture was not addressed.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of Section 14-5.2(A)(1).

Applicant: The least negative impact is replacing the light fixture. Repairing the windows and replacing the door and light fixture were not major construction jobs, yet they enhanced the appearance of the home and with proper ongoing maintenance, the home will have a greatly extended service life while contributing to the historic character of the home. We believe important elements of the home have been made safer for occupants and at the same time the home has been preserved for the future by making the outward appearance of the home pleasant and in harmony with the homes on Agua Fria in the Guadalupe Historic District and also preserving property values.

Staff: Staff is not in agreement with this response because the lack of proper maintenance on the historic windows which lead to inappropriate treatment could have been avoided and the result is not harmonious.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the request to remove historic material that embodied the historic character of the building as having not met the exception criteria. True or simulated divided lites in a vertical orientation would be more appropriate for this contributing historic structure.

Ms. Mather asked concerning #1 where it said there appeared to be more than 30% of the historic material removed from the windows. She asked if that meant they had been entirely replaced or if there was some historic material remaining.

Mr. Rasch believed the sash was still original but had new glazing and snap-in muntins. The original pattern was six over six.

Mr. Katz asked if it was possible to get snap in muntins to match.

Mr. Rasch agreed and here, the applicant went to great pains to duplicate the original muntin width for the windows and made the snap in muntins himself.

Present and sworn was Mr. Charles Smith, #2 Entrada de Santiago, who said what they did was sand the windows. He tried to save the muntins but there was only caulking there holding them together. But he kept the wood that was left.

Ms. Rios asked what the present pattern was.

Mr. Rasch said it was four over four.

Ms. Walker asked why this was put in for the door.

Mr. Smith explained that the door was falling apart. It was not straight and could not be straightened.

Ms. Walker asked if he had considered replacing with a historic door from somewhere else.

Mr. Smith said he had not. They installed a metal door because they needed to protect the people in there. Besides, the screen door was original and he put them back up. So you couldn't see the door anyway.

Mr. Acton noted this was fairly Territorial. He thought those windows could be enhanced by some casing around the perimeter.

Mr. Smith believed it would take away from the historic part of it.

Mr. Acton felt the restoration seemed rather store bought. He either did a very beautiful job but turned into pristine restoration but some trim would do a good job.

Chair Woods disagreed.

Mr. Smith said they were supposed to keep the historic look.

Mr. Katz asked if he couldn't have done better on the light fixture.

Mr. Smith said the fixture was falling apart so they threw it away. They could find a better fixture to take the place of the old one.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather wondered if Kenny could do the six over six pattern.

Mr. Smith said it would make the muntins thinner. He tried it and it didn't work.

Ms. Mather asked if he could find a more appropriate fixture like at Artesanos. Mr. Smith agreed.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 11-024 as submitted with the condition that a more appropriate light fixture be used and the exception be approved. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. O'Reilly addressed some concerns from the last meeting.

The first concerns were about the St. John's College permit. Since the last meeting, Mr. Rasch and he reviewed the permit and found that the changes were very minor so the permit was issued.

Regarding staffing Mr. O'Reilly said the HP Division continued to be staffed by two people. There had been little progress in hiring other people. The reasons were not worth going into now but the City wanted to hire and had not been able to.

Mr. Katz asked if it was because Council was not allowing him to hire anyone.

Mr. O'Reilly said Council had approved the position. There were some personnel matters and he felt it was not appropriate to go into them in a public meeting.

Mr. Katz asked if he could provide more information about the deviations at St. John's College.

Mr. O'Reilly said what staff found was that there were some details left off the plans submitted. There were some lines that were not clear what they represented. When the architect submitted his plans he was more specific about those things. Most of them met the Board's intent. There was one instance where staff asked them to make a change in the steel detail. The plans to the board didn't indicated that the flanges of steel would be exposed. So they asked the architect to change that steel member so it would not read as structural steel. They did that. Most everything else was very minor.

Chair Woods said Mr. O'Reilly had asked to speak at the end of the meeting because it involved personnel matters.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer