



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6-22-11 TIME 1:45

SERVED BY Cynthia Vignone

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 28, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 28, 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
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
- F. COMMUNICATIONS
- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
 - 1. Case #H-10-033. St. Catherine's Industrial Indian School. Landmark (outside of historic districts). Patricia Barey, agent for NM Consolidated Constructions Services LLC, owners, proposes to demolish non-landmarks: Feature #15 Garage; Feature #16 Maintenance Building; Feature #17 Senior High Building; Feature #18 Laundry; Feature #19 Business Education Building and Feature #20 Library. (David Rasch) (WITHDRAWN BY STAFF).
- I. OLD BUSINESS
 - 1. Case #H-10-011. 557 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Luis Olivas, agent for William and Amice La Calle, owners, proposes to install an air conditioning unit on the roof and construct a stuccoed screen wall to 42" and lower than the adjacent parapet on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
 - 2. Case #H-08-102. 974 Old Santa Fe Trail. Historic Review Historic District. Robert Jorgensen, agent for City of Santa Fe – Water Division owners, proposes to install a pressure reducing valve (PRV) to 54" high at the curb side. (David Rasch).
 - 3. Case-H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nurit Walsky, owners proposes to construct a 490 sq. ft. addition at 12'6" high alter existing pergolas, and construct new pergolas on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch).
 - 4. Case-H-11-033. 306 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michelle L. Gaugy, owner/agent proposes to remodel a contributing property by removing a coyote fence to construct a parking space with a brick finish, a 2'6" high stuccoed wall, and planters. (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-048. 142 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. MarkNaktin, agent for David Bigby, owner proposes to remodel the rear enclosed patio at a non-contributing property by removing a shed, replacing doors with windows, and resetting the brick paving in a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-049. 363 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Steve William, agent for Patricia LaFarge, owner proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing non historic windows, installing a skylight, reroofing, restuccoing, repairing or replacing yardwall opening lintels, and repairing the sidewalk. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-051. 250 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences owners, proposes to construct a 5,370 sq. ft. 3-story addition to match existing adjacent height on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-052. 224 Maynard Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc., agent for Gertrude Krasin, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-056. 420 Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kate Leriche, agent for Leo Martinez, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by altering windows and doors, installing storm windows, removing a deck, remodeling a non-contributing casita by adding approximately 146 sq. ft. and increasing the height from 8'9" to 10'9" where the maximum allowable height is 15'3" and to increase the street facing yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 62". (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-057. 1005 E. Alameda Street, Unit F. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles C. Newman, agent for Magdalena Gehrhligster, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 232 sq. ft. ramada to a height of 9'6" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-058. 303 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Terry Ballone, agent for Ed Aldworth and Marcia Southwick, owners, proposes to extend an existing side lot line yardwall at the existing height and repair an historic braided wire fence on a contributing property. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-054. 544 Agua Fria A& B. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Sanbusco Corp., owners, proposes to construct a 10 sq. ft. addition to connect two significant structures together and to install pedestrian gates in existing yardwalls. An exception is request to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-055. 1047A Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Christopher Boehm, owner, proposes to enclose an existing carport on a non-contributing property. An exception is requested to match non-conforming windows that exceed the 30" glazing rule (Section 14-5.2 (E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the June 28, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, June 28, 2011.



Agenda

DATE 6/14/11

TIME 10:00am

SERVED BY

RECEIVED BY

Camille Vique
[Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, June 28, 2011 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, June 28, 2011 – 5:30 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES June 14, 2011
- E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-038	311 E. Palace Avenue	Case #H-11-046	100 Block of Camino del Compo(East)
Case #H-11-041	1379 Upper Canyon Rd.	Case #H-11-047	100 Block of Camino del Compo(West)
Case #H-11-026	436 W. Water Street	Case #H-11-043	607 E. Palace Avenue
Case #H-10-038	147 Gonzales Road, #8	Case #H-11-044	103 Catron Street
Case #H-11-042	1139 Cerro Gordo Road	Case #H-11-045	614 & 616 E. Palace Ave.

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

1. Case #H-10-011. 557 Agua Fria. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Luis Olivas, agent for William and Amice La Calle, owners, proposes to install an air conditioning unit on the roof and construct a stuccoed screen wall to 42" and lower than the adjacent parapet on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-08-102. 974 Old Santa Fe Trail. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robert Jorgensen, agent for City of Santa Fe – Water Division owners, proposes to install a pressure reducing valve (PRV) to 54" high at the curb side. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-10-033. St. Catherine's Industrial Indian School. Landmark (outside of historic districts). Patricia Barey, agent for NM Consolidated Constructions Services LLC, owners, proposes to demolish non-landmarks: Feature #15 Garage; Feature #16 Maintenance Building; Feature #17 Senior High Building; Feature #18 Laundry; Feature #19 Business Education Building and Feature #20 Library.

4. Case-H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nurit Walsky, owners proposes to construct a 490 sq. ft. addition at 12'6" high alter existing pergolas, and construct new pergolas on a non-contributing building. (David Rasch).
5. Case-H-11-033. 306 Delgado Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michelle L. Gaugy, owner/agent proposes to remodel a contributing property by removing a coyote fence to construct a parking space with a brick finish, a 2'6" high stuccoed wall, and planters. (David Rasch).

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-11-048. 142 Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. MarkNaktin, agent for David Bigby, owner proposes to remodel the rear enclosed patio at a non-contributing property by removing a shed, replacing doors with windows, and resetting the brick paving in a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-049. 363 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Steve William, agent for Patricia LaFarge, owner proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing non historic windows, installing a skylight, reroofing, restuccoing, repairing or replacing yardwall opening lintels, and repairing the sidewalk. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-11-051. 250 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences owners, proposes to construct a 5,370 sq. ft. 3-story addition to match existing adjacent height on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-11-052. 224 Maynard Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc., agent for Gertrude Krasin, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-11-056. 420 Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kate Leriche, agent for Leo Martinez, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by altering windows and doors, installing storm windows, removing a deck, remodeling a non-contributing casita by adding approximately 146 sq. ft. and increasing the height from 8'9" to 10'9" where the maximum allowable height is 15'3" and to increase the street facing yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 62". (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-11-057. 1005 E. Alameda Street, Unit F. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles C. Newman, agent for Magdalena Gehrhilister, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 232 sq. ft. ramada to a height of 9'6" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-11-058. 303 E. Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Terry Ballone, agent for Ed Aldworth and Marcia Southwick, owners, proposes to extend an existing side lot line yardwall at the existing height and repair an historic braided wire fence on a contributing property. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-11-054. 544 Agua Fria A& B. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Sanbusco Corp., owners, proposes to construct a 10 sq. ft. addition to connect two significant structures together and to install pedestrian gates in existing yardwalls. An exception is request to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).
9. Case #H-11-055. 1047A Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martinez, agent for Christopher Boehm, owner, proposes to enclose an existing carport on a non-contributing property. An exception is requested to match non-conforming windows that exceed the 30" glazing rule (Section 14-5.2 (E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch).

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

L. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the June 28, 2011 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 on Tuesday, June 28, 2011.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

June 28, 2011

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
Approval of Minutes	Not considered	
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Not considered	2-3
Communications	None	3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Administrative Matters		3
1. <u>Case #H-10-033</u> St. Catherine's Industrial Indian School	Withdrawn by Staff	2-3
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H-10-011.</u> 557 Agua Fria	Approved with conditions	3-4
2. <u>Case #H-08-102.</u> 974 Old Santa Fé Trail	Approved with conditions	4-6
3. <u>Case #H 11-014</u> 208A Gonzales Road	Approved with conditions	6-9
4. <u>Case #H 11-033</u> 306 Delgado Street	Approved with conditions	9-12
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 11-048</u> 142 Palace Avenue	Approved as recommended	12-13
2. <u>Case #H 11-049</u> 363 Garcia Street	Approved as presented	13-14
3. <u>Case #H 11-051</u> 250 East Alameda	Postponed	14-17
4. <u>Case #H 11-052</u> 224 Maynard Street	Approved as recommended	17-18
5. <u>Case #H 11-056</u> 420 Hillside Avenue	Postponed to July 12	18-20
6. <u>Case #H 11-057</u> 1005 East Alameda Unit F	Approved with conditions	20-22
7. <u>Case #H 11-058</u> 303 East Berger	Approved as recommended	22-23
8. <u>Case #H 11-054</u> 544 Agua Fria A & B	Approved as recommended	23-25
9. <u>Case #H 11-055</u> 1047A Camino San Acacio	Approved as recommended	25-27
Matters from the Board	None	27
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:04 p.m.	28

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

June 28, 2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Pro Tem Christine Mather 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. Christine Mather, Chair Pro Tem
Mr. Rad Acton
Dr. John Kantner
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelly Brennan, Asst. 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.

Ms. Walker moved to elect Ms. Mather as Chair for this meeting. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Katz moved to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to consider.

E. FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

There were no findings of fact or conclusions of law to consider.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Chair Mather announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of this board had fifteen days after the approval of findings of fact and conclusions of law for that case.

1. **Case #H-10-033. St. Catherine's Industrial Indian School.** Landmark (outside of historic districts). Patricia Barey, agent for NM Consolidated Constructions Services LLC, owners, proposes to demolish non-landmarks: Feature #15 Garage; Feature #16 Maintenance Building; Feature #17 Senior High Building; Feature #18 Laundry; Feature #19 Business Education Building and Feature #20 Library. (David Rasch) (WITHDRAWN BY STAFF).

Mr. Rasch referred to a memo in the packet from the Legal Department. Staff was withdrawing the current case to demolish six non-landmarked buildings. He explained that he was relying on a section in the code about not affecting adjacent land marked buildings. But this Board didn't not have jurisdiction over the non-landmarked buildings.

Mr. Acton asked what process an application for demolition of non-landmarked buildings would go through in Land Use.

Mr. Rasch said that because it was next to registered landmarks, the Land Use Department asked for his advice on it but it was normally just a building permit through the Land Use Department.

Mr. O'Reilly thought Mr. Rasch explained it very well. In this case, the Building Permit Division needed an approval from Mr. Rasch. The administrative okay was only to go down to ground level but no ground disturbances were permitted so it would be only walls and roofs.

Chair Mather asked if there was an appeal process for that approval.

Mr. O'Reilly said there was. Once the permit was posted, anyone had 15 days to appeal.

Mr. Acton asked if the City knew what the owner's intention was and if they were actually going to demolish them.

Mr. O'Reilly said they applied for and received approval for a demolition permit.

Mr. Acton explained that one of the prospective buyers wanted to purchase all of the buildings. It might be complicated by an overly expedient exercise of this permit. He said that to alert the community to expedite those negotiations.

Dr. Kantner said for future reference his understanding was that for a demolition request of a building in a historic district the Board would have jurisdiction.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The code was clear that demolition adjacency to a listed building. The alteration had to be on a listed building to see how it affected another listed building.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-10-011, 557 Agua Fria.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Luis Olivas, agent for William and Amice La Calle, owners, proposes to install an air conditioning unit on the roof and construct a stuccoed screen wall to 42" and lower than the adjacent parapet on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

557 Agua Fria Street is a single-family residence that was constructed between 1892 and 1895. Major remodeling with loss of historic material and non-historic additions have overwhelmed the original historic integrity. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

On April 27, 2010, the HDRB approved remodeling at this property. During the permitted project, a publicly-visible roof-top mechanical unit was installed without approval or a permit. Now, the applicant proposes to construct a screen wall on the roof to screen the unit. The screen will be a partial octagon in plan, up to 42" high, and stuccoed to match the existing conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Luis Olivas 557 Guadalupe, who said he had the permit to remodel the house and the company doing the A/C never finished the job so he planned to construct a little wall to hide it.

Mr. Katz was puzzled with the octagon shape and asked why it was not a rectangle.

Mr. Olivas said it could only be seen from the west side - northwest.

Mr. Acton said he would support approving it if he would agree to make the screening wall rectangular with 3' on either side. It looked like it was about 12' across.

Dr. Kantner said it was 8' wide.

Mr. Acton noted that in the drawing the top was also tapered. That was not in keeping with the other square lines. He asked Mr. Olivas to make it square with a flat top at the same elevation of the lower parapet line.

Mr. Olivas agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H 10-0011 on the condition that the surround was constructed square with a flat top edge with the bullnose as shown. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-08-102. 974 Old Santa Fé Trail.** Historic Review Historic District. Robert Jorgensen, agent for City of Santa Fé – Water Division owners, proposes to install a pressure reducing valve (PRV) to 54" high at the curb side. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report and indicated it was not in the Board packet.

Ms. Walker asked if he got the color choices.

Present and sworn was Mr. Robert Jorgensen who said the design was a standard design and the result of two public hearings held by the Public Utilities Committee. The original had a 20' mast and a 20' wooden drop pole with overhead electric service. It now used underground telephone telemetry and eliminated a second box the phone company usually required and had underground electric service with a 16" pedestal. They were about one foot apart to narrow the footprint. They didn't get input on color and proposed using park service brown like many others that had been constructed. He shared a photo with the board members. [Exhibit A]. The photo was on Siringo in front of the State Printing Offices.

At this location was a 5' exposed adobe wall. They were required to put it ten feet away from the power pole and place the enclosures so the back one was about 3' from the wall to meet electrical code.

Ms. Walker said on the field trip we would call the wall adobe colored. She asked if there was any way he could paint it to match more closely the color of the wall.

Mr. Jorgensen thought they could. He said it was already preainted but they could repaint it if needed.

Ms. Walker saw in the second paragraph that staff said there was only one located in the historic district. She asked if that meant only one.

Mr. Jorgensen said they originally proposed 25 and reduced it to nine. We were going to eliminate 8 but there would be others, although they were not proposed in this phase.

Ms. Walker asked how many would end up in the historic district.

Mr. Jorgensen said probably ten more. They still had about 30 stations to construct and he was not sure how many in the historic district because he didn't have the list with him.

Ms. Walker thought this was probably a good time to get the color right. She asked what the process would be for that.

Mr. Rasch said the Board could include in the motion whether staff should handle it. Or the Board could tell him if they didn't like the color and he would put it on the agenda.

Mr. Acton asked if in general they were going to try to do them below grade.

Mr. Jorgensen said the majority of them were below ground. There was a large manhole in the street here. In the last 5-6 years they had gone to above grade in new ones because it was safer. They were trying to do a good job on each specific site. The answer was that they had both.

Mr. Acton said there might be pressure in the historic district to maximize underground. But where that was not possible he asked what they would be looking at.

Mr. Jorgensen said the units were about 54" high and covered a 6'x8' area. There was one on 839 Gonzales Road so the Board could see what it looked like.

Mr. Jorgensen agreed to get the list to the Board of the locations proposed inside the historic districts.

Chair Mather asked if staff planned to bring them to the Board one at a time.

Mr. Jorgensen thought under the ordinance they were required to bring each one either as a group or each one at a time. For the next group, however many were in the historic district, they would make an application for the group.

Mr. Acton said it created an unfortunate visible obtrusion. It could be over a length of 15'. The Board might want to look at a screening device for them. He asked if a fence could be placed in front to conceal the box and still provide for access. It could be a fence you could take down and put back up.

He explained he would like to know the worst case scenario to have a fence device. This was setting a precedent here for reviewing them so he recommended they be site-specific colors that would blend in with the setting. With pine trees it should be darker. Almost anywhere in the city he would suggest they consider that. The impact was not insignificant.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H 08-102 with two conditions -

- 1. That the color match the wall and**
- 2. If it was still obtrusive that a coyote fence be built to hide it. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case-H-11-014. 208A Gonzales Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mark and Nurit Walsky, owners proposes to construct a 490 sq. ft. addition at 12'6" high alter existing pergolas, and construct new pergolas on a non-contributing building. (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.

On April 26, 2011, the HDRB postponed action on this application pending submittal of more detailed plans. Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with a more scaled down design with the following five items.

1. A 490 square foot addition will be added to the southwest corner of the residence. The addition will match existing character and finishes.

2. The overall building height at 14' 2" will not change, but massing changes are proposed, including the removal of the clerestory. Also, two existing pergolas/portals will be altered and two additional pergolas/portals will be constructed.

3. Existing non-historic aluminum windows that do not meet emergency egress/ingress will be replaced with true divided-lite windows in a dark color.

4. The building will be restuccoed with cementitious "Buckskin" and the woodwork will be stained a medium brown color.

5. The existing 6' high perimeter board fence will be retained and two 12' wide bileaf board gates will be installed to match the fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Chair Mather didn't recall seeing the fence on the north. Mr. Rasch said it was there.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, 200 West Marcy, who clarified that the board fence was on the north but there was also one on the south and they wanted to hang part of it on gates and add a gate at a southern location.

Chair Mather said what they saw on the south was a coyote fence with a stringer that faced the street.

Mr. Purvis said it would be a coyote gate then.

Mr. Acton noticed he showed a fence on all sides of the property.

Mr. Purvis clarified that they were not adding fence but just adding gates.

Mr. Acton recalled in the letter it said he wanted to restore a fence.

Mr. Purvis agreed.

Mr. Acton suggested he consider putting the posts and rails on the inside so the street side was more presentable.

Mr. Purvis thought that sounded good.

Mr. Acton said the perimeter was not labeled. He asked if the gate would be of the same material as the fence at that location.

Mr. Purvis agreed that all gates would match the fence.

Dr. Kantner said it looked like to the side of the new addition was a gate being put in.

Mr. Purvis said that was existing. There was a yard wall and gate in between.

Dr. Kantner asked about the height.

Mr. Purvis said the wall was 5' high with a lintel over doors at 7' 4".

Dr. Kantner asked if the doors were wood and finished. Mr. Purvis agreed.

Dr. Kantner asked if there would be any exterior lights.

Mr. Purvis said there would and they were not selected yet. He would be happy to bring something to Mr. Rasch.

Mr. Katz thought it was a vast improvement there.

Chair Mather asked what the portal roofing material was.

Mr. Purvis said it was decking with a small drip edge.

Public Comment -

Present and sworn was Ms. Rosalyn Stone who was not clear on some things .From the diagram and talking with Mr. Rasch there was the existing fence and then some inside fence.

Mr. Rasch said he might have been mistaken on it and it did need to be clarified.

Ms. Stone said the gate was also very confusing. She asked if the existing fence was at the outer perimeter and then the gate was put into the existing fence.

Mr. Purvis explained that the fence was not on the property line but inside of an easement. He pointed out where the gate would be installed.

Ms. Stone understood the driveway gate. She asked how far was the other gate was from the addition.

Mr. Rasch said it was about 8'.

Mr. Purvis said the vehicle gate was 12' wide.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the gate was at the easement and would allow them to drive into the back of the property.

Ms. Stone asked if there was any change to the casita.

Mr. Rasch said no.

Ms. Stone asked if they would use her lane for construction vehicles. Last time they took out a section. The lane didn't support a lot of heavy equipment.

She guessed no carports would be put up.

Regarding the lighting she said most of the people living there didn't leave on outside lighting. She asked if that could be taken in consideration. The way they were now it lights up her whole house.

Dr. Kantner agreed it must have a sconce on it so it didn't shine into other properties.

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

Mr. Purvis said there was no anticipation of access from the north side. The fence that was down would be rehabilitated. They would also comply with the ordinance that lights cannot shine on other property.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-014 with the conditions that gates and repairs would be of the same material of the fencing with stringers on the inside and lighting would be taken to staff for review and approval. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 4. Case-H-11-033. 306 Delgado Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michelle L. Gaugy, owner/agent proposes to remodel a contributing property by removing a coyote fence to construct a parking space with a brick finish, a 2'6" high stuccoed wall, and planters. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

306 Delgado Street is a residential structure that was originally constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style by 1928. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the east and south elevations are designated as primary.

On May 24, 2011, the HDRB postponed action pending submittal of a redesigned proposal. Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following three items.

1. An existing 4.5 – 6' high coyote fence will be removed from the front edge of the property and a 2.5' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed in the same location.

2. An existing brick patio will be extended over a parking area and the same brick will be used to surface a planter around the gas meter and a planter.

3. A concrete ramp will be installed at the front entrance per ADA requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the condition that the ramp shall be finished with brick or the concrete shall be colored an earth tone or brick color. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Walker asked if was finished with concrete, why staff would allow a brick colored concrete. Mr. Rasch said he recommended it be colored than grey.

Chair Mather asked if it was part of the coyote fence or the entire fence. Mr. Rasch said it was entire.

Present and sworn was Ms. Michelle Gaugy who said she made changes according to the Board's directions. She made the brick just a four foot walkway down the middle because the Board didn't like all that brick. She met with city staff on the ADA parking requirements and found that contrary to what she said before that she didn't need rigid material for wheel chairs but just tamped down gravel. So that was what the redesign had so people with high heels would have a walk way 4' wide. Also, now the adobe wall that matched her neighbor's exactly.

Ms. Walker asked if the doors were on the south elevation. Ms. Gaugy agreed.

Chair Mather asked for public comment and reminded the public that the Board had no jurisdiction on zoning, parking or use.

Public Comment -

Present and sworn was Ms. Reggie Cox, 314 Delgado said this had been proposed as a gallery and information center and wanted to know if the proposed use was still the same.

She also wanted to know the details on signage and if it would be lighted.

She asked the Board to please remember their concerns over the problems with zoning and parking and specifically about parking in front of her house. This would change the character of this block forever so remember the removal of the coyote fence.

Mr. Rasch reported having been working with land use staff. He said it wouldn't be an information center but a gallery. Signs were not approved by the Board but by the Building Permit Division. Dominic Gonzales was the staff person to contact.

Ms. Walker asked if the sign had to be wood. Mr. Rasch said that was not true - just size and colors but not materials.

Ms. Walker remembered a sign on Palace had to be taken down because it was not a wooden sign.

Present and sworn was Ms. Marilyn Bane, 622.5B Canyon Road, who said she was speaking on behalf of the coyote fence. It was testified that there were no other coyote fences on Delgado. But there were seven of them and not all were right on the street. She wanted to reinforce that the coyote fences were part of the character of that street.

Also she was appalled at what happened to the coyote fence on or about June 11th. It now was very different from the pictures in the packet. She thought it was important to keep that fence because it was a defining characteristic although not part of the house next door.

She asked the Board to please think about the coyote fence.

Present and sworn was Mr. Pen La Farge 647 Old Santa Fé Trail also speaking on behalf of the coyote fence and more directly to a wider concern of harmony with the street. He was glad to hear it was going to be a gallery. He believed the Board did have jurisdiction over a coffee house according to the ordinance. That portion of the street was residential and people who lived there saw it as a precedent to turn their own residences into commercial uses.

Chair Mather clarified again that the Board didn't have control over use of building there.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He added that in the non-conformity rule, if a proposal was for non-conforming use it would be a special exception at the Board of Adjustment.

Chair Mather said that exception had been granted.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It was for Arts & Crafts use and was on the boundary of that commercial district.

Ms. Walker commented that the A/C was not a straight line boundary. It was complicated.

There were no other speakers regarding this case.

Ms. Gaugy said she was very sympathetic with those concerns. She wouldn't dream of doing what the gallery across the street did. There were coyote fences on Delgado but every single one of them were on side walls. She had photos of all of them. There was not one single fence on Delgado on the street except this one. It was actually aberrant here.

She handed out copies of the photos to the Board [Exhibit B].

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H 11-033 with the condition that the 2½' length of adobe wall not be adobe but a coyote fence. It didn't have to be thick but could be relatively thin to allow to be seen through and not terribly tall but at least three feet high. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker asked for clarification on the surface issue. She asked if it was brick or something else.

Mr. Acton thought it was brick.

Dr. Kantner was not particularly happy with the four foot section. It wasn't what he had in mind.

Mr. Acton agreed that the sidewalk was misconstrued in the conversation.

Mr. Katz added to his motion that the brick that was currently there could come out to the road to the edge of the existing gate and that the coyote fence be new fencing.

Ms. Walker suggested using the old wood if it was not rotten.

The Board discussed the fence height.

Mr. Katz added to his motion that the fence height would be at the bottom of the window.

Chair Mather restated the motion to include coyote fencing with new or used wood to the height of bottom of window and the brick would extend out to the street and edge of gate.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Mather told Ms. Gaugy that Mr. Rasch could answer any question for her about the decision.

J. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #H-11-048. 142 Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Naktin, agent for David Bigby, owner proposes to remodel the rear enclosed patio at a non-contributing property by removing a shed, replacing doors with windows, and resetting the brick paving in a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

142 West Palace Avenue, known as the Palace Restaurant, was constructed in the Territorial Revival style at an unknown date. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic

District.

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

1. Lean-to sheds will be removed.
2. French doors in the west elevation will be removed and replaced with divided-lite windows that are based upon original 1961 drawings.
3. Brightly painted elements and bamboo screening will be removed and a white-painted board fence with board pedestrian gates will be installed to the maximum allowable height of 8'.
4. The patio surface will be leveled and reinstalled with brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Naktin, 1334 Pacheco, who said they wouldn't know what was underneath until they removed the plywood. If it was in good shape, they would retain what was there.

Mr. Acton asked if he was willing to restucco with the same color if they uncovered the wall and found it in good shape.

Mr. Naktin agreed. They would try to tie in with what was next door and restore that building facade if possible.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-048 per staff recommendations. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-11-049. 363 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Steve William, agent for Patricia La Farge, owner proposes to remodel a contributing property by replacing non historic windows, installing a skylight, reroofing, restuccoing, repairing or replacing yardwall opening lintels, and repairing the sidewalk. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

363 Garcia Street is a single family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style between 1920 and 1927. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District

and the west elevation may be considered as primary.

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

1. Non-historic windows will be removed and replaced with 2-over-2 simulated divided-lite windows in the existing openings.

2. a tubular skylight will be installed so that it is not visible above the parapet.

3. The tar and gravel roof will be removed and replaced with a sprayed-foam roof.

4. The deteriorated headers on openings in the yardwall will be repaired or replaced as needed.

5. The residence and yardwall will be restuccoed with El Rey cementitious "Adobe".

6. The deteriorated concrete sidewalk will be removed and replaced with an earth-toned concrete sidewalk.

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.

Ms. Walker asked if the windows were simulated divided light windows. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Dr. Kantner noted that the two over two window pattern was different from the existing six over six.

Mr. Rasch explained that there was no evidence of what it replaced so it would be conjecture.

Chair Mather asked if the concrete had to be replaced. Mr. Rasch was not sure.

Ms. Walker liked it as dirt.

Present and sworn was Mr. Steve William who had nothing to add to the staff report. He thought the suggestion about earthen sidewalk would work well. It just needed something that was stable.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H 11-049 as submitted with either a dirt or cement sidewalk. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-11-051. 250 E. Alameda.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residences owners, proposes to construct a 5,370 sq. ft. 3-story addition to match existing adjacent height on a non-contributing property. (David

Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

250 East Alameda Street, known as El Castillo, was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1963 with additional structures in the late 1990s. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct a 5,370 square foot three-story addition to match existing adjacent height. The building massing and all finishes will match the existing conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application as complying with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Duty, 404 Kiva Ct., who said they got DRC approval. It was an important needed addition to El Castillo. It only added 10 beds but allowed them to remodel to single occupancy from double occupancy. It would fit over the garage.

Ms. Walker asked what would happen to the windows on the west facing second story units by the drive at De Vargas.

Mr. Duty said it was offset from that building by about 16' so those windows would remain with no change to balconies or windows. It was open space with a drive underneath to give two means of egress.

Mr. Acton noted in looking at the scale of structures along DeVargas that it was a very narrow lane with a predominance of one-story structures on two story. This would be 2.5 stories with the open face unbroken. He didn't have a problem with verticality elsewhere except that west wing. The third floor plan went all the way out to the south elevation and he had trouble seeing that instead of stepping of the massing that appeared elsewhere at El Castillo.

Dr. Kantner noted the sheer face there and was concerned with the decks and wondered if one way would be to open up the decks so they would have stepping back.

Mr. Duty said the decks were designed in the L shaped building to step back from Brother's Lane. It was the third floor if you count parking. If the patio were unroofed it would step it back somewhat. El Castillo protects residents from the sun and without that there would not be much protection. He was sensitive to that comment.

Dr. Kantner asked if he was using stuccoed pillars between openings as opposed to the posts on the existing structure.

Mr. Duty said there were both but those balconies repeated what was on the west and front. He had no problem doing columns instead of stuccoed pillars. It could be either way.

Chair Mather pointed out between the west building and this new construction there was a second floor that was not shown on the elevations. She asked what folks would be looking into there.

Mr. Duty said the set back was 16'. They would be looking into the facade of that building. But it was a landlocked situation. The questions were brought up by the residents. They would still have the same amount of light but not a great view - It was a fact of life.

Chair Mather went to the south elevation and asked if they were doors that went to uncovered decks on second and third floor.

Mr. Duty said they were windows and it was not much of a setback. There were two openings there so there was precedent for uncovered decks. He showed an elevation (photograph showing the tree cover).

Mr. Katz had a problem that it was not present in the new part as it was in the old part. Using uncovered decks would do it. There was also a segment jutting out to the south.

Mr. Duty said it was not a flat facade and was a big factor. There was no problem having the top deck be a walled area if the Board felt that would improve it.

Dr. Kantner said he would defer to a builder but there were just a lot of sheer facades and he would like to see step backs.

Mr. Duty said he could do that. It was important to understand the L shape and how it set way back.

Mr. Rasch read the ordinance regarding setbacks.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case #H 11-051 until the next meeting to give time for revised drawings. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Duty saw an opportunity on the south side of the western end of the L. The building was only about two stories at that point. He could avoid the loss of a unit there. He pointed out that part of it was with larger rooms. He could put a deck on the end of that unit.

Dr. Kantner said he could also pull out the lower floor.

Mr. Duty said they had transformers there that should be moved. The end of that was only about 22' wide and was the only portion of the southern part that was really on the street and could be most beneficial.

Mr. Acton said the height of the rail would want to be aligned with the one and a half section.

Mr. Duty agreed. They would be within inches of matching.

Mr. Acton moved to postpone Case #H 11-051 for modification that included stepping back the third floor unit on the south elevation to allow for a deck in the manner that accorded with the angle of the portal intersect with the west elevation of the south facing unit, and that the third story portal roof be removed to the extent of the proposal. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Dr. Kantner agreed they needed to give him latitude and he knew what the Board wanted there.

Mr. Acton thought perhaps a pergola could be put up there.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Rasch asked Mr. Duty to change his posted sign to July 12, the date of the next meeting. Mr. Duty agreed.

- 4. Case #H-11-052. 224 Maynard Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc., agent for Gertrude Krasin, owner, proposes to demolish a non-contributing structure. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

224 Maynard Street is a single-family residential structure that was constructed in a vernacular manner between 1933 and 1939. Remodeling and additions after 1945 overwhelm the original historic integrity and the building is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

A water leak last winter severely compromised the rear two-story adobe structure and the applicant is requesting to demolish the entire building. The City Building Official has determined that the structure is unstable. The building is not of historic importance and it does not establish an essential part of the streetscape. No replacement structure is proposed at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application as having met the demolition standards (Section 14-3.14).

Chair Mather asked if it would not affect the building behind. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Krasin who said they expected to keep the fence in front and thought they could save the tree there.

Chair Mather asked what caused the leak.

Mr. Krasin said over the unit the studio had a pipe that burst.

Mr. Acton saw where it would benefit from removal but wanted to be convinced about the first floor.

Mr. Krasin said right after the freeze and damage they talked to a lot of people and the engineer. The shared adobe wall was compromised. The engineer thought it would all have to come down. The footings were not that great.

Mr. Acton asked if the poor foundation continued around the one story structure.

Mr. Krasin agreed - and the shared adobe wall had to be built. There was also the possibility of mold. It had been since January. There were so many questions that they thought it would be easier to take it down. This was important to his mom's situation. She currently lived in the house but would need assisted living soon. If they could take it down, it would make a huge difference in selling it to help with her expenses.

Ms. Walker said there was a letter from Mr. Garcia in addition to Mr. Purdy and Mr. Enfield.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-052 per staff recommendations. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H-11-056. 420 Hillside Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Kate Leriche, agent for Leo Martinez, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing residence by altering windows and doors, installing storm windows, removing a deck, remodeling a non-contributing casita by adding approximately 146 sq. ft. and increasing the height from 8'9" to 10'9" where the maximum allowable height was 15'3" and to increase the street facing yardwall to the maximum allowable height of 62". (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

420 Hillside Avenue is a single-family residence and free-standing casita that were constructed in a vernacular manner in the 1930s. The primary residence is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and the north and east elevations may be considered as primary. The casita is listed as non-contributing.

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

1. The north and east primary elevation historic windows will be repaired and maintained and storm windows will be installed on the exteriors along with storm windows on the west elevation.
2. A window on the east elevation will be removed and replaced with a door with no change to header height and opening width.
3. Windows and window locations on the south elevation will be altered and the wooden deck leading to the second floor will be removed.
4. A 146 square foot addition will be constructed on the northeast corner of the casita. The exterior character and finishes will match existing conditions.
5. The height of the casita will be increased from 8'9" to 10'9" where the maximum allowable height is 15' 3".
6. The front yardwall is damaged and deteriorated. The wall will be increased to the maximum allowable height of 62".

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Kate Leriche, 1334 Pacheco, who clarified in reference to the door where there was a window. The head height needed to be higher where the window was. It was not visible from the street and she hoped the Board could see fit to do that.

Mr. Rasch clarified it was on the east elevation and was primary. An exception was required.

Mr. Katz asked if they would need to postpone it for notice and response to exception criteria.

Mr. Rasch said he had recommended north and east but the Board hadn't designated a primary elevation yet.

Mr. Katz suggested that the wall be dropped a little lower than five feet to get a good view across.

Ms. Leriche asked if that could be from the second gate on the left to step that wall down a foot and a half.

Mr. Katz agreed that would work.

Mr. Acton was confused. He hated to just change the status of a primary facade but asked if it would be possible to just vet those questions now.

Mr. Rasch said it could not be done because exceptions had to be posted.

Chair Mather thought the ordinance didn't prohibit raising the opening.

Mr. Rasch agreed but it had been the Board's practice.

Ms. Brennan agreed that practice had meaning. With respect to an exception, notice must be given and questions answered. So it could not be done at this meeting.

Chair Mather guessed they would need to postpone it then.

Dr. Kantner asked if the Board should approve the rest.

Mr. Acton thought they could amend the permit later.

Public Comment -

Present and sworn was Mr. Raymond Herrera whose concern was the color of the stucco and also that they were not planning to use cementitious stucco. The adjoining house had cementitious stucco and it would take away from it if this one was allowed to be STO. He also was concerned about the height of the wall.

Mr. Rasch suggested it would be best to assign the primary elevation first.

Ms. Walker moved that the east (north part of east) and north elevations be primary. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Walker thought they should postpone the case.

Mr. Acton thought a building permit could be amended later.

Ms. Leriche was fine with postponing it to July 12.

Ms. Walker moved to postpone Case #H 11-056 to the July 12 meeting. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-11-057. 1005 E. Alameda Street, Unit F.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Charles C. Newman, agent for Magdalena Gehriglister, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 232 sq. ft. ramada to a height of 9'6" on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1005 East Alameda Street, known as the Rodriguez House, was a single-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner before 1900. Alterations and additions to this structure have caused the building to lose its historic integrity. This structure and non-historic structures are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct a free-standing ramada at Unit F. The ramada will be 232 square feet at 9' 6" high. The structure will be constructed with wood timbers and aluminum louvers to alter shading. Stuccoed bancos will be constructed under the ramada.

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.

Dr. Kantner asked for clarification that aluminum was an acceptable material.

Mr. Rasch said the ordinance was not that specific.

Chair Mather asked if it was mechanized. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Acton asked if there were some alterations.

Present and sworn was Mr. Dale Zinn who had more information to share. He explained that Charles Newman was in the hospital.

This was a resolution of the aluminum awning. The sketch explained that they had a narrow beam that encapsulated the entire trellis and would be a medium brown color. It echoed some existing trellises and would be stained wood.

Mr. Acton asked if the 4x4 wood trellis spanned the whole length of it.

Mr. Zinn said there was a main beam down the middle but yes.

Mr. Acton was curious about the height because of the height of the existing residence behind it. It was 9' 6" so the bottom was 8' 6". It was 9' 4" at the top.

Present and sworn was Ms. Magdalena Gehriglister who said that a two inch change made no difference to her.

Mr. Acton wanted it to be secondary to the structure behind it. She appreciated the modification

because the drawings they had were very diagrammatic. The house was a nice soft pueblo adobe and they wanted a pergola that carried on that spirit. She would feel better if the pergola was lowered so bottom of beam was changed. The 4x12 beam would be an 8x12.

Mr. Zinn said that metal was only 8 " deep so a 10" or 8" beam - as shallow as possible - would work. That lowered it another two inches

Mr. Acton wanted it to work for everyone. There were issues about the beautiful old wood in this residence and want reassurance this structure would harmonize with it. So the Board would have some issues on the nature of the beam and the height of the structure. He proposed lowering it so that the bottom of the beam could be 8x10.

Mr. Zinn said the posts would be bigger.

Mr. Acton thought a viga post would be very good.

Ms. Gehrhilster said she appreciated her house very much. This had been designed in colors to fit the ramada already there.

Mr. Acton asked if the existing one had six inch posts.

Ms. Gehrhilster agreed. They were viga posts.

Mr. Zinn showed pictures of it.

Ms. Gehrhilster said this one was bigger so it would work.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H 11-057 with the following conditions:

- 1. That the height of the ramada be lowered so that the 8x10 beam be at 8' above finished grade;**
- 2. That the supporting viga posts be 8" in diameter minimum at mid height;**
- 3. That the finish on the wood match the existing pergola.**

Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 7. Case #H-11-058. 303 E. Berger Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Terry Ballone, agent for Ed Aldworth and Marcia Southwick, owners, proposes to extend an existing side lot line yardwall at the existing height and repair an historic braided wire fence on a contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

303 East Berger Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the 1930s. A free-standing studio was constructed at a non-historic date. The residence is listed as contributing and the studio as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. The deteriorated wooden posts at the historic braided-wire fence will be replaced and the fence straightened upon reinstallation.

2. A section of non-historic wire fencing will be removed and replaced with stuccoed block wall to match the existing wall at 6' high.

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.

Chair Mather commented that evidently there were lot line problems with the new fencing and asked if it would be moved back.

Mr. Rasch agreed - anywhere it was encroaching now.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ed Aldworth 303 East Berger, who said he wanted to make it as simple as possible because Mr. Rasch explained it well. He was asking permission to rehabilitate a wire fence which to his amazement was a historic wire fence. They wanted it back on their property. They also wanted to extend the stucco existing wall to the north lot line (19' 3").

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H 11-058 per staff recommendations. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-11-054. 544 Agua Fria A& B.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Sanbusco Corporation., owners, proposes to construct a 10 sq. ft. addition to connect two significant structures together and to install pedestrian gates in existing yardwalls. An exception was request to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

544-A Agua Fria Street, formerly known as the Baca Store or the Pino Store, was constructed in a vernacular manner by 1930. 544-B Agua Fria Street was constructed in the Hipped Box style by 1928. Both structures are listed as significant to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

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

1. The two structures will be enclosed as one building by constructing a 10 square foot addition between them. An exception is requested to place an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required exception criteria statements are provided at the end of this report.

The addition will be physically and visually set off from the two structures without attachment to the ground and will be glass fronted so as not to add visual massing.

2. Coyote latilla fencing and pedestrian gates at 5' high will be constructed to enclose an outdoor dining area.

- I The new construction being proposed is not only extremely small (approximately 8 square feet), but is set back 40 feet from the street facade of 544-A, and can barely be seen from Agua Fria. It has been designed as to not damage the streetscape or the two buildings it connects. The intent of the design is to maintain the visual separation of the individual structures. It is setback from the corners of the existing stucco facades, and has a glass facade to maintain the transparency.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- II The two buildings that are to be connected are staggered on the lot, but for about five feet, they sit only 18-inches apart. It is this small gap that we are proposing to span. The zoning department requires that buildings on the same lot have a ten foot separation between them. By adding this connection, the buildings will be in compliance with this requirement since they will no longer be separate structures.

The new passageway will also enable Raaga Restaurant to add about 600 square feet of dining space in 544-A to the 400 square feet of dining they now have at 544-B, doubling the size of this business.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- III This proposed passageway will not have a negative impact on the unique heterogeneous character of the City since it does not change the appearance of the two existing buildings.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- IV The proximity of the two historic buildings creates a special circumstance by which adding a small passageway between them is considered doubling the size of both existing structures. In reality, there is only eight square feet being added between the two buildings while maintaining their individual character.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- V The close proximity of these two buildings on the same property, which was not a result of any action by the owner or tenant, creates a circumstance that is unique to this property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- VI We feel the solution presented here does not have a negative impact on the streetscape or the purpose of the Historic District criteria, but will have a very positive impact on the tenant's business and his patrons.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) and to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Dr. Kantner asked about the rest of the new addition.

Mr. Rasch didn't believe the rear was glass fronted.

Present and sworn was Mr. Steve Sanderson who said Mr. Rasch did a good job. The glass they wanted was so the addition would disappear and if the Board wanted frosted he might consider it but felt clear would be best. It would be built so it could be removed later. The back was stucco and they had a drainage consideration. The roofs overlapped each other. They should be flat and inconspicuous and not hitting the eave line of either structure. They were proposing coyote gates to enclose the patio. If the Board wanted a little coyote in front of the passageway they could consider it. The best approach was to make the connections go away.

Mr. Acton asked if the City had a requirement regarding maximum pane size.

Mr. Rasch said there was none in this district.

Dr. Kantner asked why this didn't require an exception for a new opening.

Mr. Rasch said they often got a project that had several exceptions. The Board did need to approve an exception even though it was more than one code section.

Chair Mather said it would put this historic building back into action.

Mr. Sanderson said the existing restaurant was vacant for a couple of years. Sanbusco was fortunate to get a successful tenant who wanted more space. He passed out enhanced drawings that Mr. Rasch had requested. [Exhibit C].

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-054 as recommended by staff with a requirement that the glass be clear and the rest stuccoed as proposed and exception criteria were met. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 9. Case #H-11-055. 1047A Camino San Acacio.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Martínez, agent for Christopher Boehm, owner, proposes to enclose an existing carport on a non-contributing property. An exception was requested to match non-conforming windows that exceed the 30" glazing rule (Section 14-5.2 (E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1047A Camino San Acacio was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the 1970s. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the structure by enclosing an existing carport. The roof will be raised 6" for installation of insulation. The north wall will also be insulated and restuccoed. An exception is requested to match existing non-conforming single-lite windows, but responses to the exception criteria were not submitted. Rather, the applicant cites the code standard differences between "Old Santa Fe Style" and "Recent Santa Fe Style" as to why an exception is not needed, since these windows are not publicly-visible.

(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards

The Governing Body recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the City from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with adobe, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a development from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

(1) Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with adobe, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

- (c)** Solid wall space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than 30 inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section; (i.e. under portals in Recent Santa Fe Style).

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be

that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

e) The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and portales on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; except that buildings with portales may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portales only. Deep window recesses are characteristic;

The staff and Board have required simulated or true-divided lites for all windows in this district whether publicly-visible or not, except under portals. Practice has used the 30" rule citation from Old Santa Fe Style. While the Recent Santa Fe Style standard requires that (only) publicly visible windows shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; larger single lite windows are not traditional. Since Recent Santa Fe Style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings, the consistent practice has been to require traditional lite patterns for all windows in this district unless an exception is granted.

Previous actions of the Board have been to harmonize additions or alterations with existing character. A divided-lite exception has always or at least mostly been granted to achieve harmony with existing character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to install large single-lite windows. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Mather asked if this needed an exception.

Mr. Rasch believed it did but added that the rewrite would allow harmonizing without an exception.

Ms. Brennan said the Board was allowed to consider this case.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Boehme who said he loved the house and it was architecturally consistent and had no divided windows. It was at the end of a cul de sac.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H 11-055 as recommended by staff and accepting the exception criteria responses. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Walker moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Approved by:

Christine Mather, Chair Pro Tem

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer