



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3/11/07 TIME 2:40

SERVED BY Maia R. Vigil

RECEIVED BY Donella Vigil

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2007 – 12:00 NOON

PLANNING DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2007 – 6:00PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 9, 2007
February 13, 2007

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

G. OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-06-01. 142 Lincoln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk, agent for Storico Development, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing building with reconfiguration of windows, balconies, and portals from a previous approval.
2. Case #H-06-74B. 200 Lincoln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for the City of Santa Fe, proposes to amend previous approval to replace all windows on a Contributing building with similar not matching windows.
3. Case #H-06-93-B. 729 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andy Lyons, agent for Phillip Coombs, proposes to demolish the primary residence & pool house, to remodel the 988 sq. ft. guest house with 474 sq. ft. of additions and to construct four residences ranging from 2,075 to 2,957 sq. ft. to slightly less than the maximum allowable height of 17' 10".

4. Case #H-07-10. 359 Garcia. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Stefan Merdler, agent for Roberts & Jenny French, proposes to construct an approximately 333 sq. ft. addition to a Contributing building to match existing height and remodel a Non-Contributing guest house by constructing an 80 sq. ft. portal, 335 sq. ft. attached studio to a height of 11' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 8", to construct a pergola and to raise a rear yard wall 2" to the maximum allowable height of 6'.

I. STATUS REVIEW

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-07-21. 117 Vigil Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Bill & Candace Raboff, propose to construct a 88 sq. ft. addition to match existing height on a Non-Contributing building and to construct a 558 sq. ft. guest house to approximately 12' high where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4".
2. Case #H-07-23. 505 Camino Sin Nombre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robin Gray, agent for Mary Kay Casey, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing building by replacing non-compliant windows and doors, constructing an overhang, removing overhangs and replacing with parapets, and re-stuccoing.
3. Case #H-07-12. 1433 Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Philip Kozely, agent for Peter Kozely, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by constructing approximately 82 sq. ft. of additions an approximately 165 sq. ft. deck, raising a non-historic addition to a height of 14' 9" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5", replace windows, re-stucco, construct a 379 sq. ft. garage to a height of 9' 9" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5", construct an approximately 63 sq. ft pergola, and construct walls and fences. Four exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2,D,2,c) to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2,D,4), to replace historic material (Section 14-5.2,D,5,a), and to construct an addition less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2,D,2,d).
4. Case #H-07-22. 229 Galisteo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning, agents for Bina Said, propose to construct approximately 852 sq. ft. of portals to 11' 6" high to enclose an existing roofed, open-walled structure, change existing stucco and trim color, and to construct a 66" high fence where the maximum allowable height is 36" high on a Non-Contributing property. A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2, D,9).

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 March 13, 2007 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Planning Division by 9:00 am on Tuesday, March 13, 2007 so that transportation can be arranged.

SUMMARY INDEX
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Santa Fe, New Mexico
March 13, 2007

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
Approval of Minutes:		
January 9, 2007	Postponed	2
February 13, 2007	Approved with corrections	2
Communications	Discussion	3
Matters from the Floor	Statement from OSFA President	3
Administrative Matters	None	3
Old Business to Remain Postponed	None	3
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 06-01</u> 142 Lincoln Ave.	Approved with conditions	4-8
2. <u>Case #H 06-74-B</u> 200 Lincoln Ave.	Postponed with instructions	8-12
3. <u>Case #H 06-93B</u> 729 E. Palace	Approved with conditions	12-16
4. <u>Case #H 07-10</u> 359 Garcia	Approved with conditions	17-21
Status Review	None	21
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 07-21</u> 117 Vigil Lane	Approved with conditions	21-23
2. <u>Case #H 07-23.</u> 505 Camino Sin Nornbre	Postponed	23

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
3. <u>Case #H 07-12</u> 1433 Canyon Road	Postponed	24
4. <u>Case #H 07-22</u> 229 Galisteo	Postponed with instructions	24-28
Matters from the Board	Discussion	29
Adjournment	29
Exhibit: A		

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

March 13, 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:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Historic Planner
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. 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 reported that Case #H 07-23 had been postponed by application and Case #H 07-12 had been postponed by the City. He also asked the Board to consider moving Business from the Floor right after Communications.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve the agenda as amended by staff. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 9, 2007

Ms. Farrar moved to postpone Jan 9 minutes to next meeting. Ms. Shapiro seconded and it passed unanimously.

February 13, 2007

Mr. Frost requested the following changes to these minutes:

1. Page 17, 3rd paragraph: "about" should be "above."
2. Page 36, 6th paragraph up: "Frosts" should be "Frost."

Mr. Newman requested the following changes to these minutes:

1. Page 10, 5th paragraph - second sentence should read "He said he was talking about the relationship of the south elevations to the fence and the street. Twelfth: delete "frankly." "And move the other back to create much nicer houses."
2. Page 14, 4th paragraph up: combine the fifth with the fourth and delete that last sentence from the beginning to "but". "The existing house was forty feet back so moving the middle back six feet was not sufficient."
3. Page 30, in the motion. The first sentence third line "... and that the wall that attaches to the stable ... and extended around to the east side with a one or two-step transition provided to staff for review." and delete the rest of the sentence.

Mr. Frost moved for approval of the minutes of February 13, 2007 as corrected. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said the New Mexico Heritage Alliance conference was scheduled for April 28-30 in Roswell and staff would attend.

MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Marilyn Bane, President of the Old Santa Fe Association said they had an executive committee meeting yesterday and they asked her to convey to the Board their sympathy regarding the exceptions the Board was being asked to approve regularly. She said the Old Santa Fe Association, like the Board, believes exceptions were not a right but were to be granted only in extraordinary circumstances. She thanked the Board.

Chair Rios said they tried to scrutinize those carefully.

Ms. Farrar agreed. She said it was hard to know what an exception was created for: hardships for family but today more and more they were brought forward for economic gain.

Mr. Rasch said it was clear they needed to change the language of exceptions and perhaps several sets. He said he was considering an amendment for sustainability and it might have a different set of criteria. He asked the Board to think about that.

Ms. Farrar talked with Councilor Chávez about the Civic Center and making a recommendation that, as much as possible, the fixtures and doors be made by local craftsmen. She felt it might help for the Board to write him a letter encouraging this.

Chair Rios asked if she would like to write the letter.

Ms. Farrar said she would, with the Chair's help.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

None.

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 short 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.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-06-01.** 142 Lincoln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk, agent for Storico Development, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing building with reconfiguration of windows, balconies, and portals from a previous approval.

Ms. Farrar recused herself from consideration of this case.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"142 Lincoln Ave, known as the La Esquina Building, is a five-story commercial building that was constructed in 1982 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The building features paired and single column portals and upper floor balustrade balconies. It is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. A BCD variance is required for portals over the right of way.

"On June 27, 2006, the Historic Design Review Board approved remodeling of this building with the condition that the stucco and trim color be submitted to the Board.

"The applicant proposes to amend the remodel of the building with the following items. The buildings massing will generally remained the same with only slight alterations to the organization of windows and the doors from the previous HDRB approval. The most significant alteration is the elimination of the underground garage entrance.

"The stucco type will be elastomeric, color will be Adobe Brown, and trim color will be Hemlock.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"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 Mr. Lorn Tryk, 206 McKenzie who asked if the Board had in their packet the existing, the originally proposed and the new proposal.

Chair Rios said they did.

Chair Rios asked if this would enlarge the window openings.

Mr. Tryk said no. He added that the garage entry was going away so it reorganized the windows in the building. He showed the Marcy Street side existing. The biggest feature last time they presented was the extremely short portal. He said they still planned to remove the story eight feet above the sidewalk.

He showed what was approved last time and said the garage entry and basement would be eliminated at the western end of the lower level except for mechanicals. He said they were still proposing the addition of the balconies on the second floor.

Mr. Barrow asked what was going into the garage entry because it looked the same.

Mr. Tryk said it would stay the same but they might come back with new gates. The ones there now were fairly utilitarian. He explained they were putting first floor at grade with 18' height. The only basement would be the mechanical room at the western end on the north side and the cooling tower would actually be in that space.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the divides on the windows had changed.

Mr. Tryk said they had not changed and the railings, light fixtures, etc., stayed the same as proposed before.

Mr. Newman asked if the windows were true divided lights.

Mr. Tryk agreed and said they would be metal clad. He said Hemlock was a standard green color, and fairly common.

Mr. Featheringill asked if there was a pop up that went away and now was back.

Mr. Tryk said it was existing.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they would have mechanicals up there.

Mr. Tryk said they would have a little bit but no chillers.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they lost the chimneys.

Mr. Tryk said yes.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the balcony on the east side was gone.

Mr. Tryk said it was still proposed.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the canales had been relocated.

Mr. Tryk said they were the same as last time. He said he did reduce the top of it without the arch, now squared off. He said they were using galvanized steel, not copper lining.

Chair Rios asked what it would be used for.

Mr. Tryk said the first floor would be retail; the top would be residential and in between would be offices. The two who want to live there have off site parking.

Mr. Tryk reviewed the east elevation and the stairwell in the middle of the building. He said there were very few changes from the last proposal.

Mr. Frost asked if they were eliminating the windows on the second and third floors that were off center.

Mr. Tryk agreed.

Mr. Tryk explained that on the west elevations, they had to set back in order to have windows because it was the property line. He said they would eliminate the ones on the north part and set back five feet with railings.

Mr. Barrow said it read like five stories and asked if it was.

Mr. Tryk said the mezzanine was nine feet above street. The north and east elevations were more valuable for retail. There was no portal on that side. A little office loft could be put in there.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the west elevation was actually a change from 2006.

Mr. Tryk said yes. He felt it helped take away a lot of blank wall and would give more light.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow spoke to the request for elastomeric stucco. First Interstate has elastomeric stucco. In his mind, this building was a grey area. He said his tendency would prefer cementitious. It was a feeling for the way the design was taking shape. There was a lot of detailing and he was not so convinced about mezzanine level. He asked when it was built.

Mr. Tryk said it was done in 1982.

Mr. Barrow thought there were advantages to cementitious, especially as it gets wet.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Tryk to do a comparison on it.

Mr. Tryk said the owner was wedded to elastomeric because of large expanses. He said he was not a huge fan of it, particularly in adobe because it traps moisture, but this was a steel structure so that was not an issue. As the red colors oxidize, they get better than when new.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he had a sample of Adobe Brown.

Mr. Tryk said he didn't but it was a standard color, fairly dark but not as dark as existing. It has some red in it.

Mr. Barrow asked if he was retaining some existing stucco or was it all coming down.

Mr. Tryk said they would have a complete three-coat system

Ms. Shapiro asked if it was cementitious now.

Mr. Tryk said yes.

Mr. Frost said he believed every building in the downtown should be cementitious.

Chair Rios agreed.

Ms. Shapiro agreed also. The Eldorado new stucco was cementitious.

Ms. Shapiro said the new civic center was also cementitious.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 06-01 according to staff recommendations

and with the conditions that canales have galvanized steel with tops squared, on west that the mezzanine be approved as well as new windows for the first floor, that the applicant consider cementitious stucco with colors brought to staff for approval.

Mr. Barrow seconded with condition that it be cementitious.

Ms. Shapiro said okay and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Farrar rejoined the bench at this time.

- 2. Case #H 06-74B.** 200 Lincoln. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for the City of Santa Fe, proposes to amend previous approval to replace all windows on a Contributing building with similar not matching windows.

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"200 Lincoln Ave, also known today as City Hall and previously as Santa Fe High School, was originally constructed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style by John Gaw Meem in October 1950. An addition, known as Seth Hall, was constructed on the Northwest corner in 1953. These buildings are listed in the Meem inventory under Santa Fe School System as file number 464-J.

"The building was upgraded as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District on August 22, 2006.

"The building features two-story portals, cast concrete headers and sills, decorated elements on window panels and sills, and steel casement windows. The thermal pane windows are installed at the front entrance on Lincoln Avenue and on the entrance to Planning and Land Use on the south elevation. It is estimated that this alteration occurred in the 1960s.

"On August 22, 2006, the HDRB approved an application to replace all original and historic windows and exceptions to maintain the noncompliant fenestration with the condition that the new windows match the existing in frame and muntin width.

"Now, the applicant requests to replace all single pane steel casement windows with thermal pane steel windows that will only closely mimic but not identically match the exterior appearance. There are two options to choose from: steel frames imported from Europe that are flexible in color or American aluminum frames in solar bronze or cream

brown.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

“Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2 (E). Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards and as previously approved with Section 14-5.2 C Regulation of Contributing Structures.”

Chair Rios asked if staff recommended either option.

Mr. Rasch said staff were leaving it up to the Board.

Present and sworn was Mr. Harvey Monroe, PO Box 1183, Santa Fe.

He said that since the last meeting, he had researched to try to meet the conditions of the original approval and was dismayed to find that there was not a material meeting exact specs at City Hall. He said he found one option was the steel frame produced by Hope Windows out of New York and another was an aluminum frame more readily available but somewhat limited in color because it was anodized and slightly different in dimensions. Most were one-quarter inch to an inch in thickness. The aluminum was not as strong as steel and some had larger members. The steel was also painted so they could match the existing windows better. The steel was twice as costly as the aluminum. He said that in the packets were details of the different windows.

Chair Rios asked which more closely resembled the existing windows.

Mr. Monroe said probably the steel. Like an eighth of an inch up to one inch.

Chair Rios asked if the City had a preference.

Mr. Monroe said the City wanted the more economical windows.

Mr. Featheringill asked if the aluminum was thermally broke

Mr. Monroe said yes, slightly more efficient.

Mr. Featheringill said the Hope windows would last longer than the aluminum. The aluminum looked a lot different and he loved Hope windows.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were no steel windows made in the US.

Mr. Monroe said there were but not that thin of a profile. He said Hope windows

were used a lot in historic buildings on the east coast.

Ms. Shapiro asked for the cost.

Mr. Monroe said it would cost \$400,000 for the steel.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they were going to buy offsets.

Mr. Monroe said the aluminum had a 20-year life span and the steel windows had a 50-year life span.

Mr. Frost asked about the color options on steel.

Mr. Monroe said they could have any color.

Mr. Featheringill asked if they were installing within the existing frames.

Mr. Monroe said because of the asbestos, they had to remove the frame.

Mr. Featheringill thought that would make a better application.

Chair Rios asked if the City was ready for either option.

Mr. Monroe said Mr. Fiedler might have better sense for that.

Mr. Newman asked about the size of the muntins. He said 1 5/8 " muntins were because of insulating glass. They were peculiar to start with: Double hung with awning at the bottom.

Mr. Monroe said they were not recommending double hung with awning at the bottom.

Mr. Barrow said at NPS they were able to find some steel a year ago and asked if he was sure it was not possible to have channel custom made windows.

Mr. Monroe said the steel ones were custom made for this job. They were duplicating what they had as closely as possible. The cost difference was almost double.

Mr. Barrow said 1 3/8 was the smallest channel.

Mr. Monroe said they called dozens and it took 3 months for Hope to respond. He said there were over 110 windows.

Mr. Newman asked if they were being removed because of asbestos.

Mr. Rasch said yes.

Mr. Newman said at the Denver conference, they talked about thicker glass rather than insulated glass.

Mr. Monroe said they didn't look at that option and didn't have enough information to make an educated comment. The level of labor would be a lot more because it was retrofit and asbestos abatement. He estimated the asbestos abatement would cost \$70,000 to 80,000. He added that it would close city hall while being done.

Mr. Newman recommended more study.

Mr. Barrow questioned whether an assessment was done for possible repair.

Mr. Monroe said that was not done. He said the double-hung windows have frozen in place, some of them work partially. It was not just a simple process and most of the units would need to be refurbished.

The Board discussed the possibility of repair instead of replacement. There was not enough information to make a determination.

Chair Rios asked how quickly the City wanted to move.

Mr. Monroe said the soonest for construction would be September.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman said in some respects, the aluminum was closer in proportion.

Mr. Featheringill asked why this building wasn't significant.

Mr. Rasch said probably the change of use and enough alternation not to merit it.

Mr. Barrow said from sustainability they should look into the repair option a little bit.

Mr. Monroe said he would do the research and would like whatever information Mr. Barrow had on it.

Mr. Richard Fiedler said just taking one window and stripping it and abating it and

making it functional would take far more time than taking the window out and replacing it. He didn't think it was a viable option.

Mr. Newman said they could very carefully take them out and off site to controlled conditions and set up an assembly line, to reduce the costs.

Mr. Barrow said they just finished 110 windows on Old Santa Fe Trail last year in exactly that way. The cost got close and it cost a little bit more to do it that way.

Mr. Barrow moved to postpone Case #H 06-074 B to allow city staff time to prepare an estimate of repair. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion.

Mr. Featheringill said they needed to make sure thermal value was considered.

Mr. Monroe said the steel frame was only ten percent of area and it was the glazing that was important.

The Board briefly discussed sealing and energy efficiency.

Ms. Shapiro said she was really against buying the windows in Europe.

The motion to postpone passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H 06-93-B.** 729 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andy Lyons, agent for Phillip Coombs, proposes to demolish the primary residence & pool house, to remodel the 988 sq. ft. guest house with 474 sq. ft. of additions and to construct four residences ranging from 2,075 to 2,957 sq. ft. to slightly less than the maximum allowable height of 17' 10".

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"729 E. Palace Ave is a single-family residential property that presently consists of a large rambling structure made up of four original structures. The main original structure, built before the 1890s, was a brewery and then a bar and bowling alley before becoming a residential structure in 1911. The building is designed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style today and it is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. However, the Board recommended historic status downgrade in 1992 which was never acted upon by the Governing Body. The building has been substantially altered, so that it does not retain its historic integrity. A second

story and pitched roof has been removed. In 1992, a 1,230 square-foot addition on the east has doubled its footprint and a smaller addition from 1989 on the northwest has attached it to other freestanding structures. All of historic windows have been replaced and opening dimensions have been altered.

"The previously freestanding structure at the northeast corner of the property (number one) was built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style between 1951 and 1958. There are no historic windows in the building. A 1988 carport attached the west elevation to other freestanding structures. A 1990 addition on the east elevation stands in front of the original south elevation. The building is listed as non-contributing.

"The previously freestanding structure at the northwest corner (number two) was built in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style before 1951. There are no historic windows in the building and the parapet height was increased. The 1988 carport and a 1989 addition on the southwest corner attached the east and south elevations to other freestanding structures. There is a small 1988 edition on the north elevation. The building is listed as non-contributing.

"In 1992, a pool house addition was constructed at the southwest corner in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The non-historic date confirms that this structure is non-contributing.

"The Board approved non-contributing status for all structures on November 14, 2006.

"Now the applicant proposes to remodel the northeast wing (number one) of the existing large structure and demolish all of the remaining structures in order to construct four additional residences.

"The City Building Inspector's report indicates that there were minor structural issues, no code violations, but potential dangerous mold infestations. This along with the staff's determination that the non-contributing structures are not a unique and essential part of the streetscape allows the Board to determine whether a demolition permit shall be approved or not.

"All buildings are designed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style with rounded edges, recessed windows, canales through parapets, and exposed wooden elements at portals including viga posts and carved corbels. The maximum allowable height for all structures is 17'10".

"Unit number one will be located at the southeast corner of the lot. The building will be 2,554 square feet and 17'2" high. The building will feature a portal with kiva

fireplace on the southeast corner. And inset north entry portal will have a shed roof.

"Unit number two will be located at the center of the lot. The Board postponed action on this application pending redesign of this unit, requesting that the unit be set back and not as consistent in design as the others street facing units. The building has been reduced in size from 2,780 sq. ft. to 2,586 sq. ft. and from 17'4" high to 17' 1" high. In addition, the layout and elevations have been changed to give the building some distinction and setback. The building will feature a portal with a shed roof and a kiva fireplace on the northwest corner. And inset north entry portal will have a shed roof with gray Glavalume sheeting.

"Unit number three will be located at the south west corner of the lot. The building will be 2,957 sq. ft. and 17'8" high. The building will feature a portal with kiva fireplace on the southeast corner. An inset north entry portal will have a shed roof.

"Unit number four will be located at the northwest corner of the lot. The building will be 2,075 sq. ft. and 15'2" high. The building will feature a portal on the southwest corner. An entry portal on the south will have a shed roof finished with gray Glavalume sheeting.

"The existing 988 square-foot guest house (now unit number five) will be remodeled. The building will be 1,462 sq. ft. and 13'4" high. An entry portal with central fireplace will be constructed on the south elevation. Noncompliant windows are existing on the east and the south elevation. These will remain.

"The existing vehicle entrance on the eastside, off of a private road, will be widened. Two 11' wide mesquite vehicle gates will be installed between stuccoed pilasters flanked by a six-foot high coyote fence with a regular latilla tops. Additional coyote fences on the lot interior create personal open space for the units.

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 said on the site visit she asked for measurements.

Mr. Frost said from eastern corner, the rock retaining wall was 32" high. The adobe wall was 18" high and the coyote fence was six feet high. He said down to middle of fence: rock = 36", adobe = 42" and six foot post. On the west the total was 16', 12' at the middle, and 10' on the east.

Present and sworn were Mr. Phillip Coombs and Mr. Andy Lyons.

Mr. Coombs said at the last review they got some good suggestions on how to work with the middle unit to change the look, style, and pull it back.

He said they pulled it back quite a bit; made it a two bedroom unit with a three sided portal and a pitched roof.

Ms. Farrar asked if page 49 and 52 were the same.

Mr. Rasch said they were identical.

The Board took a brief recess to examine the model.

Mr. Frost asked where the grade was inside of the fence.

Mr. Coombs said it was exactly at the bottom of the coyote fence.

Mr. Barrow asked about the vehicle gate saying there was not now a vehicle gate there.

Mr. Rasch said there was one.

Mr. Coombs said it would be similar but more pleasing and it would swing in.

Mr. Barrow said gates were usually associated with single-family needs. He said the gates didn't have much historic precedence. He said an isolated gated community was not the message they wanted to send and it was not historic. This was five people behind this gate. He wanted to see that changed.

Mr. Newman asked what the rationale was for removing the existing wall and replacing with a coyote fence.

Mr. Coombs said a view corridor was required.

Mr. Rasch said it was for safety.

Mr. Coombs said it could be stucco and noted that the building was surrounded by coyote on Palace.

Mr. Newman asked if the gates have solid bottom and zig zag on top.

Mr. Coombs agreed and said the total gate was five feet.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the gate could be shorter.

Mr. Frost said it should be a little more open on top.

Mr. Coombs said he could make the wall solid.

Ms. Shapiro said the coyote was fine but the gate needed looser materials.

Mr. Coombs said okay. Three feet solid and two feet open on top.

Ms. Shapiro said okay.

Ms. Shapiro said lighting details and the new gate design should be submitted to staff.

Ms. Shapiro asked about landscape lighting between units.

Mr. Coombs said they would have Malibu type lighting but he had no plan.

Ms. Shapiro said he should bring that to staff also.

Mr. Newman asked if he would consider demolishing all the stucco wall and having coyote on all of it so it would be consistent, softer.

Mr. Coombs said he could see the wisdom in that.

Mr. Newman asked about having no solid part to gate.

Mr. Coombs said it was not out of the question.

Ms. Farrar agreed with Mr. Barrow that the gate would seal it off and went the wrong direction. If there was a gate, she would like it open.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H 06-93-B per staff recommendations without the gate. Ms. Shapiro seconded with the condition that lighting plans be submitted to staff and also changing stucco to coyote. The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Ms. Farrar who voted no.

4. **Case #H 07-10. 359 Garcia Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Stefan Merdler, agent for Mr. Frosts & Jenny French, proposes to construct an approximately 333 sq. ft. addition to a Contributing building to match existing height and remodel a Non-Contributing guest house by constructing an 80 sq. Ft. Portal, 335 sq. ft. attached studio to a height of 11' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 14' 8", to construct a pergola and to raise a rear yard wall 2" to the maximum allowable height of 6'.

Ms. Barrett presented staff report for this case as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The approximately 1,510 sq. ft. single-family residence located at 356 Garcia St is Spanish Pueblo Revival style and according to the 1984 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory was constructed between 1920 and 1927. The building has had minor alterations that include an approximately 167 sq. ft. addition on the non-publicly visible, non-primary elevation and loss of historic windows with noncompliant windows. An approximately 522 sq. ft. simplified Spanish Pueblo revival style guest house with construction date uncertain is located to the east of the main residence. This structure has been altered from its original state with the addition of noncompliant windows and faux shutters. The official map lists the main residence as contributing and lists no status for the guest house.

"This application was heard at the February 13, 2007 hearing and was postponed so that the applicant might obtain the required zoning affidavit or redesigned as to not need the affidavit. The applicant has received a revised preliminary zoning sheet that approves the application as submitted without an affidavit as long as the rear yard wall is 6 feet to 8 feet high. The current yard wall is 5'10" and the applicant proposed raising at 2 inches to meet the zoning requirement as well as the maximum allowable height of 6 feet for historic.

"This application proposes the following:

"Construct an approximately 333 sq. ft. addition to the non-publicly visible, non-primary east elevation to match the existing height and stucco finish. New windows will comply with the 30-inch window rule and will match existing in style and trim color.

"Construct an approximately 65 sq. ft. pergola to the non-historic 1995 addition on the non-publicly visible, non-primary east elevation. The pergola will be finished in a compatible color.

"Construct an approximately 335 sq. ft. studio in addition on the non-publicly visible north elevation to a height of 11'6" reduced from the previously submitted 12 feet where the maximum allowable height is 14'8" and the existing height is approximately 10 feet. The addition will have divided light windows and single light windows that comply with the 30-inch window rule. The west elevation of the guest house will be remodeled by replacing the door with divided light French doors and windows will be removed and replaced in different locations with divided light double hung windows. The overhang on the west elevation will be replaced with an 80 sq. ft. simplified portal. All finishes will match the existing.

"Lastly proposed is an approximately 273 sq. ft. pergola between the west elevation of the guest house and the east elevation of the main residence. The pergola work is described as being compatible in style and color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that any exterior light fixtures are approved by staff and that the pergola finish details are specified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulations for Contributing Structures and Section 14 - 5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Stefan Merdler , 918 Calle Arco, who corrected the height on the original application we said 12' 6" which has been reduced to 11' 6". He added that the studio that was attached to existing guest house was originally on the zero lot line and now was 5' 2" away from the property. He said the wall would be raised to six feet.

Chair Rios asked what neighbors would see.

Mr. Merdler said he didn't know if they could tell but visibility of the studio would be approximately 4-5 feet.

Mr. Merdler said the existing vegetation wouldn't be taken out and they located the structure so they would not have to remove the old apricot tree.

Mr. Frost asked if they were raising the wall two inches with stucco.

Mr. Merdler said yes.

Chair Rios said she asked Mr. Frost to measure the neighbor's house height.

Mr. Frost said the portal at the front was about 10'. The room behind was approx 12' and house behind that was approx 14'.

Ms. Farrar said the affidavit was no longer an issue then.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. David Mittle on behalf of Lorie Silver who was in Texas to be with her ailing father. He said what the Board ordered at the last meeting was that the applicant discuss the project with Ms. Silver and the discussion did not take place. He said the question of what would be seen from the street was never answered. The structure would be higher than the existing building and it would be seen from Garcia Street.

He said this was said to be a small lot but it was a ten thousand sq ft compound and what was proposed was ramadas along the back that would effectively destroy all the open space in the back. He said there was not ten feet of separation from building in back.

He said he couldn't find any information on the common wall between the applicant and Ms. Silver. He said they never discussed with Ms. Silver that they wanted to increase the burden and with an easement, you cannot increase the burden unless both parties agree. So they needed to talk and agree on it.

He had serious concerns that the common wall could be raised by one party and questioned a structure at 11' 6" while next door it was 7' 4".

Mr. Frost said Ms. Silver's house was actually 14' and her wall was higher than the applicant's wall.

Mr. Mittle said without a 15' setback it would require an affidavit.

Ms. Barrett explained that they could not come closer than ten feet to the contributing structure. Also the motion did not require him to talk with the neighbors.

Chair Rios said staff could make a recommendation to the Board and Board had the choice of accepting the recommendation or not.

Mr. Featheringill said the added burden would be increasing the width of the wall.

Mr. Merdler said his measurements indicated that the height of the front façade on Garcia Street was in excess of 12' so the addition in the back would not be seen.

He added that they had a very well developed garden with lots of landscaping and it wouldn't be affected by this project. The new part would be 24 feet away from Ms. Silver's house.

Chair Rios asked for the interior ceiling height in the guest house.

Mr. Merdler said 9', maybe 9' 6".

Chair Rios asked for the square footage

Ms. Barrett said it was 233.

Chair Rios asked what length he was adding

Mr. Merdler said it was about 25'.

Mr. Frost asked for the dimensions of the windows in the studio addition and how high the window pane was from the ground.

Mr. Merdler said the window was 6' 6" so top of it was at 8' 6".

Mr. Frost said Ms. Silver's concern was light from the addition and asked if he could scale those down.

Mr. Merdler said, "Without question."

Mr. Newman suggested that he could have a wash wall skylight and eliminate the windows.

Chair Rios asked about the pergola.

Mr. Merdler said it was to provide shading at noon.

Mr. Merdler said the guest house would be used as a studio.

Mr. Newman said they had to be careful because it had a kitchen and bath.

Ms. Farrar really liked the studio idea. She felt it fit in with the way she liked to see growth. But she added that maybe this property was at its limit and this project was not in the spirit of what the historic district was all about. It was almost a philosophical thing.

Ms. Barrett said they were still only at 32% lot coverage.

Mr. Frost said the entire back of the house sat within one foot of the property line.

Ms. Farrar felt the density here was overwhelming.

Mr. Merdler said there was a negative connotation being suggested with the loophole on this zoning requirement but they did not seek out the loophole, Zoning just told him what they had to do. He said there was considerable open space there and now there were five units.

Present and sworn was Ms. Jenny French, 359 Garcia, who said when they bought the property they were careful to determine that they could build a studio. She said they had hoped to connect the two buildings and historic turned them down for good reasons. So they decided to put the studio where it was now and they were quite willing to let the pergola go. She said she planned to have gardens between those. She said they weren't insensitive to the concerns of Ms. Silver and would gladly work with her on the windows on that side. She pointed out that there were trees there already above the six foot wall, evergreens and pyracantha.

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

Mr. Barrow didn't think it was in their purview to resolve lot line issues and was convinced there was not a lot of visibility.

Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-010 as recommended by staff and pergola details to be submitted to staff. Mr. Barrow seconded with the condition that neighbor work with neighbor to resolve the windows.

The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes except Ms. Farrar who voted no.

STATUS REVIEW

None.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 07-21.** 117 Vigil Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Bill & Candace Raboff, propose to construct a 88 sq. ft. addition to

match existing height on a Non-Contributing building and to construct a 558 sq. ft. guest house to approximately 12' high where the maximum allowable height was 14' 4".

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

"117 Vigil Lane is a single-family residence that was constructed in 1993 in the Territorial Revival style. It is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

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

1. An 88 sq. ft. second-story addition will be constructed on the East elevation to match the existing adjacent height. The brick parapet coping and the stucco type and color will match existing conditions. The simulated divided light window and door do not match the noncompliant conditions.

2. A freestanding 558 sq. ft. guest house will be constructed in the Territorial Revival style. It will be approximately 12 feet high, where the maximum allowable height is 14'4". The building will feature simulated divided light windows and doors and a portal with a shed roof finished with a dark brown C-panel metal roof. The stucco will match the main residence in "Buckskin" and the trim color will be white.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"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 Mr. Christopher Purvis, 227 E. Palace Ave.

Chair Rios asked what the square footage of guest house was.

Mr. Rasch said it was 558.

Mr. Barrow asked what C panel was.

Mr. Purvis said it was corrugated.

Mr. Barrow asked about the stucco.

Mr. Purvis said it would match the synthetic stucco there now. The guest house tied back into the existing wall.

Ms. Shapiro asked for the main residence height.

Mr. Purvis said it was 17' and about the same for the guest house.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the portal on main house was to be duplicated on the guest house.

Mr. Purvis said he would duplicate trim details with brown on the guest house.

Ms. Shapiro asked about lights, skylights, and mechanical.

Mr. Purvis said mechanical would go below in the shed type structure. He said there would be some lighting under the portal; none outside portal and had no detail of that.

Ms. Shapiro asked how much distance there was from wall to building.

Mr. Purvis said it was a zero lot line and the neighbor supported it. He explained that a driveway easement went back to serve three or four properties and they were only adding a couple of feet to the wall.

Mr. Newman asked about the roof type.

Mr. Purvis said it was like an M panel. The new C panel would match this color and would look a little better.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro moved to approve Case #H 07-21 with staff recommendations and the conditions that the detail of any exterior lighting be submitted to staff for approval and that the color of portal roofing match existing portal roof. Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H 07-23.** 505 Camino Sin Nombre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Robin Gray, agent for Mary Kay Casey, proposes to remodel a Non-Contributing building by replacing non-compliant windows and doors, constructing an overhang, removing overhangs and replacing with parapets, and re-stuccoing.

This case was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

3. **Case #H 07-12.** 1433 Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Philip Kozely, agent for Peter Kozely, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by constructing approximately 82 sq. ft. of additions, an approximately 165 sq. ft. deck, raising a non-historic addition to a height of 14' 9" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5", replace windows, re-stucco, construct a 379 sq. ft. garage to a height of 9' 9" where the maximum allowable height is 17' 5", construct an approximately 63 sq. ft. pergola, and construct walls and fences. Four exceptions are requested to construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2, D 2, c), to alter opening dimensions on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2, D 4), to replace historic material (Section 14-5.2, D, 5, a) and to construct an addition less than 10' back from a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2, D, 2, d).

This case was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

4. **Case #H 07-22** 229 Galisteo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Liaison Planning, agents for Bina Said, propose to construct approximately 852 sq. ft. of portals to 11' 6" high to enclose an existing roofed, open-walled structure, change existing stucco and trim color, and to construct a 66" high fence where the maximum allowable height is 36" high on a Non-Contributing property. A height exception is requested (Section 14-5.2, D, 9).

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

"229 Galisteo St is a commercial building that was constructed between 1933 and 1935 in the Mission Revival style. The building was originally a gas station and then a restaurant before its current use as a gallery. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District due to alterations.

"At an unknown recent date, the buildings white walls were painted a light brown and at approximately 5 years ago a six-foot high iron fence was constructed without a permit. In addition, the current owner changed the trim color to red without a permit.

"Now, the applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following items and requests permission to retain the unauthorized changes that have occurred.

1. A 6' high iron fence was constructed along Galisteo St. and Alameda St. Even with the 20% of additional height that the Board may grant, the fence requires a height exception and the required responses are attached.

2. The building recently had a white exterior with sky-blue trim. Now, the building is tan with red trim.

3. An existing carport-like open-walled structure will be enclosed on the three open sides. The west and east infill walls will be set back from the original openings and will have no windows or doors. The south elevation infill wall will also be set back to reveal the previous opening dimensions. Divided light French doors with full divided lights sidelights will be centered on this elevation.

4. An 852 sq. ft. portal will be constructed to 11'5" high, wrapping around both the west and south elevations. The portal is designed in a simplified Territorial Revival style with square posts and larger square bases and capitols.

5. Mechanical equipment and a shed left over from the restaurant will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

“Staff recommends denial of defense height exception unless the board has a positive finding of fact to support the request, the first to the board to determine if the red trim color is arresting or not, and recommends approval of the remainder of the application which complies with section 14 – 5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Horcasitas, 421 St Francis Drive, Santa Fe, who said they agreed to staff conditions and added that they worked to make sure it was a seamless transition to this building. He said it was a great location for her to display her rugs and one idea to help protect the rugs were tent like structures.

Mr. Rasch said staff didn't support the tent.

Mr. Horcasitas said they decided on portals instead. He said some people said the fence was twenty years old, others about five. So the owner inherited a fence not approved by the Board. He said as they were getting the interior ready, the owner painted the trim. He apologized and said they were here to discuss it.

He said they would like to keep the fence. She didn't build the fence. It has been there a long time and she would like to keep it.

Mr. Rasch said the height of fences was from 1996.

Mr. Frost said he didn't remember it being there eleven years ago.

Ms. Farrar said she thought it was there. They had furniture out there. She said this was the first time she heard of a non-compliant fence. It was extremely unusual.

Mr. Barrow agreed with Ms. Farrar but felt they should all be brought forward.

Mr. Rasch said one of the Councilors was very concerned about these violations.

Ms. Farrar felt uncomfortable with the things that went back so far.

Mr. Rasch said he was told the fence was red tagged five years ago.

Mr. Barrow asked about the new portal. He thought it did not detract from the features of the property but was concerned about the part on Alameda, because of its unusual shape, that it would read not as belonging to the building.

Mr. Newman said he couldn't imagine why this building was made non-contributing. He wondered what vocabulary would cover the open covered space with existing building and thought it would be preferable to add on to the building. It should look like what a car would drive under long ago.

Mr. Horcasitas said he didn't know what it was used for.

Chair Rios asked if they had history on this.

Mr. Rasch said it was only what was in the packet. He said the new addition on the front was what made it non-contributing.

The Board briefly discussed the status.

Mr. Frost suggested he would take down the fence if he were opening a business there.

Ms. Shapiro said she would hate to see that portal in there.

Ms. Farrar said they first needed to contemplate the historicity of the building.

Mr. Barrow said it historically reads as a gas station.

Mr. Frost commended them for getting rid of that ugly fan.

Present and sworn was Ms. Bina Said who said her original idea was to have tents as a bazaar, the colorful tents of Afghanistan and India and similar to the tents on the Plaza in the summer.

Mr. Barrow asked if she would have some rolling display for the rugs to roll into the building at night and out during the day.

Ms. Said said she would like to do that but weather wouldn't allow it.

Mr. Frost said what they would use the closed building for.

Mr. Horcasitas said it would be for storage.

Ms. Said asked how she could keep her rugs from being ruined.

Mr. Frost asked if they could go back after these discussions and bring back a codified design.

Ms. Farrar felt the fence revisit was strange. She noted the color went white and blue to accomplish a Greek feeling but was not sure about the red. It reminds her of a service station color.

Mr. Newman found the red troubling, jarring, attention grabbing. He suggested the trim should be tan or off white.

Ms. Said commented that 80% of all rugs were red.

Mr. Newman asked if they could cut off the finials on top.

Ms. Said said the fence did provide some security at night. She said someone had been throwing rocks at night and it was very scary.

Chair Rios asked what the reasons were for the exceptions.

Mr. Horcasitas read them.

Mr. Frost asked if there were other fences around there.

Mr. Horcasitas said there was one behind the Inn of the Governors along Ortíz.

Mr. Rasch said there were some along the river.

Mr. Barrow reminded the Board that the applicant had to meet all six. He felt the fence actually detracted from the historic use of that building and corner. So item #1 was not satisfactory. He added that the fence wouldn't stop rock throwers.

Mr. Frost agreed that not all six were met.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Ms. Victoria Reyes, 315 Mercer Street. She read a letter from Seret

and Sons that addressed the fence and said the variance criteria were not adequately addressed. The fence does not enhance the property. [attached as Exhibit A].

Mr. Frost asked who put the fence up.

Ms. Said said she didn't know who did.

Mr. Frost said the owner would have to take it down.

Mr. Horcasitas said the owners lived in New Jersey and were collecting the rent. She was taking care of it for them.

Mr. Barrow said that was not a factor that they should try to understand but should look at the fence as if it were being constructed today.

Ms. Farrar thought they needed a city attorney's opinion on this and felt the comments from Mr. Seret were also inappropriate. It all seems like a big political mess.

Mr. Barrow supported that point of view.

The Board discussed the red tag further.

Ms. Farrar moved to postpone the Case #H 07-022 so it could be surveyed and ask the applicants consider the suggestions by the Board on different fabrics, to consider not building the portals and to determine what color was acceptable.

She encouraged the applicants to use more historic red colors such as the one on Alto Street. She felt they needed to find out the history of the building because it looked like it was of historic value.

Mr. Newman seconded the motion.

Chair Rios asked them to bring the alternative to the Board.

Ms. Farrar clarified that it was historic status she wanted to determine.

Chair Rios said whatever changes, it needed to continue to look like a service station.

Mr. Horcasitas said they would meet with staff and make another presentation.

The motion to postpone passed by unanimous voice vote.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Shapiro asked about the training session.

Mr. Rasch said they hadn't scheduled them yet.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Newman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Approved by:


Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer