



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 7.3.12 TIME 1:56

SERVL BY Camille Veyl

RECEIVED BY R. Ortiz

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, July 10, 2012 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, July 10, 2012 at 5:30 P.M.

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: June 26, 2012
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-105b 237 & 239 E. de Vargas St.
Case #H-12-042A 566 Camino del Monte Sol
Case #H-12-042B 566 Camino del Monte Sol
Case #H-12-034 202 Irvine Street

Case #H-12-049 616 E. Alameda
Case #H-12-050 219 Shelby Street
Case #H-12-051 711 Don Cubero Alley

- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-12-054. Paseo de Peralta @ Cross of the Martyrs. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. City of Santa Fe, Public Works Dept., agent/owner, proposes to install a sidewalk and construct a retaining wall on the north side, up to 6' in height where the maximum allowable height is 4'6". A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-11-095. 124 E. Marcy Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Barbara Felix, agent for Davis Select Advisors, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to replace 13 roof-mounted mechanical units with 6 units and construct screen walls on a non-contributing commercial building. A height exception has already been approved. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-12-052. 843 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Deborah Werenko, agent/owner, proposes to change windows and doors and make other modifications to a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
4. Case #H-12-053. 540 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Northington Proprietor, LLC, owners, proposes to stucco two brick yard walls and increase the height to 6' and construct two coyote gates on a contributing property. (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-12-014B. 428 San Antonio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing garage by adding a 456 sq. ft. approximately 10'5" high addition, which will include construction of two pergolas and installation of photovoltaic rooftop equipment. Two exceptions are requested: to construct an addition to a contributing building that exceeds 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (John Murphy).
6. Case #H-12-015. 428 San Antonio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a significant residence by constructing a 200 sq. ft. portal, adding windows and doors, installing photovoltaic rooftop equipment, and constructing a 5' high stucco yardwall. Three exceptions are requested: to construct an addition to a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)); to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)); and to create an opening where one does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)). (John Murphey).
7. Case #H-11-133B. 1228 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney/Kenneth Payson, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residence by removing sections of roof, replacing windows and doors, and constructing a wall approximately 6' in height. (John Murphey).
8. Case #H-12-048. 421 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gary and Saude Sievert, owners, proposes to replace existing side yard coyote fence with 5'6" high wrought-iron fence with 6' high stucco-faced pilasters and stucco a low wall of a contributing commercial building. (John Murphey).
9. Case #H-12-037. 414 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Robert and Lora Sandroni, owners, proposes to construct a 77 sq. ft. addition, a 216 sq. ft. pergola, 4' high yardwalls, and other hardscaping on a significant property. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6/20/12 TIME 3:30 PM
BY *Canulle*
FILED BY *SS*

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, July 10, 2012 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, July 10, 2012 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 26, 2012
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-1095 124 E. Marcy Street
Case #H-11-105B 237 & 239 E. de Vargas St.
Case #H-12-042A 566 Camino del Monte Sol
Case #H-12-042B 566 Camino del Monte Sol
Case #H-12-034 202 Irvine Street

Case #H-12-049 616 E. Alameda
Case #H-12-050 219 Shelby Street
Case #H-12-051 711 Don Cubero Alley
Case #H-12-054 Paseo de Peralta @ Cross of the Martyrs

- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-12-052. 843 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Deborah Werenko, agent/owner, proposes to change windows and doors and make other modifications to a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
2. Case #H-12-053. 540 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Northington Proprietor, LLC, owners, proposes to stucco two brick yard walls and increase the height to 6' and construct two coyote gates on a contributing property. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-12-014B. 428 San Antonio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing garage by adding a 456 sq. ft. approximately 10'5" high addition, which will include construction of two pergolas and installation of photovoltaic rooftop equipment. Two exceptions are requested: to construct an addition to a contributing building that exceeds 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (John Murphy).

4. Case #H-12-015. 428 San Antonio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a significant residence by constructing a 200 sq. ft. portal, adding windows and doors, installing photovoltaic rooftop equipment, and constructing a 5' high stucco yardwall. Three exceptions are requested: to construct an addition to a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)); to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)); and to create an opening where one does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)). (John Murphey).
5. Case #H-11-133B. 1228 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney/Kenneth Payson, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-contributing residence by removing sections of roof, replacing windows and doors, and constructing a wall approximately 6' in height. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-12-048. 421 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gary and Saude Sievert, owners, proposes to replace existing side yard coyote fence with 5'6" high wrought-iron fence with 6' high stucco-faced pilasters and stucco a low wall of a contributing commercial building. (John Murphey).
7. Case #H-12-037. 414 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Robert and Lora Sandroni, owners, proposes to construct a 77 sq. ft. addition, a 216 sq. ft. pergola, 4' high yardwalls, and other hardscaping on a significant property. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

July 10, 2012

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
Approval of Minutes		
June 26, 2012	Approved as amended	2
Communications	Discussion	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2-3
Business from the Floor	None	3
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H 12-054</u>	Approved as proposed	3-5
Cross of the Martyrs		
2. <u>Case #H-11-095</u>	Approved with conditions	6-7
124 East Marcy		
3. <u>Case #H-12-052</u>	Approved with conditions	7-9
843 Don Cubero Avenue		
4. <u>Case #H-12-053</u>	Approved as recommended	9-11
540 E. Alameda		
5. <u>Case #H-12-014B</u>	Approved with conditions	11-18
428 San Antonio		
6. <u>Case #H-12-015</u>	Approved with conditions	18-27
428 San Antonio		
7. <u>Case #H-11-133B</u>	Approved as recommended	27-28
1228 Cerro Gordo Road		
8. <u>Case #H-12-048</u>	Approved with conditions	28-29
421 Canyon Road		
9. <u>Case #H-12-037</u>	Approved with conditions	29-35
414 Acequia Madre		
Matters from the Board	None	35
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:00 p.m.	35-36

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

July 10, 2012

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 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. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
Mr. Rad Acton
Dr. John Kantner
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair [excused]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. John Murphey, Senior Historic Planner
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assistant City Attorney [arriving later]
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. Katz moved to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JUNE 26, 2012

Mr. Katz requested a change on page 4 to say, "Mr. Katz suggested the findings say, 'The Board pointed out that the reduction in width related to the setback. The Board wanted the gate narrower so it could be set back further without impeding the parking area.'"

Ms. Walker asked why the one case was requested verbatim by Geno Zamora.

Mr. Rasch said the potential appellant requested them.

Vice Chair Rios requested a change on page 18 where it should say, "How much are you requesting this evening?"

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of June 26, 2012 as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch handed out a condensation of Downtown & Eastside Historic District standards which a board member requested. He made this one about 7-8 years ago [attached as Exhibit 1].

F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-11-105b 237 & 239 E. de Vargas St.

Case #H-12-042A 566 Camino del Monte Sol

Case #H-12-042B 566 Camino del Monte Sol

Case #H-12-034 202 Irvine Street

Case #H-12-049 616 E. Alameda

Case #H-12-050 219 Shelby Street

Case #H-12-051 711 Don Cubero Alley

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

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

There was no business from the floor.

Vice Chair Rios announced to the public that anyone who wished to appeal a decision of the Board had fifteen days to file a protest to City Council from the date of approval of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case #H-12-054. Paseo de Peralta @ Cross of the Martyrs.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. City of Santa Fé, Public Works Dept., agent/owner, proposes to install a sidewalk and construct a retaining wall on the north side, up to 6' in height where the maximum allowable height is 4'6". A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2 (D)(9)). (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The City of Santa Fe, Public Works Department proposes to construct an earth-toned sidewalk, curb, and gutter along the road section that fronts the Cross of the Martyrs on Paseo de Peralta. In order to gain enough level space for the sidewalk, the hillside must be cut and a retaining wall constructed. The wall will be stuccoed to match the other walls and it will vary in height from 3' to 6' where the maximum allowable height is 4' 6". A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)) and the exception criteria responses are below.

HEIGHT EXCEPTION FOR STREET-FRONTING YARDWALL

1. Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

No. Existing adjacent retaining walls at Cross of the Martyrs were measured at 7'6", exceeding the 4'6" maximum height recommended by the Historic Preservation Division. The proposed wall will connect to two existing retaining walls, Cross of the Martyrs on the west side and Girls Inc. wall on the east side.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response that there are other adjacent walls that are taller than the average.

2. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

Earth retaining wall allow for the construction of pedestrian facilities (i.e. sidewalk) and accessibility for the disabled. Will provide an area for pedestrian use where none currently exists and help prevent unsafe pedestrian travel across and within roadway vehicular travel lanes.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response.

3. 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.

Wall design proposes use of stucco exterior, colored to match the existing walls at the Cross of Martyrs to which it connects. If during construction a lower height is found to be feasible due to field conditions, Public Works staff can effect the change.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response.

4. 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.

Special conditions involve existing high fill/steep slopes making an earth retaining structure necessary in order to provide sufficient area for pedestrian facilities (i.e. sidewalk). Wall height was determined based on fill height behind the proposed wall.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response that adjacent properties have existing retaining walls which this slope does not yet have.

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

Special conditions involve existing high fill/steep slopes making an earth retaining structure necessary in order to provide sufficient area for pedestrian facilities (i.e. sidewalk). Wall height was determined based on fill height behind the proposed wall.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response that the slope is an existing condition.

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

A wall structure will be constructed where none currently exists. However, the proposed wall will connect to two existing retaining walls, Cross of the Martyrs on the west side and Girls Inc. wall on the east side and is proposed to be of the same form, style, color, proportion, texture and material.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the height exception and the application as submitted which complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Mr. Rasch referred to the site plan that he handed out [attached as Exhibit 2].

Mr. Eric Martínez, Roadway and Trails Division Director, explained he was present to seek approval and said the purpose was to provide pedestrian accessibility on the north side of Paseo de Peralta where they had seen dangerous pedestrian movements across Paseo de Peralta from the south side to the north side. It was an area with a sharp curve and hard for vehicular drivers to see pedestrians. The project would provide a retaining wall and sides.

Ms. LeAnn Valdez was the project engineer and put everything together and did the field reconnaissance.

Mr. Acton thought when it abutted the Girls' Inc. sidewalk it went from a 5' width to 3' and asked why.

Mr. Martínez explained it was to avoid having to do additional work to the existing wall there.

Ms. Mather noted they had about 8-9 pages of different curb cuts and wondered if they were from different proposals.

Mr. Martínez clarified that they were DOT standards to build curb ramps. There was only one in the project and was at Hillside at Peralta in the type B style

Mr. Rasch said it was shown on page 16

Mr. Acton asked if the tinted concrete would match what was at the base of the Cross of the Martyrs or be a new one color.

Mr. Martínez said it was the color the City had been using on all historic projects. He didn't know if it matched the concrete at the base at Cross of the Martyrs.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-12-054 including approval for the height exception. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-11-095. 124 E. Marcy Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Barbara Felix, agent for Davis Select Advisors, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to replace 13 roof-mounted mechanical units with 6 units and construct screen walls on a non-contributing commercial building. A height exception has already been approved. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

124 Marcy Street is a two-story commercial building that was constructed in 1960 in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On September 13, 2011, the HDRB granted approval for a height exception to construct stuccoed screening in three masses for six units of roof-mounted mechanical equipment. The existing parapets exceed the maximum allowable height of 18'8" on Nusbaum Street and 20'2" on East Marcy Street.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the previous approval for the screening because changes were made to the equipment. The screens will be moved closer to the west, south, and east parapets and an additional screen will be constructed on the east side of the roof at almost 2' lower than the previously approved height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application with the previous height exception which complies to Section 14-5.2(D)(9) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the existing equipment would not be further screened but the new equipment would be screened.

Vice Chair Rios asked if all the screening would be stuccoed.

Mr. Rasch said they would use sanded paint.

Mr. Acton referred to the bottom image of the south elevation and asked if that was a section of duct that cantilevered out.

Mr. Rasch said it was duct work and there was a new standard on how high duct work had to be above the roof which was rather excessive in his opinion.

Mr. Acton said he was referring to the protrusion on the right.

Mr. Rasch thought that might be a roof overhang.

Vice Chair Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Rasch said it was minimal but not de minimus so he needed to bring it back to the Board. It wasn't very disturbing

Present and sworn was Ms. Barbara Felix, 244 Casado, #4, who said they were surprised with this. It

was an old building and they found the roof didn't have the structural capability they thought it had so they were using actual roof joists to locate the equipment. She was not anticipating needing taller screens but they were larger screens. The screens would be metal panels on metal studs and have sanded paint because the roof couldn't support the weight of traditional stucco.

She added that there was nothing hanging over the roof.

Mr. Katz said he would have been happier to see an example of what it would look like - what the finish and panels would look like. The drawings were not very helpful.

Vice Chair Rios asked if it would look like stucco.

Ms. Felix said it would and a person would only see glimpses of the screen wall. They were longer than actually needed because of the winds load and wouldn't be as tall as originally designed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-11-095 per staff recommendations and noting the Board had previously approved the height exception. Mr. Acton seconded the motion.

Ms. Mather asked for a friendly amendment that the panels match the existing stucco. Ms. Walker accepted the amendment and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-12-052. 843 Don Cubero Avenue.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Deborah Werenko, agent/owner, proposes to change windows and doors and make other modifications to a contributing residence. (John Murphey).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Perched above grade on the tree-lined Don Cubero Street, the subject house is a one-story, stucco-clad Spanish Eclectic house. The style is expressed through its arched openings, cross-gabled form and low-pitched metal roof. Constructed in the 1930s, and displaying a high degree of historical integrity, it is contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Project

The applicant proposes a remodeling project to turn an unfinished basement into a bedroom. This will involve changing above-grade door and window openings at the southeast corner of the house to provide light to this space. Particular to HDRB review are the following items:

East Elevation

Replace triplet set of non-historic 1/1 double-hung windows at Study with taller set of true-divided light wood casement windows. This will involve lowering the existing sill to ground level. The horizontal rough opening and arch will remain. Applicant claims the existing windows were put in after a fire damaged this portion of the house.

South Elevation

Replace triplet set of wood casement windows at Study with taller set of true-divided light casements. This will involve lowering the existing sill to ground level. The horizontal rough opening and arch will remain.

Replace four-panel-and-glass wood door with true-divided 10-light window.

For egress, replace three wood, three-light horizontal basement windows with larger, vertically oriented true-divided light windows.

Areas of work will be patched with El Rey "Hacienda" cementitious stucco—a Board-approved color.

The southeast corner of the house is not visible from a public way.

Primary Façades

Staff recommends the street-facing north and west elevations (1, 2, 3, 7 and 8) as the primary facades for the residence. These elevations present the highest articulation of the architectural style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application, as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (H), Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Ms. Brennan arrived at 5:50 p.m.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the Board was designating primary facades. Mr. Murphey didn't know

Present and sworn was Ms. Deborah Werenko, 843 Don Cubero, who had nothing to add and agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. Rasch explained that the City didn't need to advertise primary elevations when needed.

Mr. Katz noticed that the south elevation was listed as one elevation but on page 27 it looked like it was divided into two different pieces - one with pitched roof and one with flat roof.

Mr. Rasch clarified it was considered as one façade since the setback was less than four feet.

Ms. Walker moved to designate as primary facades numbers 7, 8 on the west and 1, 2, 3 on

north. Ms. Mather seconded the motion.

Mr. Acton wanted to add the western portion of the south elevation under the pitched roof.

Ms. Walker asked if the Board could do that.

Vice Chair Rios reminded them that the south was considered one elevation.

Ms. Brennan said if it was not a façade she didn't think it should be considered separately.

Mr. Acton was okay with it.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Mather asked if the color of the new door would match existing. Ms. Werenko agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if the project would include any outside lighting.

Ms. Werenko said it would not.

Dr. Kantner asked if on the south elevation she was replacing a door with a window. Ms. Werenko agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H-12-052 with conditions that the windows would be true divided light, that the new colors would match existing and stucco would be cementitious. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-12-053. 540 E. Alameda.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Northington Proprietor, LLC, owners, proposes to stucco two brick yard walls and increase the height to 6' and construct two coyote gates on a contributing property. (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

540 East Alameda Street is a single-family residence that was constructed in the California Mission Revival style at approximately 1928-34. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. An existing 51' long 2' high brick wall will be increased to the maximum allowable height of 6' and

stuccoed to match the residence.

2. The 6' high yardwall will be extended from the south end toward the east at a 90 degree angle for a few feet.
3. Another 6' high stuccoed yardwall will be constructed across the driveway at near the middle of the 51' foot length of the existing wall and a bileaf coyote gate will be installed at the center.

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.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the application met the wall and fence guidelines. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Mather said when the Board received these plans they had no orientation on them and no indication of what was a building and what was a wall.

Ms. Walker asked what color the proposed stucco wall would be.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis 200 West Marcy who apologized about the lack of drawing orientation and said he would do better next time. The stucco color of the wall would match the stucco on the house.

Ms. Walker pointed out that he called it 450 Alameda and staff had 540 Alameda.

Ms. Mather said it was shown as 540 on the inventory and zoning sheet.

Mr. Purvis said then it was 540.

Vice Chair Rios asked what was publicly visible.

Mr. Purvis said hardly anything was but one could see it from the dirt part of Alameda. It was set back 40' from street and was perpendicular to the street. The coyote gate could be seen.

Mr. Acton concluded it comes toward the street and butts into a perpendicular wall. He asked if that was a six foot wall.

Mr. Purvis agreed and clarified it abutted the buttress there.

Ms. Mather asked if the brick at the base of the long wall would be stuccoed over. Purvis agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if there was any providence to that brick.

Mr. Purvis said he could not find it anywhere else on that property.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-053 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H-12-014B. 428 San Antonio.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a contributing garage by adding a 456 sq. ft. approximately 10'5" high addition, which would include construction of two pergolas and installation of photovoltaic rooftop equipment. Two exceptions were requested: to construct an addition to a contributing building that exceeds 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (John Murphy).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Constructed in c.1927, the garage at 428 San Antonio Street is a one-story, stucco-clad structure exhibiting a simplified Territorial Revival style harmonizing with the main house. The Board designated the building contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District at the March 13, 2012 hearing, selecting the east elevation as the primary facade.

At the same hearing, the current applicant proposed a remodeling project to turn the garage into a "studio" by reworking its interior and constructing a 456 sq. ft. addition across the north elevation. The addition proposed was more than 50% of the historic footprint and less than 10' back from a primary façade, requiring exceptions. Because these exceptions were not addressed in the application, the Board postponed review of the project.

The applicant has revised the project and addressed the exceptions.

Project **Existing Garage**

The project involves removing the hinged wood plank doors and replacing them with a multi-light wood door with sidelights. Three new window openings are planned for the south elevation. These will be multi-light wood windows with brick sills and Territorial Revival type lintels. The north wall will be altered with a new opening to connect with the proposed addition. Other work will involve installing a metal cap over the brick parapet and stuccoing the garage to match the house.

Addition

To the north elevation is proposed an approximately 456 sq. ft., 10'-5 high addition set back 5' from the 345

sq. ft., 11'-0" high garage. The addition will include attached pergolas on the north and east elevations. Its fenestration will consist of various multi-light wood windows and doors with Territorial Revival detail to harmonize with the main house. It will be clad with cementitious stucco. Photovoltaic panels are proposed for the rooftop, which the applicant claims will not be visible from a public way.

Exceptions

Two exceptions are requested: to construct an addition that exceeds 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and at a location not set back a minimum 10' from the primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). The following are the applicant's responses to the exceptions.

A) Request for exception for an addition to a contributing building that exceeds 50% of the area of the historic structure.

- (i) "Do not damage the character of the district;"

The west elevation appears to have been significantly altered in the mid 1980's when an historic porch was converted into a bedroom. This proposed portal will not damage the character of the district as it could be removed in the future and the original form and integrity of the historic property would be maintained.

Staff does not find this germane to the subject of the garage.

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

The applicant, without this addition, would not be able to enjoy a studio and guest bedroom, which would be a hardship because no additions can be made to the main house which is only one bedroom.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

This addition will not weaken the character of the city and will ensure the new resident can enjoy beneficial use.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The proposed new addition is on the non-primary and non-publicly visible façade of a contributing structure. The above are the special conditions and this situation is particular to this site.

Staff does not agree with statement.

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

The two facts that the west elevation was altered significantly in the mid-1980's and the façade is not publically visible is not a result of the applicant.

Staff does not find this germane to the subject of the garage.

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

The proposed portal allows for the least negative impact related to: A) The existing historical areas, the publically visible sides and front, and the historical unaltered portions of the façade are being retained in this proposal. B) The proposed portal will be in the preserved historic style. C) The proposed portal will be in harmony with the historic design of the building.

Staff does not find this germane to the subject of the garage.

C) Request for exception for an addition not set back a minimum of ten feet from the primary façade; the addition on the north elevation.

(i) "Do not damage the character of the district;"

The proposed addition is setback 4'-0" and we don't believe this addition impacts the contributing status of the garage as the primary façade isn't impacted.

Staff does not find this germane to the subject of the garage.

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

The addition, if offset ten feet, would become a space that would be unusable and not provide space for the functions proposed for the room.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

This lack of a ten foot offset will not weaken the unique character of the city and allows the resident more beneficial use of her proposed new studio.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The special condition is the majority of the homes have converted or incorporated their garages into the houses as either guesthouses or studios. It doesn't appear any other of the related homes on the streetscape have a garage either. So, this is particular to this property.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

When the owner purchased this property, the garage was unsurveyed and the owner felt an addition would be fine. When the survey was done, it was declared contributing with the east façade primary. This wasn't the result of the owner.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

The proposed addition being setback five feet from the primary façade allows for the least negative impact related to: A) The existing historical areas, the publically visible front, and the historical unaltered portions of the primary façade are being retained in this proposal. B) The proposed addition will be in the preserved historic style. C) The proposed addition will be in harmony with the historic design of the building.

Staff does not agree statement.

Staff believes the applicant has not completely addressed the exceptions that are specific to the garage remodeling project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff defers to the Board as to whether the applicant has met the requested exceptions to construct an addition that exceeds 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and at a location not set back at a minimum 10' from the primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)).

Mr. Murphey added that architect did remodel the front to remove a pergola that would have been another exception.

Ms. Mather asked, given the size of the addition and removal of historic materials, what effect this project would have on the status of this contributing building.

Mr. Murphey said it would move toward affecting its status but the primary façade would still be a garage.

Ms. Mather noted in 31 and #5 of the exceptions, Mr. Murphey didn't find the response particularly

germane to the argument. But what he wrote in his letter seemed to be different.

Mr. Murphey agreed. Some of the responses might have been recycled from the house. They seemed a little generic.

Dr. Kantner agreed the letter had different responses than what was in the staff report and the letter seemed to be specific to the garage. He thought the Board should go with what was in the letter.

Mr. Murphey said he used what was received electronically.

Vice Chair Rios asked then if the letter contained the correct responses. Mr. Murphey agreed.

Ms. Walker noted that Mr. Murphey said messing with the primary elevation could change its status and knew that the Board couldn't approve anything that would cause a structure to lose its status.

Mr. Acton said in tonight's four foot offset in a previous case could change the primary façade.

Mr. Murphey said the plan had changed greatly for what was proposed for the front door and read from street level it could still be seen as a garage while the rest was very different.

Vice Chair Rios said it wouldn't be a garage any more.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fé Trail.

Mr. Enfield explained that Mr. Murphey was referencing an old letter that had been sent electronically and that was obsolete. He later sent a paper copy which was correct and was in the packet. It was altered and some things were wrong so he submitted a new letter. Also the staff report referenced a brick parapet and as the Board could see the main house addition didn't have a brick parapet because they wanted to keep the additions separate.

The garage had no status at the last meeting and he had submitted the design that became not presentable after the Board changed the status. It was not contributing until after he submitted it so he obviously had not addressed any exceptions. He had asked for feedback from the Board on his design but he didn't get any feedback on it.

What Mr. Murphey was referencing the portal they originally had put in front of the garage door to mimic the portal on main house and the setback wasn't as deep. But they were able to alter the non-primary facades like on the south side without any exception needed.

When they hired Catherine Colby to review the historic status she reviewed the bump on the back.

He was asking for the two exceptions.

Vice Chair Rios asked if the addition was 4 feet back or 5 feet back.

Mr. Enfield said it was 4' back. With the front as the primary façade he was able to alter the west, south and north that were not primary. He met with Bunny Hoffman who represented the family foundation that built the house in 1928 or 1927. She shared an original photograph of the garage with him and gave him more information. He shared the photographs with the Board [attached as Exhibit 3].

The one on far right corner showed that the garage was built at the same time as the house and the doors were 8 light pairs of doors. It also showed the white picket fence had a rock base under it and somehow that disappeared.

With the new status changed they revised their design to show no portal on the primary façade, new doors and windows replacing non-original garage doors in the historic opening and the new addition set back four feet from primary façade. He requested the two exceptions for adding over 50% of the original footprint. The addition was 456 square feet and the existing garage was about 339 square feet.

The reason they were not setting it back ten feet as code required was that would make the width of the room only eight feet because there was a five foot setback required on the other side and would make it unusable. We felt the four foot setback was the most they could provide but did define it as a separate façade. Also no additions could be made on the significant house so they did them on the garage instead. Right now every other façade on the property was primary except for the three on the garage.

To further distinguish the addition he removed the brick parapets previously shown on the garage so it looked like a stucco addition and not mimicking the territorial brick. Also dropped the additions 7" lower to distinguish new from the old. It also minimized the effect on the neighborhood because it was mostly not visible - just a small part of that façade was visible at the street.

This was the least they could do to be able to provide usable space. They did meet a four foot offset.

The only primary façade was the front and they were maintaining it including all the existing openings. So he felt they were actually protecting the garage.

Mr. Enfield reaffirmed that they were adding 456 to the 339 existing square footage for a total of 795 sq. ft. It didn't even have a kitchen but it was for his client to have a place for ceramics and one bedroom because the main house only had one bedroom.

Ms. Walker said the garage doors today were not originals but they were clearly old doors and she said if they were put in before 1962, they would be historic.

Mr. Enfield said he was unable to determine their age. It was really tough because it wasn't documented by the family. It didn't know how long the originals would have lasted. What he was trying to do with the French door was combining existing with original.

Mr. Acton felt the photos were instructive. They showed a scenario that would work with what Mr. Enfield was proposing and might be enough to salvage the contributing much more than French doors with sidelights. He suggested restoration of the doors in the photograph with lights and a buffer for visual privacy for this contemporary use.

He asked Mr. Murphey whether retaining the existing use of the garage would be sufficient basis for it to retain contributing status.

Mr. Murphey thought it could be but they needed to know if the doors today were historic or not and if they were historic it would require another exception.

Mr. Acton considered that moot because no one knew how old they were. He was fighting to retain the status the best way possible. Reconstructing the original doors as per this photo might do that.

Mr. Murphey agreed that would be a preservation reconstruction and would preserve the status.

Vice Chair Rios thought it was a very good suggestion because French doors there wouldn't read as a garage any more but would be getting light if you go to the original design.

Mr. Enfield felt they could recreate the historic look of that door in place of those French doors. They would love to emulate that original door and would agree to do that and would open the garage doors and put French doors behind it.

Ms. Mather said her main concern was that French doors wouldn't look like a garage and would help it a lot.

Mr. Katz agreed and appreciated the idea. He noticed that now immediately to the north was a coyote fence and didn't know what they planned for fencing but if a wall masked the new part for some distance that would also help isolate that east façade of the garage.

Mr. Enfield said in his next presentation the Board would see that proposed wall. His client would be willing to alter the location so as not to screen the historic front of the garage and would come off the corner with a low coyote fence.

Mr. Acton asked to further separate new from the historic structure, if he would consider bringing back that intermediate room façade so that there was a break between the trellis portion of main guest house and the garage. It would further separate it. That would give more of an offset.

Mr. Enfield said they felt they could lose one foot out of that room to provide the jog to the offset would go from 4 to 5 feet.

Mr. Acton asked if he could do two feet. It was nice to have a link piece that made it clear.

Ms. Walker thought they should do it in both cases.

Mr. Enfield agreed to take two feet off that room so he would step it back two feet for an offset of six feet.

Dr. Kantner asked if the hobby area would go back then. Mr. Enfield agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Present and sworn was Ms. Joanne McCarthy 480 D & F San Antonio who thought it was a great plan and obvious that a great deal of thought was given to it and it would be a great addition to San Antonio.

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

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-014B with the understanding that exception criteria for exceeding 50% was met per the applicant's letter in the packet and setback for the new wing would be six feet from the primary façade and the conditions that the work room would be set back two feet more than the original drawing (a total of six feet back) from the garage and that the doors of the garage would be redesigned in the original carriage style as seen in the photographs provided by the applicant.

Mr. Katz seconded the motion.

Dr. Kantner asked for a friendly amendment that the new door design and any exterior lighting be approved by staff. Ms. Mather agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H-12-015. 428 San Antonio.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Eric Enfield, agent for Wendy Fairman, owner, proposes to remodel a significant residence by constructing a 200 sq. ft. portal, adding windows and doors, installing photovoltaic rooftop equipment, and constructing a 5' high stucco yardwall. Three exceptions were requested: to construct an addition to a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)); to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)); and to create an opening where one did not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)). (John Murphey).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Constructed in c.1925, 428 San Antonio Street is a one-story, roughly rectangular plan Territorial Revival house designated significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

At the March 13, 2012 hearing, the applicant proposed a remodeling project for the residence, which included constructing a 200 sq. ft. portal across the west elevation and replacing doors and windows on a claimed non-historic addition to the residence. The Board postponed the project, requesting the applicant provide more thorough documentation on the history of the addition at the northwest corner of the house, and to address concerns discussed at the hearing about the overall design of the project.

The applicant responded by hiring Catherine Colby Consulting to do additional research on the space in question, and additionally made small changes to the design of the original project proposal.

"Bump Out"

As determined at the earlier hearing, the so-called bump-out addition was in place with a roof by 1958. The consultant, however, could not determine when it was converted to heated space. Therefore, the age and evolution of this portion of the house remains unclear.

Project

West Elevation

To the addition discussed above, the applicant proposes installing a French door on the south elevation, a paired four-light wood window on the north elevation, and changing an existing double-hung 1/1 unit on the west to a larger opening for wood casements. The windows will have wood trim and brick sills similar to windows on the house.

The proposed portal across the west elevation will consist of an app. 200' sq. ft. wood Territorial Revival-style structure with a deck on spot footings. Work will include creating a new opening near the southwest corner of the house to place a French door. The structure will be painted white.

South Elevation

Work proposed for this elevation includes removing a historic door and window assembly at the Breakfast Room and replacing it with a Territorial Revival-style multi-light door with sidelights. The applicant originally proposed a concrete landing with two sets of steps framed by wood balustrade. The applicant revised the design to have the door approached by a single run of steps with the balustrade parallel to the door.

Yardwall

In the earlier application, the applicant proposed replacing an existing white picket side yard fence along the west portion of the north property line with a 4'-0"-high stucco wall topped with a 1'-0"-high strip of coyote fencing. The applicant has redesigned the wall to be a 5'-0"-high stucco-clad wall capped with brick coping. The picket fence will be reinstalled at its purported original location at the northeast of the property.

Miscellaneous

Finish work will consist of adding a metal cap across the brick cornice and cladding the entire house with cementitious stucco to match existing color and texture. To the roof, the applicant proposes adding photovoltaic panels that will not be visible from a public way.

Exceptions

Three exceptions are requested: to construct an addition to a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)); to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from the primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)); and to create an opening where one does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)). The following are the applicant's responses to the exceptions.

A) Request for exception for the creation of a new opening on the west elevation for new doors.

(i) "Do not damage the character of the district;"

The proposed new opening will not be publicly visible and thus will not damage the character of the district.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The owner is disabled from an accident and this provides an entrance to the rear portal directly from the kitchen area without having to walk thru the Master Bedroom.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

These doors do not weaken the unique character of the city but ensure the house can be fully utilized by its new resident.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The proposed new opening is proposed on the only altered and non-publicly visible elevation of a significant structure. The special conditions are this above and this situation is particular to the site.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

The two facts that the west elevation was previously altered in the mid-1980's and the façade is not publicly visible is not a result of the applicant.

While staff has no information this elevation was altered in the 1980s, staff agrees with statement.

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

The proposed opening allows for the least negative impact related to: A) The existing historical areas, the publically visible sides and front, and the historical unaltered portions of the façade are being retained in this proposal. B) The proposed opening will be in the preserved historic style. C) The proposed opening

will be in harmony with the historic design of the building.

Staff agrees with statement.

B) Request for exception for an addition to a primary façade, the portal on the west elevation.

(i) "Do not damage the character of the district;"

The west elevation appears to have been significantly altered in the mid 1980's when an historic porch was converted into a bedroom. This proposed portal will not damage the character of the district as it could be removed in the future and the original form and integrity of the historic property would be maintained.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The applicant, without this portal, would not be able to enjoy a protected private area in her rear yard, which would be a hardship.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

This portal will not weaken the character of the city and will ensure the new resident can enjoy beneficial use.

Staff agrees with statement.

(iv) "Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are particular to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape."
The proposed new portal is on the only altered and non-publically visible façade of a significant structure. The above are the special conditions and this situation is particular to this site.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

The two facts that the west elevation was altered significantly in the mid-1980's and the façade is not publically visible is not a result of the applicant.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with this statement.

(vi) "Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in 14-

5.2(A)(1)."

The proposed portal allows for the least negative impact related to: A) The existing historical areas, the publically visible sides and front, and the historical unaltered portions of the façade are being retained in this proposal. B) The proposed portal will be in the preserved historic style. C) The proposed portal will be in harmony with the historic design of the building.

Staff agrees with statement.

C) Request for exception for an addition not set back a minimum of ten feet from the primary façade; the portal on the west elevation.

(i) "Do not damage the character of the district;"

The proposed portal is constructed so that it can be removed in the future and we don't believe this portal impacts the significant status of the main residence as the main three primary facades aren't impacted.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The portal, if offset ten feet, would become a space that would be unusable and not connect to the breakfast/kitchen which is required.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

This lack of a ten foot offset will not weaken the unique character of the city and allows the resident more beneficial use of her rear yard.

Staff agrees with statement.

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

The special condition is a porch did once exist on the west elevation but it was enclosed in the 1980's and thus a portal does not exist on the west side of the structure. It doesn't appear any other of the related homes on the streetscape had a portal either. So, this is particular to this property.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

The two facts that the west elevation was altered significantly in the mid-1980's and the façade is not publically visible is not a result of the applicant.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

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

The proposed portal being not setback a minimum of ten feet from the primary façade allows for the least negative impact related to: A) The existing historical areas, the publically visible sides and front, and the historical unaltered portions of the façade are being retained in this proposal. B) The proposed portal will be in the preserved historic style. C) The proposed portal will be in harmony with the historic design of the building.

Staff neither agrees nor disagrees with statement.

Staff believes that in the main, the applicant has met the three requested exception criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff defers to the Board as to whether the applicant has met the three requested exceptions to construct an addition to a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)); to construct an addition not set back a minimum of 10' from the primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)); and to create an opening where one does not exist (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(ii)).

Vice Chair Rios asked if the significant status would be retained with this project.

Mr. Murphey thought the applicant did meet the criteria.

Ms. Walker said that didn't answer the question.

Mr. Murphey said an addition to a primary elevation could impact the status.

Ms. Walker said the Board was not allowed to take any action that would jeopardize its status.

Mr. Rasch clarified that if the Board believed the project would harm it - a downgrade to contributing couldn't be considered tonight and would require a posting.

Ms. Mather asked about the south elevation window assembly - since it was part of the historic fabric - would Mr. Murphey rec that the assembly be reconstructed.

Mr. Murphey didn't have access to the photo presented tonight but it appears what he saw was what was there now so that would change historic material and an opening on a primary façade.

Ms. Mather felt at the site it seemed identical to what was there originally.

Mr. Katz asked if it would be possible to keep that configuration largely but have the door in the same place and up at the inside floor level.

Mr. Murphey said what was proposed was a different door, window and style. It would change the material.

Mr. Acton said the Board was looking at degrees of preservation here and wanted to preserve a very visible façade by modifying a non-visible façade. So the Board wanted to preserve its historic status while being accommodating to the proposal here tonight.

Mr. Enfield, previously sworn, said in reading Ms. Colby's report on the last page had a list of items she had confirmed as part of the history of back addition. She says in the last line - the back appears to have been altered. At the site visit the Board could see that there were Pella windows in there. The Board's job was to keep removal of historic material at a minimum. The metal door, the NDF wood the painted plywood, etc. all happened afterward and from the photograph you couldn't tell if the door opening was on left side or the right side.

Look at existing south elevation. The very simple stairs coming down was probably originally an open screened porch. Those steps probably once came out to grade from the kitchen.

Ms. Colby also referenced the appraiser in 1926 saying there was a porch at the southwest corner of the house. During a period before 1966 that southwest corner was altered. So she did detail some of the things she found.

At the March 13 meeting the Board discussed this case and asked for more details on the alterations on the west façade. So he hired Ms. Colby to do that and she couldn't find the dates either. There was no affidavit about the date the porch was altered. They were trying to retain the highest level of historic integrity with this proposed portal addition. The Board had a concern about the side area of the portal where steps projected beyond the south façade - so he altered it so the steps would not be visible from the street.

The stucco wall with coyote top was of concern. The south property line already had a six foot stucco wall that the adjacent neighbor had built. So it was not a new wall and only the west wall in the back had a portion that was built by the neighbor.

In order to address all the Board's concerns, they hired Katherine Colby to research the history and she was able to document many of the alterations that occurred on the west façade and was able to confirm part of the history on the back area.

Mr. Murphey asked why there were no exhibits for the appraiser's sketch or the family photos in the application.

Mr. Enfield said the appraiser's information was previously submitted and should be in the Board's

packet already. He asked if it was there. [It wasn't.] Mr. Enfield asked if it was taken out.

Mr. Murphey said he did not have it.

Mr. Enfield said it was submitted for the previous meeting and had the sketches and photos in it. They made the modifications based on the list of concerns he had read. They followed the design at 426 on steps out and wood rail. So they simplified the steps. They removed the tall parapets and kept the nub on the back stuccoed. They changed the wall to stucco with a brick cap. So he felt they addressed all of the Board's concerns from the previous meeting.

The house was contributing in 1984 and raised to significant in 1991. The portal could be removed and was different than the front and would look like an addition. The code allowed an addition on a significant structure. Staff didn't disagree with his responses and he didn't think it would alter the status.

Dr. Kantner understood that a building was considered significant not because all of its façades were primary but that all façades were primary because the building was significant for other reasons.

Mr. Murphey agreed.

Mr. Rasch read the definition.

Dr. Kantner felt this project would not affect its "high level of historic integrity" and consequently not affect its significant status.

Mr. Acton said the opening on the south façade did seem to date back - at least the jamb and frame pattern. It looked like the infill material was more recent. The framing seemed to have endured throughout. It might be possible to replicate that door and window pattern on the south façade but reconsider its use as access to the house. It had access on the west side through the proposed French doors under the portal. That door and glazing could be kept and access from the kitchen to the west portal through that new door.

If staff said French doors under portal were an egregious amount of historic material removed then they could be where the window opening was and that would disrupt a historic casement there.

So he asked which was most important - the south assembly that was distinctive or the new perforation on the west under the portal.

Mr. Katz was comfortable with the west elevation but not with changing the door on the south side. There were other possibilities to keep the pattern like just lifting it up or other ways to keep the pattern as is but would leave it for Mr. Enfield to return to the Board with.

Ms. Mather agreed with Mr. Katz and Mr. Acton that once it started with putting in the French door with side lights it would change the character of the south façade and makes it much more regular and she would object to that. She would try to mimic the original door window assembly pattern.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Enfield said as far as south façade was concerned, he was agreeable to make the fenestration more like the photograph. There were not many photos of the back but his client was willing to look at fenestration on the south façade.

They were not salvaging historic material so he asked to let him do the steps in front and alter the south façade but keep the historic characteristics and divisions that historically were there with his door array so the owner could use it. She wanted to access the kitchen door from her car and the French doors were for the garden in back. So he would prefer to match the historic fenestration in the photograph.

He knew what the Board was looking for on the fenestration but he needed the two steps for the door there at that opening.

Mr. Acton asked if he could put steps up to the west portal from the driveway.

Mr. Enfield said that was what he had there before but took out because of the Board's concerns.

Mr. Acton thought that would be a way of adding steps where you would get access through the French doors.

Mr. Enfield said it was hard to give up that functionality for his client when that was part of her program. They historically entered the kitchen there and she wanted to retain that use but they would do to restore the south façade to what it was historically in the pattern of the doors and windows.

Mr. Rasch asked if railings were required.

Mr. Enfield said they were not required by code and he could get rid of them and would just be a platform with two steps up. It was less than a 30" drop.

Mr. Acton said he would lose the transom above the door.

Mr. Enfield said partially and he could divide the door to make it look like that historic division.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-015, citing the applicant had met the three exceptions on pages 3-7 and with conditions that on the south elevation there would be two steps up to a door and fenestration pattern and that the applicant would replace the doors and windows in a similar fashion to the original fenestration pattern as shown in the historic photo provided by the applicants and that no railings would be built. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker asked that the applicant return to the Board to review the drawings of that south elevation. Ms. Mather accepted that and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 7. Case #H-11-133B. 1228 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Margaret Denney/Kenneth Payson, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a non-**

contributing residence by removing sections of roof, replacing windows and doors, and constructing a wall approximately 6' in height. (John Murphey).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1228 Cerro Gordo Road is a single-story, side-gabled vernacular house constructed prior to 1933 with a number of non-historic additions and alterations. Due to non-historic massing changes, the Board determined at the October 11, 2011 hearing to downgrade the property to a noncontributing designation to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

H-Board Approved Project

At the December 13, 2011 hearing, the applicant proposed a major remodeling project for the three distinct zones of the house: Main House, Workshop, and Apartment. The object was to separate and better define these spaces. The project included a program of demolition, installation of new windows and doors and construction of walls.

The Board approved the project with the condition that the proposed wood siding along the north and west elevations of the Workshop match the general composition and dimensions of the existing wood siding and be composed of a recycled barn board type of material.

Post-Approval

During demolition the applicant found that several changes would need to be made to the Board-approved project. Additionally, budgetary concerns resulted in a number of approved windows and doors being changed to more economical designs.

The proposed changes are addressed in detail in the applicant's letter and revised drawings. The applicant is seeking approval of these revisions.

While the number of changes appears extensive, most are related to cost-saving measures and in aggregate respect the spirit of the Board's original approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application, as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ken Payson, 755 Acequia Madre, who was present to answer questions.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Acton said some project applications were very spare but this one was overwhelming with the specificity and he was impressed by that.

Mr. Payson said it was a result of refinement of the plan with details as requested by staff.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-0133B as recommended by staff and submitted. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-12-048. 421 Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gary and Saude Sievert, owners, proposes to replace existing side yard coyote fence with 5'6" high wrought-iron fence with 6' high stucco-faced pilasters and stucco a low wall of a contributing commercial building. (John Murphey).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

421 Canyon Road is one-story-over-basement, stucco-clad building designed in the Territorial Revival manner. It is contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Project

To create an outdoor gallery, the applicant is proposing to replace an existing non-historic coyote fence at the west yard of the building with a wrought-iron fence.

The specific design for the fence includes three sections of 5'-6"-high wrought iron panel framed by 6'-high stucco-faced posts topped with brick coping. The space will be accessed through the center section, which opens as a swinging gate.

The project will include building a low stucco-faced curb with brick coping west of the opening, and stuccoing an existing wall to the east and capping it with brick.

The stucco and brickwork is proposed to match the building.

The wrought-iron design is found on the house in the form of security grilles and as a fencing material on other properties along Canyon Road.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application, as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Kevin Hilton, 1834 Calle San Simon had nothing to add.

Ms. Mather asked if there would be any exterior lighting.

Mr. Hilton said none was planned.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Dr. Kantner moved to approve Case #H-12-048 as submitted and any exterior lighting be reviewed by staff. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 9. Case #H-12-037. 414 Acequia Madre.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Robert and Lora Sandroni, owners, proposes to construct a 77 sq. ft. addition, a 216 sq. ft. pergola, 4' high yardwalls, and other hardscaping on a significant property. An exception was requested to exceed the 50% foot print rule (Section 14-5.2 (D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

414 Acequia Madre, also known as #2 Plaza Chamisal, is a single-family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style before 1940. The building is listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. A 77 square foot addition will be constructed to a height of 8'6" above grade on the east elevation of the non-historic addition to the residence. The closet will have no fenestration in the battered stuccoed walls. An exception is requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.
2. A 216 square foot pergola will be constructed to a height of 10' on the north side of the residence. The pergola will be constructed with wooden timbers.
3. Yardwalls with gates will be constructed around the property at a maximum height of 4'.
4. Other site improvements including a wooden lace vine support fence, a water feature, a gas fire pit, a bronze sculpture, ground and wall mounted light fixtures, river rock planters and curbing, and flagstone and brick surfacing.

EXCEPTION TO THE 50% FOOTPRINT RULE

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

This relatively small single story addition at the northeast non-historic building corner will be barely visible from lane elevations after proposed landscaping is in place. Also the proposed river-rock planter wall that terminates into the south wall of the addition, successfully helps to integrate it into the overall existing east

and south elevations. For these two reasons it is our firm belief that it will not damage the character of the streetscape.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement that the additional landscaping may be more damaging to the streetscape than the small addition.

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

With the complete loss in 2007 of our previous California home to wildfires, this home has become our primary family gathering place. Though the house is just fine for two or three adults, there is not enough storage space for necessary and appropriate items when our four grandkids are visiting. Thus we are simply desperate for more storage space.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the *city* by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

Architecturally, the proposed addition helps to mitigate the somewhat austere two-story eastern elevation. From the north it helps to bring balance on the east side of the building with the west patio extension. These factors alone enhance rather than detract from the heterogeneous character of Plaza Chamisal and by extension the City of Santa Fé. The impact is deemed so subtle and relatively inconspicuous that nearby residents and others in the historic district should not be harmed in any way.

Staff response: Staff agrees that the addition will relieve the two-story façade with better room-block massing.

- (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 very special historic status of this building and the fact that the extent of renovation work to the west portal precludes any significant additions such as a garage or carport with storage, forced us into pursuing other options. The interior spaces were explored. Here small areas of additional storage were created with more efficient layout of existing closets. In the end this made no significant impact. As a last resort, we thought about what could be done outside that would not harm the historic character of the building and more importantly where it could be placed. It turns out that the northeast building corner is the only logical and permissible candidate for an addition. The selected footprint is a minimum we can live with. It is not known if other structures in the neighborhood are faced with similar constraints.

Staff response: While staff agrees with the argument, the applicant has not responded to this criterion requiring the identification of peculiar conditions and circumstances.

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

As mentioned earlier, two events over which we had no control, impacted how we would utilize our residence. First, our California residence totally lost in a wildfire prompted us to consider Plaza Chamisal for a family gathering location. Second, unknown to us, the renovations done to the historic west portal precluded its rather significant area from being used in calculations to support meaningful additions to the property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement while not having information as to when the carport was altered with or without a permit.

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

The proposed landscaping and hardscaping are expected to significantly enhance the aesthetic and visual appeal of this property from a variety of vantage points, due to the fact that it is completely surrounded by gravel access lanes. The storage addition due to its diminutive size relative to the building as a whole, should just blend in and will not be conspicuous in any way. It is interesting to note, that had we not been successful in purchasing "Area J" and its development rights from the developer, a new residence could have been constructed on it, that conceivably would change the character of this section of Plaza Chamisal. Certainly it would have a more crowded visual aspect and much less opportunity for landscaping in a traditional "garden" format. Finally, we believe and truly feel that we are the stewards of this property...with the location of our house front and center for guests and visitors alike, we have the obligation to do our best to maintain the integrity of its design and immediate surroundings while enhancing the livability of our dream.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception request to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) for an addition and otherwise defers to the Board to determine if the additional landscaping/hardscaping is harmonious to the significant historic structure and/or the significant Plaza Chamisal.

Ms. Mather noted that staff was deferring to the Board about landscaping but she was concerned about the overall feel at Plaza Chamisal. It was open and this had lots of walls all the way around the house. She didn't think that was really harmonious to the streetscape of Plaza Chamisal.

Mr. Rasch said when he started at the City in 1992 it was the last time for any remodeling of this structure at Plaza Chamisal. But since then several cases have come from Plaza Chamisal and the Board felt vegetation or picket fences were preferred to solid walls in the Plaza or very low solid walls.

In historic times, the vegetation there was much more lush and today was more barren than once it was.

The pergola, the gas fire pit, the fountain, the sculpture were elements that were removable and wouldn't affect it long term.

Ms. Mather said the wall was at the maximum allowable height.

Vice Chair Rios said Plaza Chamisal had been and for the most part was still very open and Ms. Mather was right - there was once much more vegetation there. She didn't know if it was proper to be enclosing everything.

Dr. Kantner was confused about why this was an exception to the 50% footprint rule.

Mr. Rasch said a previous addition on the northeast already exceeded the 50% allowance so even this very small 77 sq. ft. addition needed an exception. He also pointed out this was not an addition to the historic part but to the non-historic addition so it didn't need an exception for adding on to a façade of this significant house.

Vice Chair Rios asked for the total length of the wall in the request.

Mr. Rasch deferred to the applicant but pointed out two options, A and B on the site plan.

Present and sworn was Mr. Stefan Merdler, 918 Calle Alto, who said this possibly was one of the more neglected sites for landscaping. The primary reason was that when it was purchased it did not include area J. You could almost slice from top to bottom and everything on the right side to be area J. And it conformed to the east wall of the existing residence and had a zero setback on east and north walls.

Dr. Kantner referred to it on page 16.

Mr. Merdler said the owner's concern was that area J could be developed at some time and it would jeopardize the usefulness and privacy of the building. And a year or two ago he agreed to purchase that property. It had not had a definitive owner other than the developer so it was neglected.

So they wanted to integrate it into the infrastructure and to create the space to fit their lifestyle, they engaged Mr. Merdler to make a plan. They liked to entertain.

The wall situation was carefully reviewed in the field with Mr. Rasch and got his responses on what he thought the Board would approve. They started looking at the surrounding properties. This was an island surrounded by gravel lanes and to get some sense of privacy something needed to be done. They looked around to see what others had done and saw that probably 80% of the existing buildings did have walls around them and some exceeded four feet high. When this building was renovated 6 years ago they constructed the wall on the west side. He proposed to not exceed four feet and proposed to put river rock as a base to make it more in the vernacular of a historic wall and to make it of adobe and have inset gates where appropriate. They would use material similar to what existed there now.

He provided two options. Plan A showed a section of wall that extended from the south end of the parking area on the east to the existing parking area on the south. He pointed them out. Option B showed

what was to be removed. It was a compromise in case the Board thought there was too much wall. The area on the north would be public open space maintained by the owner. It would be a primary view entering the plaza compound and larger than any other area outside of a wall. In some places it exceeded 25' deep. Chris also put in an old fashioned vine fence that possibly was in that area before.

In other areas like on the south showed a boundary of the condominium with a curb that would replace loose river rock one foot above the ground to define the edge of the property. It was similar to what the Board approved for the Guy residence. The other improvement was on the south where gravel once was to be replaced with brick so both parking areas would be of brick.

The owners were very insistent that they wanted to improve Plaza Chamisal and were not trying to reduce its historic value but to enhance the property with landscaping and hardscaping.

Vice Chair Rios asked what the length of the wall proposed was.

Mr. Merdler said it was about 100 to 120 feet and option B would be about 70 feet.

Ms. Walker referred to page 21 in the drawing at the upper left and asked what the height of that was.

Mr. Merdler said it was 20¼" high by six inches wide.

Ms. Walker said her lights were about a foot tall and asked why these needed to be this tall.

Mr. Merdler said that was the maximum height.

Ms. Walker referred to the east façade for storage and asked if they could consider some fenestration or modulation of it.

Mr. Merdler said there was none proposed at this point.

Mr. Rasch suggested a window or nicho.

Mr. Merdler said they were open to that. They would probably go along with that.

Mr. Merdler said in the exception he tried to indicate that by having that addition there it sort of balances out the portal.

Mr. Acton said counter intuitively the mass felt small. They needed to raise it up about a foot and add a little window. It wasn't comparative to the others.

Mr. Merdler agreed except for the portal. They could raise it a foot and add a window. That façade was not historic.

Mr. Acton said it seemed diminutive compared with the rest.

Mr. Merdler said the owners would like to have a bigger addition there but it had an exception because the first time a large amount was under the portal and became non-historic and Mr. Rasch said it needed an exception.

Mr. Acton asked if he could add one foot in depth.

Mr. Merdler agreed.

Mr. Rasch explained that how much it exceeded the footprint was up to the Board.

Vice Chair Rios suggested the less they added, the better it would be. She thought the proportion was fine.

Ms. Mather had questions about perimeter wall. On page 19 at the southwest side behind the barbecue there was a wall that went along and asked if it ended right there.

Mr. Merdler said that was existing. There was a picket fence and a gate and it existed.

Dr. Kantner said if they bumped out the addition further he would have questions about how much was visible. He agreed it was better to keep it as is.

Mr. Katz noted the sketch on page 18 showed three windows in the wall.

Mr. Merdler agreed and they would have latillas sort of like the ones on the west wall.

Mr. Acton thought the gate openings seemed very linear and the buttress was of CMU and stuccoed and it would be very inorganic.

Mr. Rasch suggested they be more battered.

Mr. Acton urged that it be more sumptuous and they could let them flare out at the bottom more like old adobe.

Mr. Merdler was 100% supportive of that. They were trying to bond the wood jamb into the adobe but it was not a solid connect.

Mr. Acton thought he could meld a rigid frame inside.

Mr. Merdler agreed to batter it as adobe.

Mr. Acton said it would be a metaphor of a hand built compound.

Vice Chair Rios was nervous about it being exaggerated and wanted it to be simple.

Mr. Merdler said he would make sure of a strong tie between wood and the adobe and put an adobe

veneer but not as big as shown here.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Sellers, 327 Delgado, who said he arrived after the staff report was presented. He reminded the board of the history of this house that had a famous aviatrix, an architect and a Canadian artist as previous owners. In looking at this plan it seems this building was a centerpiece of Plaza Chamisal because it was in the center. The wall would be nice with a hand crafted look. The plantings could be an alternative for privacy as much as a four foot wall and would give it a softer look.

Also he didn't know about exterior lights on the house but that was worth looking at.

The ramada looked fairly large to him in the drawing that he saw. It was not too clear and maybe not to scale. Those were his concerns.

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

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-12-037 with plan B, finding the exception to exceed the 50% footprint was approved as submitted in the materials.

He thought the low wall helped break up what was a fairly tall building and by adopting plan B it would not give the feeling it was all walled in.

Vice Chair Rios asked about any comment on the entry gate - the pilasters either what was presented or what Mr. Acton suggested.

Mr. Katz added to the motion a middle ground that the chair suggested regarding the entry gate pilasters - a little bit more than was there and take it to staff.

Mr. Katz had nothing to change regarding the lighting plan that was in the proposal.

Ms. Mather requested a friendly amendment that the wall would be of adobe with a river rock base. Mr. Katz agreed. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Merdler said to allay Richard's Sellers' concern that the plan included a substantial amount of plantings outside of the wall. So it isn't just looking at a wall.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer

Downtown & Eastside Historic District Design Standards

*Exhibit 1
HDRB 7/10/12*

Old Santa Fe Style

1600 to present

adobe construction

Recent Santa Fe Style

development from and an elaboration of old Santa Fe Style

different materials of construction , added decorations

Old Santa Fe Style (Pueblo, Pueblo-Spanish, Spanish-Indian, Territorial)

- one story, few three stories
- characterized by long and low profile
- roofs flat with slight slope
- parapet on 3 sides, at least, and finished in same color and material as walls or of brick
- roofs not carried out over walls, except to cover an enclosed portal or porch with wooden columns
- two stories on territorial buildings, with a balcony on the second story
- flat facades, varied by inset portals, exterior portals, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales, flanking buttresses, wooden lintels, architraves, and cornices
- cornices and doors may be carved and picked out with bright colors
- arches almost never used, except for nonfunctional arches, often slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding walls
- all exterior walls are same color, earth-tones, except for under portals – white, contrasting color, or murals
- solid wall space is greater in any façade than window and door space combined
- single panes of glass larger than 30 inches are not permissible except under portals
- true old Santa Fe style building are made of adobe with mud plaster finish, construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the adobe effect can be simulated is permissible, provided that the exterior walls are not less than 8” thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided
- commercial buildings have portals covering the sidewalk with the columns set at the curbline

Recent Santa Fe Style

- harmonizes with historic buildings by retaining a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail
- no more than two stories in any façade unless there are portals, setbacks, or other design elements
- door and window area in publicly-visible facades less than 40%, except under portals
- no door or window in a publicly-visible façade shall be located nearer than 3’ from the corner of the facade
- no cantilevers permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment
- 80% or more of publicly-visible facades shall be mud/lime plaster or stucco finish, 20% or less may be natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material
- publicly-visible facades and adjoining walls shall be of one color, earth-tones, matte or dull finish, and relatively smooth texture
- facades under portals may be of contrasting or complimentary colors
- windows, doors, and portals on publicly-visible portions of buildings and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles
- larger glass areas are allowed under portals
- deep window recesses are characteristic
- roofs shall have less than 30” overhang



Exh. "2"

CITY OF SANTA FE
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
ROADWAY & TRAILS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SITE PLAN

PROJECT NO.: 891B-HILLSIDE TO CROSS
OF THE MARTYRS SIDEWALK PROJECT

