



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 2-21-07 TIME 8:40

*\*Amended\**

SERVED BY Maia P. Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2007 – 12:00 NOON

PLANNING DIVISION, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2007 – 6:00PM

## CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

January 9, 2007  
January 23, 2007

**E. COMMUNICATIONS**

**F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

1. An ordinance regarding demolition and minimum maintenance requirements for Landmark structures.

**G. OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED**

**H. OLD BUSINESS**

1. Case #H-06-43-B. 1134 Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Ragins Research & Planning, agents for Robert Abeyta, propose to remodel a Non-Contributing residence with 672 sq. ft. of additions to match existing height.
2. Case #H-06-130-B. 726 Allendale. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Linda Zingle, agent/owner, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing residence with 405 sq. ft. of additions and increase the height from 11' 3" to the maximum allowable height of 14' 9".
3. Case #H-06-131. 518 Camino Cabra. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture, agents for Dan Warner and Dena Ross, propose to construct a 2,103 sq. ft. residence to the maximum allowable height of 15' 2".

4. Case #H-06-132. 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cindy Urban, agent for Clare Easterwood, proposes to construct a coyote fence and pedestrian and vehicle gates to the maximum allowable height of 5' 4" on a Non-Contributing property.
5. Case #H-06-52-B. 451 Amado. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Jonah Stanford, agent for Nick Heil, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by removing 126 sq. ft. of non-historic additions and to construct 310 sq. ft. of additions, and to increase the height from approximately 10' to 11' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 12' 4". Exceptions are requested to alter openings on the primary elevation and to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Sections 14-5.2,D,2,d & D,5).

**I. STATUS REVIEW**

1. Case #H-07-8. 314 Griffin. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property (Carlos Gilbert School).
2. Case #H-07-9. 700 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property (Acequia Madre School).
3. Case #H-07-17. 617 & 617 ½, 617-A, 617-B Acequia Madre & 349 Plaza Balentine. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Robey & James DeVille, propose an historic status review of this Contributing and Non-Contributing property.

**J. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Case #H-07-7. 301 N. Guadalupe. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Aaron J. Gonzales, agent for David Byrnes, proposes to construct two pergolas at 745 sq. ft. and 36" high yard walls on the front of a Non-Contributing building.
2. Case #H-07-18. 849 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Terry Burt, propose to construct an approximately 54 sq. ft. addition below the existing height of 13' 6" to a Non-Contributing building.
3. Case #H-07-19. 529 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Deborah Auten, agent for Tom Melk & Sarah Potter, propose to construct 300 sq. ft. of additions to an existing second floor and to remodel with window and door alterations a Non-Contributing building.
4. Case #H-07-20. 101-111 Washington. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agents for Robert Spitz, propose to construct a 413 sq. ft. portal to match the height of an existing adjacent portal on a Non-Contributing building.

**K. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**L. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Planning Division at 955-6605. Interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office upon five (5) days notice.

If you wish to attend the February 27, 2007 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Planning Division by 9:00 am on Tuesday, February 27, 2007 so that transportation can be arranged.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**CITY OF SANTA FE**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Santa Fe, New Mexico  
February 27, 2007

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended . . . . .	1-2
Approval of Minutes:		
January 9, 2007	Postponed . . . . .	2-3
January 23, 2007	Approved with corrections . . . . .	3-4
Communications	None . . . . .	4
Administrative Matters		
1. Landmark Maintenance Ordinance	Recommended with amendments . . . .	4-5,42
Old Business to Remain Postponed	None . . . . .	6
Status Review		
1. <b><u>Case #H 07-08</u></b> 314 Griffin	Upgraded to Contributing . . . . .	6-9
2. <b><u>Case #H 07-09</u></b> 700 Acequia Madre	Upgraded to Significant . . . . .	9-14
Old Business		
1. <b><u>Case #H 06-43B</u></b> 1134 Canyon Road	Approved with conditions . . . . .	14-17
2. <b><u>Case #H 06-103-B</u></b> 726 Allendale	Approved with conditions . . . . .	17-21
3. <b><u>Case #H 06-131</u></b> 518 Camino Cabra	Postponed for redesign . . . . .	21-28
4. <b><u>Case #H 06-132</u></b> 516 Camino Rancheros	Approved as recommended . . . . .	28-30
5. <b><u>Case #H 06-52B</u></b> 451 Amado	Postponed . . . . .	30-31

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<b>Status Review</b>		
3. <b><u>Case #H 07-17</u></b> 617, 617½, 617½A. 617½B Acequia Madre & 349 Plaza Balentine	Historic Status changed . . . . .	31-34
<b>New Business</b>		
1. <b><u>Case #H 07-07</u></b> 301 N. Guadalupe	Approved with conditions . . . . .	34-36
2. <b><u>Case #H 07-18.</u></b> 849 E. Palace	Approved as recommended . . . . .	36-38
3. <b><u>Case #H 07-19</u></b> 529 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved with conditions . . . . .	38-40
4. <b><u>Case #H 07-20</u></b> 101-107 Washington	Approved with Conditions . . . . .	40-42
Matters from the Board	Discussion . . . . .	42-43
Business From the Floor	None . . . . .	43
Adjournment	. . . . .	43
Exhibits: A-B		

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF SANTA FE  
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
FEBRUARY 27, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Cecilia Rios on the above date at approximately 6:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**ROLL CALL**

---

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cecilia Rios, Chair  
Jake Barrow  
Jane Farrar  
Dan Featheringill  
Robert Frost  
Charles Newman  
Deborah Shapiro

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None.

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Marissa Barrett, Historic Preservation Planner  
David Rasch, Planning Supervisor of Historic Preservation  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

---

Mr. Rasch said the last case under Old Business, Case #H 06-32 had been postponed by the applicant.

He asked how many people were present for the hearing on the schools. A sizable number of people raised their hands.

Chair Rios suggested they should move those cases to the front of the Agenda.

**Mr. Barrow moved to amend the agenda by moving Case #H 07-08 and Case #H 07-09 to the front. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**Ms. Farrar moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

---

**January 9, 2007**

Ms. Farrar requested the following changes to these minutes:

Page 28 - "while not contributing and over 16 feet, ~~she'll~~ should still be retained in the streetscape and part of the averaging."

Page 67 - Ms. Farrar said she didn't say that Wayne Lloyd did the civic center design because she knew that he didn't do that design.

Further down on the same page, she requested: "And when I see these decorative elements, like an eyebrow, I get that feeling of a little ~~big~~ bit of a decoration on a façade that has it is purposeless."

On page 82, the part with Mr. Sommer speaking, maybe the tape ran out and she needed to listen to it.

On page 87, one third down the page: "...that has included the four feet, ~~we~~ well it's actually almost ten feet on one side, thirteen four on the other and fourteen feet eleven, almost fifteen feet on the other."

On page 93 two-thirds down the page, she said what had been listed as inaudible as follows: "It's on the back side of the building but it was set way back with this large yard."

Ms. Farrar said she would move to postpone until the tapes could be heard.

Mr. Newman requested a change on page 10, last paragraph: "Mr. Newman said ~~they~~ the applicant needed to have the dimensioned hard lined drawings submitted to staff for review because there were discrepancies and did not believe there was enough information here."

On page 23, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph - Mr. Newman said that he felt everything ~~that~~ being proposed would diminish the characteristics that led to it being Contributing..." He also requested that the last sentence be deleted at the end: "...the change of the pillars and change of elevation across the front to building the portal ~~the Territorial style posts.~~"

On page 101, "Mr. Newman said he went over there today."

On page 106, sixth paragraph, "Mr. Newman said there was nothing more asymmetrical that adobe structures."

On page 109, seventh paragraph, "He said he did not ~~like~~ mind the mechanized part."

Ms. Shapiro requested the following changes:

On page 16, fifth paragraph, "Ms. Shapiro asked if ~~there was no fill~~ the lot had been filled in."

On page 106, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "Ms. Shapiro said the drawings didn't show ~~that as much~~ the rounded edges."

**Ms. Farrar moved to postpone the approval of the January 9, 2007 minutes for review of the tape on pages 58-. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**January 23, 2007**

Mr. Frost said on page 13, it should say "Mr. Frost agreed that it was the drawings that were throwing them off."

He asked that on page 23, fifth paragraph "It was a- cute little ~~fence~~ houses."

Mr. Newman requested the following changes:

On page 10, ninth paragraph: "Mr. Newman ~~commented that at the last meeting where they had granted Contributing status to a building they completely destroyed any contributing part of that building. Based on that, he said he was frustrated and concerned and not sure he understood what Contributing was any more. He agreed with Ms. Farrar that this was Contributing.~~"

Next to last line on page 10: "Mr. Newman told the applicant that, based on previous approval of contributing buildings, the Board could be incredibly flexible."

**Ms. Farrar moved to approve the minutes of January 23, 2007 as corrected. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

---

None.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

---

Mr. Rasch showed a picture taken from City Hall, looking west and giving an entire view of the Presbyterian Church because of the excavation. He said he hoped to document the progression on the civic center as it was being built.

### **1. An ordinance regarding demolition and minimum maintenance requirements for Landmark structures.**

Mr. Rasch said he was questioned by a Councilor about the condition of the property and he told the Councilor that the City could cite the owner for neglect. But the ordinance only talked about structures inside the historic district so he was bringing an amendment that would include landmark structures which were outside the districts.

Ms. Farrar commented that the present form of the ordinance's demolition procedure was something that went very much against the Board because of the time limit for their review. She said they didn't even address the demolition of the civic



center because they didn't have the correct documents of review and the 65 days went quickly and they just demolished it.

The Board has to depend on surveys that don't always happen within 65 days. So she didn't agree with that time limit.

Chair Rios explained the time line restriction to the audience.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it was possible to have the request for demolition as a separate issue.

Mr. Rasch said no. He explained that it had to be done before replacing it but it could not be separate unless the Board did away with re-establishing the streetscape.

Chair Rios thought the language including landmarks could be approved tonight.

Ms. Farrar said it was there.

Mr. Rasch said the 65 days portion was not underlined.

Mr. Featheringill said the 65 days was just to bring it to the Board but the Board could not be under the gun to make a decision within that time. So if they were to postpone or continue the consideration of the case, it should extend beyond the 65 days.

Mr. Barrow asked who was sponsoring it.

Mr. Rasch said it was Councilor Heldmeyer.

Mr. Frost said the vote was only on including landmarks because the 65 days already exists.

Ms. Farrar commented that in order to decide on the demolition, the Board had to decide if the replacement was appropriate and sometimes the surveyors could not act within the 65 days.

Mr. Frost said the 65 days needed to be extended but it was separate from what they were now voting on. This at least would give the Board 65 days where they had none before.

**Mr. Frost moved to table this item to the end of the agenda. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED**

---

None.

Chair Rios announced to the public that if anyone coming before the Board disagreed with the board's decisions that they would be able to appeal it to the Governing Body. She said that there would be a seven-day time constraint for filing that appeal and asked that anyone wishing to appeal contact staff right away. She then said that if anyone was going to speak before the board that they would need to give their name and address to the recorder and be sworn in.

## **STATUS REVIEW**

---

1. **Case #H-07-8.** 314 Griffin. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property (Carlos Gilbert School).

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

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"314 Griffin Street, known as the Carlos Gilbert Elementary School, was designed by Willard C. Kruger in the Territorial Revival style and constructed in 1942 as part of a Works Progress Administration project. The property is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and it was eligible for historic status upgrade in 2003. On December 8, 2006, the New Mexico State Cultural Properties Review Committee (CPRC) unanimously acted to list the property on the state register. The CPRC did not recognize this property as eligible for national register nomination.

"A small addition was constructed on the North elevation in 1948 by John Gaw Meem. In 1979, the window openings were reduced from triple installations to double installations with replacement of original windows. Then, in 2004, the windows were replaced again and a low historic wall surrounding the south playground was replaced with a tall metal picket fence.

"The 1984 Historic Cultural Property Inventory suggests an historic status of non-contributing due to the date of construction at less than 50 years. The subsequent re-survey of the property in 1993 suggests an upgrade to significant historic status."

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

“Staff recommends that the board upgrade the historic status of this structure from non-contributing to contributing, not to the significant status as recommended, due to the character defining alterations of window opening dimensional changes and loss of historic materials.”

Mr. Rasch pointed out where the triple windows had been changed to double windows and the openings reduced.

Mr. Rasch then read the status definitions from the ordinance.

Ms. Farrar said that under page 3 of the inventory, it listed this building as significant.

Mr. Rasch said no but it recommended significant.

Mr. Frost asked if that was before the window changes.

Mr. Rasch agreed and said that was in 2004.

Ms. Shapiro said the last paragraph on page 12 seemed very positive because it retained the integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.” She felt they should make it at least contributing.

Chair Rios said the massing was intact.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Frost noted it was over 50 years old.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Barrow suggested that the windows did change in dimension considerably.

Ms. Farrar said that was not true.

Mr. Barrow asked if the openings were the same or smaller.

Mr. Rasch said they were smaller.

Ms. Farrar said they just took one window out.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Barrow said the dimensions, then, have changed.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Present and sworn was Ms. Gracie Olivas 505 San Antonio, who said she wanted to comment on Carlos Gilbert School. She said the City has lost so many historic buildings in the downtown area and could not afford to lose another one. She urged the Board to make it a Significant property.

Present and sworn was Ms. Bobbie Gutierrez, 610 Alta Vista Street, who thanked the Board for the opportunity to address the school issue and also for the work the Board had done. She said that Carlos Gilbert was a very important school to the district. It was the home of the Santa Fe Public Schools but there were health and safety concerns. She said they wanted to maintain the exterior but to make it significant, she would be concerned with the costs associated to make sure the children were safe, especially egress and ingress. She said they wanted to continue to educate children for many years at Carlos Gilbert. She said the replacement of the wall in 2003 was for a safety issue for the children.

Mr. Frost said it appeared that the third window units could be put back in.

Ms. Gutierrez agreed.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they were redoing the entrances.

Ms. Gutierrez agreed. She explained that people entered the campus through the gym so they had to take a look at the entrance and relocate it for better monitoring.

Mr. Rasch asked if the new primary entrance would be on the west elevation.

Ms. Gutierrez said they didn't know yet but would work closely with staff. She said she knew some parents had expressed concerns with its closeness to the judicial complex and any prisoners that might escape.

Mr. Rasch said at present, the east elevation was primary.

Ms. Farrar said the Board was eager to find solutions for safety.

Chair Rios said that would be addressed in another application.

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

Ms. Farrar asked for comments from each Board member before a motion was made.

Mr. Newman said he would support a Contributing status.

Mr. Frost said that, depending on window restoration; it could be significant but at least contributing.

Ms. Shapiro said she would like more detail on it being the home of SFPS. She said that would play a part in the decision.

Mr. Rasch said it was a John Gaw Meem design.

Ms. Gutierrez said the original structure was located there in 1912.

Mr. Rasch said that John Gaw Meem did this design as a prototype for other Santa Fe school buildings.

Ms. Shapiro favored contributing.

Mr. Featheringill had concerns about the egress but if the entrances were redone, it could have major impact. He said he would lean toward significant.

Mr. Barrow favored contributing.

**Ms. Farrar moved to upgrade the status on Case 07-08 at 314 Griffin to Contributing with the hope that restoration of windows would make it eligible for Significant in the future. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Mr. Featheringill who voted no.**

- 2. Case #H-07-9. 700 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property (Acequia Madre School).**

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

## **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"700 Acequia Madre, known as the Acequia Madre Elementary School, was designed by John Gaw Meem in the Territorial Revival style and constructed in 1953. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and it was eligible for historic status upgrade in 2003. On December 8, 2006, the New Mexico State Cultural Properties Review Committee (CPRC) unanimously acted to list the property on the state register and recognized the property's eligibility for the national register.

"When the building was designed and it had a bilaterally symmetrical layout with wings on either side of the entrance block. The western block was not completed, so an L-shaped building was constructed.

"In 1964, Richard Halford constructed the western block at a smaller scale than originally proposed. And finally in 2004, additional massing was placed on the rear of the building along with replacement of the original Windows in existing opening dimensions.

"The 1984 historic cultural property inventory suggests and historic status of non-contributing due to the date of construction as less than 50 years. The subsequent re-survey of the property in 2003 suggests an upgrade to can shared the King historic status.

"The CPRC considers that the massing changes are in keeping with the original intent to expand the footprint and that the rear massing doesn't come compromise the historic façade.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends that the board upgrade the historic status of this structure from non-contributing to contributing."

Chair Rios noted that Ms. Farrar and she were both alumni of this school.

Mr. Barrow said the windows on the east look the way they always were.

Ms. Farrar said they were replaced. She said she was on the Committee. They were replaced in kind because the putty was of asbestos.

Mr. Barrow said his memory was that on the west, they were different windows. He

felt this building had not gone through many changes and they might want to make it significant.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Present and sworn was Mr. Chris Purvis, 506 Camino Sin Nombre, who wanted to add some information since the inventory was done. He said Catherine Colby had a copy of the federal application which was submitted yesterday. He passed around his copy.

Chair Rios asked about the west wing windows.

Mr. Purvis said the east was steel, the west was aluminum and all were replaced in kind. The ones on east gave a second egress from classrooms. In 1953, they just had two doors but now the standards require that students get outside directly from classrooms.

Mr. Newman noted page 6 of the packet and said they did post modern.

Mr. Purvis said they had to do it for egress and it was a compromise although they were the same openings.

Mr. Purvis shared part of the recommendations from CPRC staff on the history of school. He said it was built after World War II, constructed out of post war expansion and federal funding. [quoted John Murphy].

Present and sworn was Mr. Rick Martínez 725 Mesilla Road who grew up there and thought the school deserved this change in status. He urged them to keep Federico Vigil's mural on the front and hope the status would be approved.

Chair Rios commented that when Federico did his work, she had helped him a lot.

Present and previously sworn was Ms. Gracie Olivas who said it was a significant structure and the heart of the neighborhood. She said they have had neighborhood association meetings there for years and needed to keep it as a neighborhood school. "Without it we lose part of the character of Santa Fe."

Present and sworn was Mr. Will McDonald 488 Arroyo Tenorio, who described how his son started first grade there this year. He found a wonderful community of students, parents and teachers there and became part of the struggle to keep it open. There were issues to be dealt with on the school board, particularly overcrowding at Piñon and Chávez. He pointed out that the overcrowding there would not be solved by closing

these schools. Acequia Madre does more than educating kids. It takes fewer dollars to educate kids there of any school except one. He said what the Board could do to help would be to make it contributing.

Present and sworn was Ms. Monica Sosaya Halford and her husband, Mr. Richard Halford 850 El Caminito. She said she grew up on Sosaya Lane and went to Wood Gormley. She said her children and grandchildren have gone to Acequia Madre and she had been in PTA since 1967 and still help with artwork with the children. She said the parents and teachers were wonderful.

Mr. Halford said they have had children there for 50 years. He said they had a seven year old, a third grader and another in first grade next year. It was such a wonderful school and should be in historic area. It was a great location. He begged the Board to approve the historical style on the building itself. He said there were several important things to consider: the school board has threatened to close where they were trying to educate their children. The Board insinuated the smaller schools had to go. It should not go. It should still be there as a going small school. All of us were interested in great education. He thought the Board saying it cost too much per student was ridiculous. The Board may be \$5 million dollars short and in the same paper, the State has a surplus of 595 million. Compared to Iraq War, it was minuscule. Schools should be smaller. He encouraged the Board to do this.

Present and sworn was Margo, who lived directly across from the school. With the property values being what they are, some of the houses were not being lived in. They were second family homes. So it was critical to keep vitality in the neighborhood by keeping the school. It was important to Santa Fe. She hoped the Board would make it significant.

Present and sworn was Ms. Dena Major 545 Alameda who had two girls at Acequia Madre and echoed Margo's comment. As a local resident and a developer, She said she came in contact with historical and assumed part of the Board's responsibility was not only to look at a historic building but a historic neighborhood. She said she could think of nothing more important in preserving that area than to preserve Acequia Madre. It was the heart and soul and the sound of vibrant life. Even as a builder she would find nothing more criminal than for this to be commercial or residential.

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

Chair Rios referred to page 5 and asked about the windows on the bottom.

The Board discussed whether they were the present windows or the previous



windows and what difference it would make in designation.

Mr. Barrow said he was confused about their purview. He asked what the designation change would do to plans for keeping the school. Earlier, he said they heard testimony that the building, if contributing, the Board needed to make changes to make it more viable.

Chair Rios said they had to base it on the ordinance and determine if it had changed or not.

Mr. Barrow said the windows on the west changed.

Mr. Frost said they had to be changed for safety but the dimension openings were the same.

Ms. Farrar said the west was a non-historic addition. The integrity of it was still intact so she questioned why that was important.

Mr. Barrow said the entire building status would change.

Mr. Rasch said the only difference was height. Additions must be six inches different for Significant structures.

Ms. Farrar thought the ordinance said buildings should grow in an orderly fashion. She pointed out that they had an original portion that was intact and an addition that was almost historic. She added that the school has maintained its character.

Mr. Purvis said the windows hadn't changed except mullion patterns. Those architects preserved the masonry that was in place. They only changed what they had to change. He said that, to him, some of the significance was this was one of the post war buildings that recognized the importance of physical education so the area around was just as important.

Mr. Featheringill said he favored significant.

Ms. Shapiro agreed.

Mr. Frost agreed.

Mr. Newman said he was on the fence and not sure.

Mr. Barrow favored significant.

**Ms. Farrar moved to approve Case #H 07-009 and designate the property as Significant. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **OLD BUSINESS**

---

1. **Case #H-06-43-B.** 1134 Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Ragins Research & Planning, agents for Robert Abeyta, propose to remodel a Non-Contributing residence with 672 sq. ft. of additions to match existing height.

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"1134 Canyon Rd is a 432 sq. ft. adobe guest house located on the same lot as a non-contributing single-family residence. The guest house was constructed between 1958 and 1970 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The building's historic status was confirmed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District on April 25, 2006, due to lack of an historic construction date.

"The building features a shed roof to the south with battered parapets on three sides. Windows and doors are deeply recessed and the buildings walls have rounded edges, both due to the application of foam insulation on the exterior.

Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following items.

"A 672 sq. ft. addition will be constructed on the south elevation. The addition will be accessed through an existing opening on the south elevation. It will match the existing building height, style and color.

"The river rock entrance to the partial basement will be removed and the entrance incorporated within the building.

"The addition will feature a simplified portal on the east elevation and compliant divided light windows. Existing noncompliant windows will not be altered.

"Another window may be installed on the north elevation, as noted on the letter of intent. However, this doesn't show up on the proposed floor plan or the elevation, so clarification with the applicant is recommended.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with section 14 – 5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards.”

Present and sworn was Ms. Mary Ragins 9 Stone Ridge Road, who said the previous letter was irrelevant.

Chair Rios asked about the inset on windows.

Ms. Ragins they would do it to match; about six inches.

Mr. Frost said the small window looked recessed about twelve inches. He asked if there was any way they could preserve the unique river rock some way.

Ms. Ragins thought it was in the way of parking requirements. The owner loses two parking spaces and removal of rock would establish it.

Mr. Frost asked if they could just leave some of it showing.

Ms. Ragins said it would cover up that whole elevation. He was maintaining the basement space but through a trap door.

Mr. Frost asked if that section of rock wall could be retained instead of covered over.

Ms. Ragins said she would talk to the owner about that. He was willing to make concessions to get it moving.

Ms. Farrar said the stone wall would be in front of their front door.

Mr. Newman pointed out the new portal and wondered if a fragment of the stone wall could be retained.

Ms. Ragins said yes.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the complaint divided windows: were aluminum clad.

Ms. Ragins said they were wood clad windows.

Ms. Shapiro asked for a door description.

Ms. Ragins said they discussed moving the front door but he has decided to relocate it to the entry.

Ms. Shapiro asked about the portal.

Ms. Ragins said it would be with a drip edge.

Ms. Shapiro asked what they would have on the roof

Ms. Ragins said there would be nothing on the roof.

Chair Rios asked about lighting.

Ms. Ragins said the owner was working on it.

Chair Rios suggested he could take to staff for approval.

Ms. Shapiro thought a jelly jar light design should be considered.

Ms. Ragins said he was not a carriage house kind of guy and she would recommend jelly jar to him.

**Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 06-043 per staff recommendation and the additional conditions:**

- 1) that the windows match existing and the existing door be re-located,**
- 2) that lighting details be taken to staff,**
- 3) that they incorporate stone fixture near the door on the façade or have some stone accent there.**

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

Ms. Ragins said she could not stay to the end of the meeting and wanted to comment on the 65 days.

She said the problem was from pulling it out of historic section of the ordinance under Chapter 14 reorganization. There was another one of those funny things that happened in it.

She said that the 65 days came from early 1980's and that was a long time to think

about demolition and at that time was a national standard. She added that, more importantly, it was to give owners two months to come up with a better plan. Typically the delay was a message to owner to rethink the plan. She thought that was important.

Ms. Farrar asked if it was folded in or originally in historic ordinance.

Ms. Ragins said it was part of the original historic ordinance and pulled out by Clarion so it became confusing what it applied to.

Ms. Farrar asked her, since she was a surveyor and Acequia Madre would have to be re-surveyed, how long would it take to resurvey it.

Ms. Ragins said that, depending on the case and political climate, she usually would get it done in ten days. But with this school, there was so much written to research. There was a lot out there.

2. **Case #H-06-130-B.** 726 Allendale. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Linda Zingle, agent/ owner, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing residence with 405 sq. ft. of additions and increase the height from 11' 3" to the maximum allowable height of 14' 9".

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

#### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"726 Allendale St is a single-family residence that was constructed by 1955 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. All of the original casement windows, as noted on the 1982 historic cultural property inventory, have been replaced with aluminum sliders. The original massing of a simple rectangle has been altered during non-historic dates, beginning in 1987. Additions on the north, west, and east elevations have almost doubled the footprint. Also, the front street facing elevation has been altered by the replacement of the entry door overhang with a simplified portal and bancos. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar area Historic District and this was confirmed by the HDRB on January 9, 2007.

"Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following items.

1. The building height will be increased from 11'3" to the maximum allowable height of 14'9" with stepped-up massing up to the highest portion.

2. Eight 295 ft.<sup>2</sup> addition living room and in tree Hall with a 112 ft.<sup>2</sup> portal will be constructed on the front northeast corner. The entry hall will feature a battered wall at the corner.

“The existing non-historic 43 sq. ft. portal and bancos will be removed.

3. A 194 sq. ft. addition (master bedroom) will be constructed on the rear northwest corner. The south elevation will have a bracket-supported shed roof over paired sliding glass doors.

4. All non-historic windows will be removed and replaced with a three over one divided light double hung, casement, and the awning windows.

5. Three additional skylights are proposed. The largest is 13.5' x 1.5' and they don't appear to be visible from the public way.

6. The window cladding color will be bronzed and the stucco will match the existing elastomeric color of Desert Lace.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with section 14 - 5.2 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards.”

Present and sworn was Ms. Linda Zingle, 726 Allendale.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Rasch if increasing this building height 3.5 feet higher was in keeping with streetscape.

Mr. Rasch said the neighborhood was varied so it would not detract from that.

Mr. Frost asked if the allowable height included the added two feet.

Mr. Rasch said yes as required by City attorney.

Ms. Zingle handed out a drawing of the house [Attached to these minutes as Exhibit A].

Ms. Zingle explained that when they first applied, they planned to just add 44 square feet because they thought we were zoned R-1 which would limit lot coverage to 40% or less. But they discovered they were zoned RM-1 and could increase lot coverage

up to 70% so we went to 43% coverage.

Ms. Zingle said existing square footage was 1,225 sq. ft. and they proposed to add 493 sq. ft. heated space.

Ms. Shapiro asked how much on portals.

Ms. Zingle said it was 125 sq. ft. and was just on the front.

Mr. Frost noted it changes direction.

Ms. Zingle agreed and said it was from east to south.

Mr. Newman saw no issue with massing. He felt it was an improvement but he was bothered by the sloping pier on the right hand side of porch. He was not sure where it came from. He said if it was vertical, it would be in keeping. He added that the porch had a more contemporary vocabulary.

Ms. Farrar agreed with Mr. Newman's comment on that detail.

Mr. Featheringill asked if ceiling heights were being raised.

Ms. Zingle agreed; 8' to 11'.

Mr. Featheringill asked about the location of mechanicals.

Ms. Zingle said they would be in the mechanical room.

Ms. Shapiro asked about exterior lighting

Ms. Zingle said they had not yet decided.

Chair Rios asked if they proposed changes to walls.

Ms. Zingle said no. She clarified they would demolish to get in a backhoe and then rebuild.

Mr. Rasch reminded her to add that on to the permit.

Ms. Shapiro asked about ground finish.

Ms. Zingle said they would use brown pebbles.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they were going to use elastomeric.

Ms. Zingle said yes because that was existing.

Mr. Rasch said that was in compliance.

Ms. Farrar asked if the proposed eyebrow on the south elevation was in compliance.

Mr. Rasch said it was.

Chair Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Rasch said the east was visible and had a low yard wall. Some of north and south was visible. None of west was visible.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Farrar moved to approve as per staff recommendations and the condition that the portal wall be straightened vertically and lighting plan be brought to staff. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion.**

Mr. Rasch asked how it would affect closet space if the wall was straight.

Ms. Zingle said it would not affect it at all.

Mr. Barrow felt it was unusual to have battered wall on one side and posts on the other and agreed with his colleagues.

Ms. Zingle asked if it would be more harmonious if instead of using a beam and used a column so it was battered on both sides.

Mr. Newman said no.

Mr. Barrow said it depended on how much the battering was. If softened a little and the same on both, it would be better.

Ms. Farrar thought they should approve all but that part and ask the applicant to bring back drawings.



Mr. Featheringill felt a little bit was okay; it was their taste vs our tastes but wasn't part of the standards.

Ms. Farrar didn't agree because it was an obvious design element that was new.

Mr. Newman didn't like adding another stucco pier on the other side, particularly if it was battered.

**The motion passed by majority voice vote with Ms. Farrar, Ms. Shapiro, Mr. Frost and Mr. Newman voting yes and Mr. Barrow and Mr. Featheringill voting no.**

Ms. Zingle thanked the Board and said they would bring back the lighting.

- 3. Case #H-06-131.** 518 Camino Cabra. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture, agents for Mr. Featheringill Warner and Dena Ross, propose to construct a 2,103 sq. ft. residence to the maximum allowable height of 15' 2".

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"518 Camino Cabra is a 4,267 sq. ft. vacant lot in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,103 sq. ft. single-family residence in the Recent Santa Fe style.

"The Historic Design Review Board postponed action on this request pending a resubmittal that considers a design that brought the proposal more into compliance with traditional style and that a rendering of the east street-facing elevation be submitted to help visualize the proposal.

"The applicant has submitted a larger scale color rendering of the east elevation for this hearing. Design changes on the east elevation include: singular rather than two-block massing on the street-facing wall, round portal posts rather than square, and an exposed wood lintel over the entry gate.

"The building will be 14 feet high at midpoint on the street-facing elevation, where the maximum allowable height is 15' 2" as determined by a linear calculation.

"The building features a wall-dominated massing. The proposed radius of the parapets was not detailed, but the corners will have a 2-inch radius and the

window/door reveals will have 3.5" recesses. The proposed elevation drawings appear to lack wall battering.

"The simplified portals will have the maximum allowable overhang of 30 inches above projecting beams. All windows and doors meet the 30-inch and three-foot rules where applicable.

"The building will be stuccoed in cementitious 'Buckskin.' Exposed wooden beams and portals will be stained a natural brown color. Window and door cladding will be a tan color.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Chair Rios asked what style it would be.

Mr. Rasch said it was Recent Santa Fe Style.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 460 Cerrillos Road.

Chair Rios asked how he would characterize this style

Mr. Martínez said it would be Recent Santa Fe style. He noted that three members of the Board were not here the last time. He explained he was given a three-fold task: 1) to make it bigger; 2) to have a heated connection to both parts of the house; 3) to make the project permissible under the historic code. He said he changed the windows, rounded the corners, and got rid of non-historic elements.

He said at the last meeting, he was asked to do a rendering because it was not clear what was forward and what was recessed. He hoped the drawing showed that for the Board. He said the lot was very narrow with a zero lot line on the north and 5' on the other side. The house was back and not a huge element on the streetscape. He said he also added a little coyote fence on the left side of entrance and got rid of the double wall and added the beam at the gate and had new plans to submit.

Chair Rios asked how close the house was to the street.

Mr. Martínez said the closest element, the buttress on the side of the portal, was seven feet back from lot line which was a few feet back from the street.

Chair Rios asked about height.

Mr. Martínez said where the chimney was but not counting the chimney itself was 14' high.

Chair Rios asked what the square footage of house was.

Mr. Rasch said it was 2,103.

Chair Rios asked him to describe the doors under the portal.

Mr. Martínez said they were sliding clad wood doors eight feet tall and with a single piece of glass in them.

Chair Rios asked for the depth of the porch.

Mr. Martínez said it was 4 feet deep.

Ms. Farrar referred to the portal over the guest house and asked if that beam at the top of the roofline was back from the gate.

Mr. Martínez said it was back from the front of the gate. He explained that the gate was deep enough for you to stand in. It was a courtyard gate that when you stand there, you were not in the rain.

Ms. Farrar asked if at that end of the portal there was a beam.

Mr. Martínez agreed and pointed it out.

Ms. Shapiro referred to page 12, the site plan, and suggested that on the east side of property, it looked like the portal with vegetation was right on the property line.

Mr. Martínez said the yard wall went out to the property line and the street was five feet further.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he could you show on the photo where it would be. She felt it was very close to the street.

Mr. Martínez noted that all of the Hispanic houses on the other side were right on the street.

Ms. Shapiro asked about trees.

Mr. Martínez said they had to take out all of the trees because they were Siberian elm trees.

Mr. Frost asked what elements defined Recent Santa Fe style.

Mr. Rasch said there was not agreement on that issue.

Mr. Frost suggested that Recent Santa Fe style really did not exist.

Mr. Rasch said he found an article written by John Gaw Meem written by him in 1975, which said it looked like old Santa Fe style but used permanent materials. It could get very contemporary in staff's position.

Mr. Martínez asked if that made old Santa Fe style only adobe.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Rios asked if what he quoted, was that from John Gaw Meem.

Mr. Rasch said he was paraphrasing it.

Ms. Shapiro said the Board needed a copy.

Chair Rios said it was not part of ordinance.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Rios said that, to her, recent Santa Fe style imitated old but used modern materials. She said to her, the east elevation had modernistic style and it looked like sharp edges.

Mr. Martínez said it did not have sharp edges. It would be made of blocks. This would have a very nice wall that stucco would show off very well.

Chair Rios asked about rounded corners.

Mr. Martínez said all of the edges would be rounded.

Mr. Rasch said in his letter he stated that corner radii were two inches and window recesses were 3.5 inches.

Mr. Frost asked if he said he was moving them forward to mimic the old houses around it and asked how that would mimic old Santa Fe style.

Mr. Martínez said that recent Santa Fe style was put in to include the style of 30's and 40's. the rounded edges were from plastering over and over again.

Mr. Frost - I live in an old adobe house with 10" recesses inside and outside. The walls were 32" thick and built in 1912.

Mr. Frost said it looked more like recent Malibu style and didn't reflect Santa Fe style at all.

Ms. Farrar asked staff if the rule that the "roof shall have less than 30" overhang" was a deterrent from having a shed roof.

Mr. Rasch said it was to deter a prairie style. He added that here, the viga was offset.

Mr. Martínez said both of these beams were right on top of the vigas. He added that if the Board wanted corbels, they could do that.

Ms. Farrar said her feeling was that these were more like a roofline and not a portal.

Mr. Featheringill asked where was overhang measured from.

Mr. Rasch said he would measure from the post. He said if it was less than 30", it was compliant with the style.

Ms. Farrar said the visual experience with the retaining wall at 4.5 feet high was not privacy and the house sits on top of that. It was going to be a very strong experience of a house on that street. It was so close to the street and not softened in any way. She wondered how it would affect the streetscape.

Mr. Featheringill said there were a lot that were closer than that.

Ms. Farrar said her house was right on the street and there was something about the way it holds you and this doesn't hold you.

Mr. Rasch said this property sloped up on the east side, but on the west side there

were no houses until you get to Cabra. He thought the neighbors had a wall.

Mr. Martínez said they were cutting four feet off the hill there and were trying to get as much space as possible.

Mr. Frost asked if that wall next door was a stone wall.

Mr. Martínez agreed and said it was very fancy.

Mr. Featheringill asked if it was the same height.

Mr. Martínez said it was much taller.

Mr. Rasch added that it had a coyote fence on top.

Mr. Barrow felt without question it was a contemporary look but in its favor was the rounded edges and the surface that wouldn't be a flat surface.

Mr. Martínez said it would be a hand worked surface.

Mr. Barrow felt with those elements, he had moved the design along.

Chair asked about the vigas.

Mr. Martínez said they would be six inches at top and eight inches at bottom.

Ms. Farrar still had concern about asymmetrical aspects and worried that it would have a strong impact on the streetscape. She felt it would be like the Cerro Gordo house without the wall in front of it. She said the design was not there yet for her to feel comfortable with it.

Ms. Shapiro noted the three planter areas seen. She said she really liked the design and the work he put in it but it didn't have the warmth it needed. She asked if he would face one of the planters with stone.

Mr. Martínez said they could do the one at the street with it.

Mr. Frost felt that would bring it closer to Santa Fe style.

Mr. Martínez said it would not be river rock but rough.

Mr. Rasch said the wall next door was a really very good example to follow.

Mr. Martínez said it would not be fitted but have a dry stack look.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Featheringill suggested they limit the overhang to less than 30".

Mr. Martínez said he could just cut off the overhang past the portals to be less than that. He thought it was about 15" there now.

Mr. Featheringill moved to approve Case #H 06-131 with the staff recommendations and the following conditions:

1. That the addition of the stone to match to match adjacent property be used on the retaining walls in front of the house,
2. That the portals be cut back to no more than 30" overhang,
3. That the applicant bring the lighting details to staff,
4. That there be no mechanicals on the roof and no visible skylights.

Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion with the condition

5. That he move the portals back to six inches from the post.

**The motion failed by majority voice vote with Mr. Featheringill, Mr. Barrow and Ms. Shapiro voting yes and with Mr. Frost, Mr. Newman and Ms. Farrar voting no. Chair Rios voted no to break the tie.**

Mr. Rasch said there was not unanimous feeling about the asymmetrical look. How do you bring it into more compliance with the lack of any traditional elements.

Mr. Frost said there were no traditional elements. They were missing. It didn't look Santa Fe.

Chair Rios said Mr. Martínez had been here many times. She had confidence that he knew what Santa Fe style was. She noted the doors were nothing but glazing.

Mr. Martínez said he could do divided lights on the doors and add corbels.

Ms. Farrar said her greatest worry was that this was on the street but with design elements that were strong in your face. The roofline proportions didn't have anything of the language of portals and it was completely urban. She did feel that the floor plan was great.

**Ms. Farrar moved to postpone the case for redesign with suggestions made by the Board in order to bring it into compliance with recent Santa Fe style especially proportion and general detail. Mr. Frost seconded the motion.**

The Board made several suggestions to him including exposed viga ends or a more traditional look on the portal, changing the three doors, maybe a short fence.

**The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Mr. Newman who voted no.**

- 4. Case #H-06-132.** 516 Camino Rancheros. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cindy Urban, agent for Clare Easterwood, proposes to construct a coyote fence and pedestrian and vehicle gates to the maximum allowable height of 5' 4" on a Non-Contributing property.

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"516 Camino Rancheros is a single-family residence that was built at an unknown date and is listed as a non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. No work is proposed on the residence.

"The applicant proposes to construct a fence with gates at the front of the property. The HDRB postponed action on this request at the January 9, 2007 hearing for the applicant to consider a redesign that allows for more visual access into the property.

"The coyote fence, with irregular latilla tops, will be constructed to the maximum allowable height of 5' 4". The fence will weave between existing piñon and juniper trees. Also, the applicant has altered the visual appearance of the fence to include approximately 2" of space between latillas.

A coyote fence pedestrian gate will be installed in the fence at 36" wide.

A vehicle gate, which has been reduced in width from 18 feet to 14 feet, will be constructed of wooden panels below an open grillwork of iron spindles instead of coyote fence latillas. The vehicle gate will be installed between 2' wide stuccoed pilasters at 5' 4" high. The pilasters will be fitted with wall-mounted light fixtures that are finished in dark bronze with amber glass.



## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Cindy Urban, P. O. Box 9322, who said after last meeting, she re-read the guidelines that the City provides. She read it. She hoped what she presented addressed all those issues.

Mr. Frost asked what color was the metal in the gates.

Ms. Urban said it would match the light fixtures and the wood would be stained natural. She said they also added iron hardware to make it more welcoming.

Ms. Farrar asked what she read.

Ms. Urban said it was the wall and fence guidelines.

Mr. Barrow asked if the guidelines were approved by Council.

Mr. Rasch said no but they supported the ordinance.

Ms. Farrar thought she had done a good job. It was softer.

Mr. Barrow commented that they were balancing. He said as they went up the street, there were gates and walls and places where there were no gates or walls. And all of them appeared to be more recent construction. He didn't know how many they reviewed in a year.

Mr. Rasch said there were about 200 cases.

Mr. Barrow suggested about 40 gates per year, so it was not harmony with what it has been but what it was becoming. The old photographs didn't show many gates and walls. So personally he had difficulty with walls and gates and was still opposed to the gate.

Ms. Urban said that in the sixteen hundreds, large heavy gates were present for protection.

Mr. Barrow said they went back 50 years for historic. He said he had been here 20 years and seen proliferation in a major way. Everybody wanted one.

Mr. Rasch said there were very few walls that were designated historic and on this street, none of them were historic.

Ms. Farrar agreed.

Mr. Rasch asked if they harmonized to existing streetscape or historic streetscape.

Ms. Urban said it seemed the Board was asking that she open this up. Perhaps that should be in the written guidelines. She felt the owner should have the right to have a gate and it was the Board's job to dictate what it should look like.

Mr. Barrow didn't think they should encourage them.

Chair Rios said this was a point of contention and the point Mr. Barrow made was very valid. She said when she was growing up, some neighborhoods had high walls but she recalled no fences in back yards. She thought vehicle gates came in more than ten years ago. The purview of the Board was to make the connection with the historic part of what was here before.

Ms. Shapiro said there were no drawings of the pedestrian gate.

Ms. Urban said it was the same design as the vehicle gate.

Chair Rios asked about the public visibility of the gate.

Ms. Urban said it was set back twenty feet and one would see entire gate because it was on the driveway. It was a sloping drive up so closer to the street was better.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 06-132 per staff recommendations. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Mr. Barrow who voted no.**

5. **Case #H-06-52-B.** 451 Amado. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Jonah Stanford, agent for Nick Heil, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by removing 126 sq. ft. of non-historic additions and to construct 310 sq. ft. of additions, and to increase the height from approximately 10' to 11' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 12' 4". Exceptions were requested to alter openings on the primary elevation and to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Sections 14-5.2,D,2,d & D,5).

This case was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

## **STATUS REVIEW**

3. **Case #H-07-17.** 617 & 617 ½, 617-A, 617-B Acequia Madre & 349 Plaza Balentine. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Scott Robey & James DeVille, propose an historic status review of this Contributing and Non-Contributing property.

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

## **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY**

"617 and 617½ Acequia Madre, 617½ A and 617½ B Acequia Madre, and 349 Plaza Balentine is a Territorial Revival multi-family residential compound that was constructed before 1940 in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The main residence (617 and 617½) is listed as non-contributing. The remodeled two-car garage (617½A and 617½B) and the guest house on Plaza Balentine are listed as contributing. This group of buildings is not recommended for historic compound status, but other buildings on Plaza Balentine are recommended for historic compound status.

"The main residence, described in to the historic cultural property inventories HCPI and recommending contributing status, was remodeled in 1989 with the addition of a noncompliant sunroom with pitched roof, very tall parapet extensions, addition of brick coping, loss of garage door opening on the west elevation, and loss of window openings on the north elevation. These may be considered as character defining changes.

"The associated yard walls were constructed after 1984, as stated by the previous owner.

"The two-car garage was converted to two residential units in 1989. The HCPI recommends non-contributing status due to non-historic remodeling and alteration of massing with a false façade and deep roof overhang.

"The guest house on Plaza Balentine, retains original character and the materials, including divided light doors and windows. Several projecting viga ends were cut off flush with the stucco and cemented over and the bracket-supported shed roof of the entry door may not be original. This building appears to deserve its contributing historic status with only minor alteration.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends downgrading the historic status for the remodeled garage from contributing to non-contributing due to major alteration of the primary street facing a location, maintaining the non-contributing historic status for the main residence due to character defining changes including massing, height, and opening dimensions, and maintaining the contributing historic status for the guest house on Plaza Balentine. If the applicant proposes to restore the Main residence, then contributing status may be restored to that building.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Scott Robey, 617 Acequia Madre

Chair Rios asked if he agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. Robey said yes. He said they had some other things that were character defining. He handed them out to the Board [attached as Exhibit B].

Mr. Frost noticed the viga ends were cut off and wondered if Territorial style with viga ends wasn't unusual.

Chair Rios said it wasn't.

Mr. Frost asked if they planned to restore viga ends.

Mr. Robey said no.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Frost moved to retain the contributing status for the guest house. Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Chair Rios noted staff recommended downgrade of status for the garage.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were windows in front where the garage doors were.

Mr. Robey agreed there were three large windows the size of typical garage doors. He said the third was added in 1989 to mimic the other two and the one on the right had a door in it.

Chair Rios asked the age of the building.

Mr. Rasch said it was pre 1940 but had alteration of the street facing elevation.

Ms. Shapiro asked how much.

Mr. Robey said it had been added onto on the front and back, parapets were added and it doubled in size. He said it had nothing of the original integrity. He said it was 586 sq. ft. and enlarged to 1200 in 1989.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Farrar moved to downgrade to non contributing 617½A & 617½B. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

### **Main Building:**

Ms. Farrar asked what alterations were done besides the east sun room.

Mr. Rasch said there was a four-foot high parapet wall with new brick.

Ms. Farrar asked why it was added.

Mr. Robey said it was added to hide the pitched roof. He added that on the north side, all windows were walled over to provide privacy.

Chair Rios asked how much of the original footprint remains.

Mr. Robey said all of it remained.

Ms. Farrar was impressed with the shadows being kept to show original openings so that was not a downside to its status. She asked if the parapet height that was lifted in back was done in 1989.

Mr. Robey agreed.

Ms. Farrar said that has been done a lot to protect the roofline. She felt the addition definitely stood out from the rest of the building and still allowed her to see the original building.

Mr. Barrow asked, if they upgraded the building and 2-3 years from now, new owners wanted to make changes such as removing this glass feature, how would the Board address that.

Mr. Rasch said the ordinance says that once they were remodeled, they must be brought into compliance.

Mr. Frost asked if he wanted to keep it.

Mr. Robey said no.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Farrar and Mr. Barrow discussed the non-compliant section of the ordinance.

**Ms. Farrar moved to upgrade the status of 617 and 617½ to Contributing. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion.**

Mr. Robey asked about yard walls that were added in 1980's.

Ms. Farrar said that as non-historic walls they could be removed.

**The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Mr. Barrow who abstained.**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

1. **Case #H-07-7.** 301 N. Guadalupe. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Aaron J. Gonzales, agent for Mr. Rasch Byrnes, proposes to construct two pergolas at 745 sq. ft. and 36" high yard walls on the front of a Non-Contributing building.

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

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"301 Guadalupe St is a two-story multi-unit commercial building that includes the CD Café. The original building, constructed after 1945, was demolished in 1992 and replaced with the present building in 1999. The building is designed in the recent Santa Fe style with stepped parapets and a portal that includes projecting wooden beams above stuccoed pilasters with stepped corbels. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building by constructing 430 sq. ft. of

pergolas to a height of 10 feet in front of the existing south elevation portal.

“The pergolas will be constructed of earth tone stained wooden timbers with roof beams that mimic the projecting beams on the existing portal and corbels that are stepped like this stuccoed corbels on the existing portal. The trellis beams extended 24 inches from the posts and would violate the roof overhang will by 6 inches if the beams were to be covered with a solid roof treatment.

“There will be a concrete slab ground treatment under the pergolas and a 36 inch high stuccoed garden wall around the new seating area.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Aaron Gonzales, 2194 Camino Lumbre.

Mr. Gonzales clarified that there would be no solid covering on the pergola.

Chair Rios asked for the depth.

Mr. Gonzales said it was ten feet.

Chair Rios asked if they would keep the tree.

Mr. Gonzales said yes.

Mr. Frost said from the end of beams tip to tip was 14 feet.

Mr. Gonzales said he thought the depth might be twelve.

Ms. Farrar said she had a hard time reading the design plans. On proposed, it looks like the stucco deco design would no longer be visible.

Mr. Gonzales showed the drawings to her.

Mr. Barrow asked about the pergola joists.

Mr. Gonzales said they were not shown in the plan.

Mr. Barrow said it would be a ledge going across the open space.

Mr. Newman said that anything that covered this building would be an improvement.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Frost asked how many pergolas existed in the surrounding area.

Mr. Gonzales said there was one on the second floor in the back.

Mr. Frost asked how he would regard doing one on this end but not on the other end.

Mr. Gonzales said there was no covered portal where the Kinkos was. It was a flush façade.

Mr. Rasch said he measured and the existing garden was 11.5 feet wide. The beam on the pergola was 10.5 and the overhang was 12.5.

Mr. Gonzales said it was now a sandwich place and the owner was making his client do this to tie together the outdoor space and increase the outdoor space.

Mr. Gonzales said there was no chance they would cover it over but they might have a soft net in summer.

Mr. Frost asked how many parking spaces would be impacted by the three-foot wall.

Mr. Gonzales said they would build it inside that curb.

**Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-007 per staff recommendation Ms. Farrar seconded. Mr. Frost asked for a friendly amendment with condition that the tree remain. Mr. Newman and Ms. Farrar agreed. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

2. **Case #H-07-18.** 849 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Would McDonald, agent for Terry Burt, propose to construct an approximately 54 sq. ft. addition below the existing height of 13' 6" to a Non-Contributing building.



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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"The approximately 1,607 square foot single-family residence located at 849 E. Palace Ave is Spanish Pueblo Revival style and was first constructed in the 1940s or 1950s. The building has undergone alterations which include an addition to the front, north elevation, in the 1970s and replacement of the most original windows. The replacement windows are not compliant and include dimension changes. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes construction of an approximately 54 sq. ft. bathroom addition to the north elevation. The addition will be to a height of 11' 7" where the existing height is 13' 6". The frame addition will be stuccoed in El Rey 'Buckskin' to match the existing building. Windows will be divided light aluminum clad in a putty color similar to the existing. A cannelure is proposed on the north elevation which will be lined with tin. No skylights or rooftop appurtenances are proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for all H-Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District design standards."

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Will McDonald, 488 C Arroyo Tenorio.

Chair Rios asked about the location.

Mr. McDonald said it was by some of the lovely backwoods part of the historic east side, past the Palace grocery. He said Montoya Circle goes to left. This drive way goes to the right. He argued that it was not publicly visible.

Ms. Farrar said it was non compliant, but the back of building looked great.

Mr. McDonald said the bathroom would be adjacent to the shed.

Mr. Frost asked if there was no outside lighting.

Mr. McDonald agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 07-18 per staff recommendations. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. McDonald commended the Board for catching up.

3. **Case #H-07-19.** 529 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Deborah Auten, agent for Tom Melk & Sarah Potter, propose to construct 300 sq. ft. of additions to an existing second floor and to remodel with window and door alterations a Non-Contributing building.

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"529 Camino del Monte Sol is a two-story single-family residence with an attached guesthouse and garage that was originally constructed in 1938 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival Style. Multiple additions have been added with a remodel in the late 1950s by Bill Lumpkins. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District due to alterations.

"The HDRB approved multiple alterations on July 26, 2005 for a previous owner. Now, a new owner is requesting further alterations.

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

"1. A 1230 square foot closet addition will be constructed on the west elevation of the second floor to match existing height. There will be no windows on this massing and a 24x36' skylight will be installed for light.

"2. A 120 square foot bathroom addition will be constructed on the south elevation of the second floor to match existing height. New divided light windows will match existing windows. A 42" x 48" skylight will be installed in the roof.

"3. A solid balcony wall on the east elevation of the second floor will be removed and replaced with a vertical slat railing.

"4. Numerous window and door replacements will be performed on multiple

elevations of the house and guest house. The windows are compliant to the 30" light rule and will match existing.

"5. A mechanical room door on the north elevation ground floor will be infilled with wall.

"6. An 18" x 62" skylight will be installed in the living room ceiling.

"7. The buildings will be restuccoed to match existing color.

"8. Two light fixtures at 21" high will be installed at an entry door. See photo on page three of images.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Present and sworn was Ms. Deborah Auten, 125 E. Palace Avenue. #72. She clarified that the additions approved before were more extensive with the exception of the second floor. She said they were adding more onto the second floor from 2005. There were other significant things on ground floor that they also were not doing. She said the skylights wouldn't be visible. Also one change on east elevation: the transom would not be done.

Ms. Shapiro asked if all one would see from the street was the second floor.

Ms. Auten agreed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the windows on second floor, finish technique, reveal and headers would match existing.

Ms. Auten agreed. She said Sarah Potter, the owner, has been a member of the Chicago Historic Board in Chicago and was very sensitive to historic style and preservation.

Chair Rios asked if the size was 250 sq ft on second floor.

Ms. Auten agreed.

Mr. Frost said with this design, the closet protruded to the front and that massing

appeared a little heavy. He asked if they could consider a window or something.

Ms. Auten said that was possible.

Mr. Newman asked if it would be possible on that closet in addition to the window to lower the parapet height six inches.

Ms. Auten agreed that they could do that.

Mr. Barrow said he had trouble reading the photo. He asked how much would the view of the mountains be blocked.

Ms. Auten said it wouldn't change from this angle. The bath would be six feet back from the façade.

Mr. Frost said the arrow made it appear it would go from one corner to the next corner.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Farrar asked about the owner's experience on the Chicago H Board. She commented briefly.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the street facing façade had two lights on either side of door.

Ms. Auten agreed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were no changes to wall, driveway material, etc.

Ms. Auten agreed. She said the only thing was that the guest house was still being designed. It was possible she would come back with a few changes to it. She said the west courtyard elevation, might go down to two there but there would be no changes on the publicly visible façades.

**Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-19 per staff recommendations and that the massing of the closet be softened with a window and the closet parapet be dropped six inches. Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

4. **Case #H-07-20.** 101-111 Washington. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, agents for Mr. Frost Spitz, propose to construct a 413 sq. ft.

portal to match the height of an existing adjacent portal on a Non-Contributing building.

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"101-107 Washington Avenue is a commercial building that was constructed between 1930 and 1942 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The original gas station was remodeled at an unknown date after 1945 including the filling in of the garage doors. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District due to alterations.

"The applicant proposes to construct a 413 square foot portal adjacent to an existing portal and match existing adjacent height and all characteristic features of the existing portal.

"The portal will feature two bays with stuccoed pilasters, exposed wood corbels and header beam, and an undulating parapet.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

Present and sworn Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, who thanked the Board for hearing him. He said his other project was approved by the Planning Commission and he would come back in April on Inn at Loretto.

He said Mr. Spitz's family had owned this property for a long time.. All were razed in 1932. He gave the history. It was a gas station for awhile and was completely remodeled in 1972.

He said the purpose of extending the portal was as a protected area for the children. The building to the north was not affected. The addition would add 413 square feet, colors and stains to match. He said the only visible lighting would be submitted to staff.

Mr. Frost asked if there was any way to take the portal and mimic that same pattern of driving between the bays to have the post right between the bays.

Mr. Enfield said they did look at that but there were three bays there and it made it

very difficult to match because the spacing was off and they wanted it as open as possible.

Mr. Frost asked if there were skylights.

Mr. Enfield said no.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the people next door would feel hemmed in.

Mr. Enfield said he went to the tenants and that was why they went to two bays and kept visibility open. He said they were only losing one planter.

Mr. Newman asked him to redefine the parapet.

Mr. Enfield said the brick coping would remain. He said he couldn't find a picture of the gas station.

Mr. Newman suggested either pushing the new part out or pulling it back a little bit. He said he would prefer pulling it back enough to distinguish it.

Mr. Enfield asked if maybe six would be okay.

Mr. Newman said no.

Mr. Enfield said he would do twelve inches.

Mr. Barrow said the building reads like a filling station and he liked the idea of recessing and lowering it slightly.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman was concerned that lowering it would interfere with the doors.

**Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-020 per staff recommendations with condition that:**

- 1. The portal extension be set back from existing a minimum of twelve inches;**
- 2. That the parapet line be straight across, leaving existing eaves.**

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

## **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

---

- 1. An ordinance regarding demolition and minimum maintenance requirements for Landmark structures.**

**Mr. Newman moved to remove the Administrative Matter from the table. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Ms. Farrar said they should give themselves a six-month grace period to act on the demolition. We don't have to take six months but it gives us time and might need.

Mr. Rasch said that would violate due process.

Mr. Featheringill thought 65 days was huge for initial hearing.

There was much discussion on when the 65 days started.

The Board agreed the application in proper form must include a plan to re-establish the streetscape.

Mr. Frost said they needed to include landmark in this now.

**Ms. Farrar moved to recommend approval of the amendment in Section 14-3.14 and 14-5.2(B) SFCC 1987 to the Governing Body as amended, deleting on page one, line 21 ", within 65 calendar days from the date of application," and deleting the last sentence on page one (lines 22-25). Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

---

Chair Rios said the Board needed to have study sessions on the ordinance to discuss specific sections so they would be on firm ground. She felt they should have someone from legal there also.

Mr. Barrow thought it was a good idea and asked when they should do it.

Ms. Shapiro suggested they have it on a week when they didn't have a board meeting and have it from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Farrar said the Historic Santa Fe Foundation would let the Board meet there.

Mr. Frost said he would be gone from March 25 to "April whatever."

Chair Rios asked the Board members to email Mr. Rasch with dates and times they would prefer.

### **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 p.m.

Approved by:

  
Cecilia Rios, Chair Rios

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer