



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3-29-07 TIME 8:40

SERVED BY Maria R. Ziegler

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2007 – 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2007 – 6:00PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 9, 2007

March 13, 2007

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

H. OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-04-184. 625 Garcia. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Dennis Branch, proposes to construct a 6' high coyote fence and a 4' high wire fence with lilac bushes in the historic Alire Compound.
2. 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. single family residence not to exceed the maximum allowable height of 15' 2".

**J. STATUS REVIEW**

**K. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Case #H-07-31. 211 Lorenzo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jasper Vassau, agent/owner, proposes to construct an approximately 3,154 sq. ft. single-family residence and 484 sq. ft. attached garage to a height of 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 6" and to construct a yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 5' 7".
2. Case #H-07-33. 161 S. Armijo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan, agent for Shirley Jordan, proposes to construct an approximately 814 sq. ft. roofed carport and storage area to a height of 11' where the existing height is 11' 6" to a Non-Contributing building and to construct a 4' high yard wall and pedestrian gate.
3. Case #H-07-34. 645 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Robert & Kelli Glazier, propose to remove an approximately 381 sq. ft. portal, to construct approximately 1,364 sq. ft. of additions to a height of 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 9", to construct approximately 566 sq. ft. of portal additions, replace doors and windows, to construct an approximately 775 sq. ft. free standing guest house to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 9", and to construct a yard wall to a height of 4' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 4' 6" on a Contributing property.
4. Case #H-07-35. 517 Abeyta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Spinden, agent/owner, requests a preliminary hearing for a proposal to construct an approximately 3,500 sq. ft. single-family residence on a vacant site with sloping grade at 4' above the maximum allowable height of 16' 5".
5. Case #H-07-36-A. 618 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Apryl Miller & Joseph Walfish, agents/owners, propose an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property.  
  
Case #H-07-36-B. 618 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Apryl Miller & Joseph Walfish, agents/owners, propose to remodel two Non-Contributing buildings by altering doors and windows, constructing a parapet to match the existing height, and constructing yard walls not to exceed the maximum allowable height of 6'.
6. Case #H-07-38. 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Wyndham Carlisle, agent for Thomas Parks, proposes to enclose approximately 14 sq. ft. Non-Contributing covered patio and to construct an approximately 535 sq. ft. addition to a height of 15' 7" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 8" and to construct a 5' 6" high mechanical vehicular gate.
7. Case #H-07-37-A. 138 Park Avenue/513-B W. San Francisco. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Ragins Research & Planning, agents for 138 Park Avenue & 513-B W. San Francisco Partnerships, propose an historic status review of this Contributing, Non-Contributing, and structures without status on the property.  
  
Case #H-07-37-B. 138 Park Avenue/513-B W. San Francisco. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Agnew/MIFSUD Architects, agents for 138 Park Avenue & 513-B W. San Francisco Partnerships, propose to remodel existing buildings and to construct a hot tub with perimeter fence. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height of 55" (Section 14-5.2,D,9).
8. Case #H-07-39. 2214 Wilderness Meadow. Historic Review District. Stephen Velie & Hannah McCaughey, agents/owners, request a preliminary hearing for a proposal to construct an approximately 3,000 sq. ft. single-family residence on a vacant site with sloping grade at 4' above the maximum allowable height of 16'. Exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable height plus 4' (Section 14-5.2,D,9,c) and to construct a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2,D,9,d).

9. Case #H-07-32. 116 Laughlin. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Jessica Lucas, agent/owner, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by replacing historic windows, constructing gates and fences, stuccoing yard walls. Exceptions are requested to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2,D,5,a,ii), and to alter distinctive features (Section 14-5,2,C,1,c).

**L. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**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 April 10, 2007 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Planning Division by 9:00 am on Tuesday, April 10, 2007 so that transportation can be arranged.

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

Santa Fe, New Mexico  
April 10, 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	Approved as corrected . . . . .	2
March 13, 2007	Not Considered . . . . .	2
Communications	None . . . . .	2
Business from the Floor	Statement on height ordinance read . . . . .	2-3
Administrative Matters	Discussion . . . . .	3
Old Business to Remain Postponed	None . . . . .	3
Old Business		
1. <b><u>Case #H 04-184</u></b> 625 Garcia	Approved with conditions . . . . .	3-7
2. <b><u>Case #H 06-131</u></b> 518 Camino Cabra	Approved with conditions . . . . .	7-9
Status Review	None . . . . .	9
New Business		
1. <b><u>Case #H 07-31</u></b> 211 Lorenzo Lane	Approved with conditions . . . . .	9-16
2. <b><u>Case #H 07-33</u></b> 161 S. Armijo Lane	Approved as recommended . . . . .	16-18
3. <b><u>Case #H 07-34</u></b> 645 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved with conditions . . . . .	18-23
4. <b><u>Case #H 07-35</u></b> 517 Abeyta	Denied . . . . .	24-28

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
5. <b><u>Case #H 07-36-A</u></b> 618 E. Alameda	Upgraded to contributing .....	28-29
<b><u>Case #H 07-36-B</u></b> 618 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions .....	29-34
6. <b><u>Case #H 07-38</u></b> 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue	Approved with conditions .....	34-37
7. <b><u>Case #H 07-37-A</u></b> 138 Park Avenue	Status upgraded to significant .....	37-39
<b><u>Case #H 07-37-B</u></b> 138 Park Avenue	Denied .....	39-40
8. <b><u>Case #H 07-39</u></b> 2214 Wilderness Meadow	Removed from Agenda .....	40-41
9. <b><u>Case #H 07-32</u></b> 116 Laughlin	Approved with conditions .....	41-45
Matters from the Board	Discussion .....	45
Adjournment	.....	45

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

**TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 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. Robert Frost  
Mr. Charles Newman  
Ms. Deborah Shapiro  
Ms. Sharon Woods

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None.

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Historic Planner  
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

---

Mr. Rasch noted two changes to the Agenda: 1) there were no March 13 minutes in the packet, 2) on Case 07-37-A, Ragins Research was not the agent but it was the same as the B case.

He added that under New Business #6 there was typo in second line. It should read 414 square feet; not 14 sq ft.

**Ms. Woods moved to approve the Agenda as amended. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

---

**January 9, 2007**

**Ms. Farrar moved to approve the minutes of January 9, 2007 as previously amended. Ms. Woods seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**March 13, 2007**

Consideration of these minutes was postponed under Approval of the Agenda.

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

---

None.

## **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

---

Present and sworn was Mr. Paul Holton, who read a statement from Karen Walker for the record.

Ms. Walker reminded the Board that the overlay ordinance provided that the parapet two feet was the maximum of the average of building heights. On March 20, Frank Katz concurred. And a friendly reminder that other exceptions relating to height, pitch, massing and set backs, the applicant must respond appropriately to all of the criteria required for the exceptions.

Ms. Woods asked about the ordinance provision for height.

Mr. Rasch explained that the two feet was added by mandate but the four foot issue was the Board's discretion but only if the grade slope was two feet or more.

Ms. Woods said at this time, the City Attorney's opinion was hearsay.

Chair Rios agreed that the Board did not have discretion regarding the two feet.

Mr. Holton said okay, but they disagreed on it.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

---

Mr. Rasch said they had a place for the awards at a house on Acequia Madre on May 19<sup>th</sup>.

He said they were going with the Ewing picture of Santa Fe Baldy on the poster.

Chair Rios said they could discuss at the end of the meeting.

### **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-04-184**. 625 Garcia. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Dennis Branch, proposes to construct a 6' high coyote fence and a 4' high wire fence with lilac bushes in the historic Alire Compound.

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



## **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"625 Garcia Street is a single-family residence located at the northeast corner of the historic Alire Compound in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. It was constructed at approximately 1950 in a vernacular style. The building was upgraded to contributing historic status on January 11, 2005. In addition, the HDRB approved walls, fences, and hedges in the compound on May 23, 2006.

"On February 19, 2007, the developer received a stop work order for construction of a coyote fence along the northern boundary without a permit. Now, the applicant proposes to construct the fence and also to install a wire fence and a lilac hedge in the compound.

"The coyote fence at 625 will be from 3' 6" high to a maximum of 6' high at the eastern end. It will be constructed on top of an existing 3' high CMU wall.

"A 4' high wire fence (details not provided) will be constructed along the south and east sides of the property at 601 San Antonio Street. 6' high lilac bushes will be planted along the wire fence for screening.

## **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. Chris Purvis, 227 E. Palace Avenue, who said Mr. Rasch asked him to verify heights out there. He said that on the low side, it was as much as ten feet because there was an old acequia that ran along there. The height on the high side was from grade to top of coyote.

Chair Rios asked if he would stucco the existing wall on both sides.

Mr. Purvis said he would and added that a vine there would have to be pulled off.

Chair Rios asked if Mr. Branch talked with Mr. Alire

Present and sworn was Mr. Dennis Branch who said he had not discussed it with Mr. Alire. He said Mr. Purvis felt the hedge would be a little softer. He noted that when they made the original application, it included all the retaining walls. He said Mr. Alire came to that meeting. He felt it would not be an issue but they would discuss it with

him.

Ms. Shapiro asked why a wire fence and hedge.

Mr. Purvis said it would just take a while for the hedge to fill in there. It was just an open wire fence to keep people from going through there with wooden posts every 20'.

Mr. Rasch asked about the posts.

Mr. Purvis said they would use 4" posts.

Ms. Shapiro asked if on the highest side it would be six feet above the CMU.

Mr. Purvis said no, that the measurement was from grade to top of wall.

Mr. Branch said all the fences were approved before but this fence was omitted. He added that they made a varied top on the coyote fence.

Ms. Woods asked where staff measured heights of walls when there was a retaining wall.

Mr. Rasch explained it was not in the historic ordinance but in the building code. No wall could exceed six feet on residential and 8' on commercial. It was measured from highest grade.

Ms. Woods found ten feet on one side to be excessive.

Mr. Purvis agreed but explained it was on the back at an acequia. He noted there was another stucco wall six feet away at the same height and it was not inside the compound but just the width of the acequia. He said this one would vary while the other one was straight.

Chair Rios asked how long it was.

Mr. Branch said it would be about 70 feet.

Mr. Frost asked if the wire fence would be constructed so the fence would be encased by the bushes and trimmed on the outside.

Mr. Purvis agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Farrar asked if the acequia was a walkway.

Mr. Purvis said it was used that way.

Ms. Farrar asked if the wall would impinge on the walkway.

Mr. Purvis said no because it was on top of an old block wall.

Mr. Frost asked if the backside of the wall was only visible by walkers down the acequia.

Mr. Purvis said that was correct.

Mr. Newman asked if the purpose was security or why did it need to be ten feet.

Mr. Purvis said it would hide the tagging on the neighbor's wall.

Mr. Branch explained that all of the grades vary along there. Many of them were eight and ten feet tall. Many of them were weekend walls (no permit). It kind of dies before Garcia but abuts about 15 houses and 90% of them were at that height. He said he didn't want to exceed six feet.

Chair Rios said the Compound ordinance does encourage open space and not introducing new fences.

Mr. Branch said that was why they were trying to do the hedge. He said he didn't want to offend Mr. Alire but from the photos, one could see there were lots of trees there.

Chair Rios asked for the height of that fence.

Mr. Branch said it was about four feet.

Mr. Purvis added that they were asking for six feet for the vegetation there.

**Ms. Farrar moved for approval of Case #H 04-184 per staff recommendations and the condition that the height of the fence be no more than six feet and the tops of latillas be varied. Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Woods said both block and coyote should not exceed six feet.**

**Ms. Shapiro said they should use cedar posts with the wire fence. Ms. Farrar agreed to those amendments and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 2. Case #H-06-131.** 518 Camino Cabra. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture, agents for Dan Warner and Dena Ross, propose to construct a 2,103 sq. ft. single-family residence not to exceed 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 square foot vacant lot in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The applicant proposes to construct a 2,103 square foot single-family residence in the Recent Santa Fe Style.

"The HDRB 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 elevation be submitted to help visualize the proposal. At that hearing, the east elevation changes included: 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.

"For this hearing, the applicant made the following additional changes to the east elevation: removal of portal overhangs and wooden posts with replacement of stuccoed wall massing; divided light glazing on sliding and hinged doors; stone surfacing on retaining walls rather than stucco surfacing, and a coyote fence above the retaining walls.

"The building will be 14' 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 wall-dominated massing. The proposed radius of the parapets was not detailed, but the corners will have a 2" 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" above

projecting beams. And all windows and doors meet the 30" and 3' 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 & Eastside Historic District design standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, who explained there was no overhang on the portals, it would have exposed lintels over the portals, and the entry into the courtyard was not integrated. He said he also put stone on the front wall as the Board recommended.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to describe the stone.

Mr. Martínez said it would match the neighbor's stone. He thought it was limestone, not river rock or moss rock.

Ms. Farrar said he did a great job and she was very pleased that he heard all of the Board's concerns. She asked staff about front façade and a three-foot rule to the corner.

Mr. Rasch said he did not see any violation.

Mr. Martínez explained they were behind the portal.

Chair Rios asked about rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Martínez said there were none.

Chair Rios asked for the ceiling height.

Mr. Martínez said it was 10' in the great room and 8' in the others. He added that they had to cut into the hill.

Mr. Frost asked about exterior lights.

Mr. Martínez said he had not figured that out yet.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to describe the railing to the right.

Mr. Martínez said it was coyote three feet high on top of planters with an uneven top.

Ms. Shapiro suggested the variance should not be more than an inch or two.

Mr. Frost agreed.

Mr. Martínez said okay.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there would be any battering on the parapets.

Mr. Martínez said they would have 2" tops and corners.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Woods moved for approval as submitted. Ms. Farrar seconded with the condition that exterior lighting be submitted to staff. Ms. Woods agreed and the motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes but Mr. Newman who voted against.**

## **STATUS REVIEW**

---

None.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

---

1. **Case #H-07-31.** 211 Lorenzo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jasper Vassau, agent/owner, proposes to construct an approximately 3,154 sq. ft. single-family residence and 484 sq. ft. attached garage to a height of 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 14' 6" and to construct a yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 5' 7".

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

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"This application proposes to construct an approximately 2,802 square foot Spanish Pueblo Revival style single-family residence which will include 352 square foot portal, and a 484 square foot attached garage. The total roofed area for the project is 3,638 square feet. The height of the building measured midpoint on the south, street-facing elevation is 13' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 6".

"The portal on the south and east elevations will have a galvanized metal standing seam shed roof. It appears that there is a conflict between the floor plan and east elevation shed roof which needs to be addressed by the applicant. Overhangs are proposed on the north, south, and west elevations. All overhangs will be galvanized metal standing seam.

"Windows will be Pozzi divided light aluminum clad in an off-white color. One window on the east elevation and one on the west elevation do not meet the 30" window rule, all others are in compliance. Doors will be both solid wood and divided light. A wood veneered garage door in a horizontal pattern is proposed for the east elevation. The door will be stained and sealed to match other wood trim.

"The building will have rounded corners and parapets and bull-nosed detailing at doors and windows. Canales will be wood and lined with galvanized metal. Approximately eight skylights are proposed throughout. The building will be stuccoed in El Rey Bamboo. Light fixtures will be Kichner, bronze finish, 9" wall mounted cans.

"Also proposed is a CMU stuccoed yard wall to the maximum allowable height of 5' 7" on the south elevation. The wall is set back at least 8' from Lorenzo Lane and steps down in height as the grade changes. Wood grill windows in a zig zag design are proposed in two locations. A pedestrian gate and mechanical vehicular gate are also proposed on the south elevation. The pedestrian gate will be wood and will have an approximately 9' 6" high stuccoed entry header and pilasters. Two wall mounted down light fixtures will be installed in each pilaster. The stoop in front of the entry gate will be flagstone. The vehicular gate details were not provided. All hardware on gates will have a bronzed rubbed finish. Lastly proposed are dry stacked river rock terrace walls along the east elevation. The walls will not exceed 2' and will be battered to approximately a 3:1 slope.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that overhangs over 30" have a support, that the east elevation portal is addressed, that all windows not under a portal meet the 30" window rule, that skylights are not publicly visible, that an example (photo) of the proposed light fixtures be submitted, and that vehicular gate details are

discussed."

Present and sworn was Mr. Jasper Vassau, 260 Los Pinos Road

Chair Rios said it appeared there was a conflict between floor plan and shed roof.

Mr. Vassau agreed and said he did an edit on it. He said it was a drafting error and he switched it and brought the portal down. The other element he changed was the two windows on the east elevation and one on the west elevation that exceeded the 30" rule so he put dividers in them.

Ms. Farrar asked what was over this larger bay of windows.

Mr. Vassau said it was a galvanized standing seam shed roof with fascia below.

Mr. Frost asked how far out it went.

Mr. Vassau said it was 24" and was more a bay. He said they were hand drawn. He pointed out the bay on the projected floor plan.

Chair Rios asked if there were skylights and anything else on the roof.

Mr. Vassau said it was only skylights that would be low profile and would not be seen.

Chair Rios asked for wall details.

Mr. Vassau said there would be an adobe wall on Lorenzo Lane set 8' back and the high point would be 5' 7" and step down. He said it created an alcove for a planting area.

Mr. Frost said in their notes were vehicular gates and asked if that feature was omitted.

Ms. Barrett agreed.

Mr. Frost asked if there were any light fixtures for the Board to see.

Mr. Vassau shared brochures on them for the Board and let them be passed around.

Mr. Frost asked if they were visible at the street.



Mr. Vassau said only if you looked over the wall.

Ms. Shapiro noted they flanked each door and each window.

Mr. Vassau said they were all down facing, on the west side just at doorways and on the east side a single light. He showed the wall light design for the lights on the deck and said they would be set at three feet high and down facing inside the courtyard. They could be used at the patio.

Ms. Woods was concerned with the fenestration pattern. She thought each window did meet the ordinance but under the portal with no muntins and both casements and double-hung windows or awning and double-hung windows. And then fixed casements under the portal, all on the same façade. She asked what he would have at the deck.

Mr. Vassau said those were doors. He showed the model to Ms. Woods.

Ms. Shapiro asked where the 13' 6" height occurred.

Ms. Barrett said it was on the south elevation.

Ms. Shapiro asked, on the east elevation, for the height at the patio if read from the garage.

Mr. Vassau said it was a six-foot wall and 13' 6" from there. It was a six-foot wall and then two feet topo so it was 13' 6" plus six plus two plus two.

Ms. Shapiro asked if what were they reading there was 23 feet.

Mr. Vassau said it was 18' 6".

Ms. Woods clarified this was existing, not fill.

Mr. Vassau agreed.

Mr. Frost asked for the detail on the front gate.

Mr. Vassau said it was construction by La Puerta using old mesquite wood with decorative hardware. He added that the front wall would be adobe with a thickened wall at the gate expressed as a rectilinear passageway with lintels. He said the gates

were 6' 9" of his design with a flagstone stoop at the gate. He said the gate was set back 8' from the fence.

Mr. Barrow said the lintels were not exposed on the drawings.

Mr. Vassau agreed and said he tended to bull nose just below them.

Mr. Barrow asked if one would see a small portion.

Mr. Vassau agreed.

Chair Rios asked if he had spoken with neighbors.

Mr. Vassau said he had, that he had four meetings with different neighbors and received really positive feedback.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to talk about reveals around the parapet and battering.

Mr. Vassau said they would use spray foam and could not determine radius but it would be a minimum of 2". He said he was bullnosing the windows.

Chair Rios asked if he would have anything on the roof.

Mr. Vassau said only skylights domed but not visible.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Garcia Shelton, 215 Gonzales Road, who said she was concerned that the other man was going to build there and the driveways would go in there at Lorenzo Lane. She said she didn't want anyone backing up to her window and wanted them to have a circle to go around so they won't have to back up into her property.

Ms. Shelton said that was her only concern. She said she saw the plans and they seemed to be better for the vicinity except for the circle.

Mr. Vassau said they did put a garage on this project and he knew it was tight parking. He said it was just big enough for a turn around so you could go in and turn around and back out. He added that they left the meadow for overflow parking. He said he sensed that would be an issue, which was also why he pulled the wall back.

Present and sworn was Ms. Morgan Farley 208 Gonzales Lane, who said she had been here before and was happy with this project; with the reduced scale that makes it more in keeping and also with Pueblo Revival style that was more congruent. She would like to see it go forward but had a few questions for clarification. She said on the height, she could not hear what was being said. She thought she heard that the measurement was from the bottom, which was her boundary.

Chair Rios said it was about 19' 6".

Ms. Farley said she got two feet for each

Mr. Vassau said it was 23' 6" from her property line. He said there was a 12' slope and he cut the building two feet into the site, so from the very bottom to the very top of the building was 23' 6" but from the building it was 18' 6".

Ms Farley said the previous building proposed was 19' but she didn't remember if they considered the slope. She said she knew he has not used all of the maximum height allowance.

She noted in the report was the driveway opening. She said that was a concern because it went along her boundary, patio and house. She asked how far it was from her boundary and if there was any setback regulation.

Ms. Barrett said there was no gate there, just an opening.

Ms Farley asked how close the driveway was to her boundary and whether there was a set back.

Ms. Barrett said there was no setback required.

Ms Farley asked if a galvanized standing seam shed roof was typical for Pueblo Revival and if it would be shiny.

Mr. Vassau said it was galvanized metal and it would patina over time but would be bright when they put it up. He said he picked up the standing seam from older buildings.

Mr. Frost asked if he would consider diluted acid wash to dull the sheen.

Mr. Vassau said "absolutely."

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

Ms. Woods asked if he was bringing any fill into this project.

Mr. Vassau said he was not an engineer but a designer. He said they were not bringing in fill but they would use base course for the foundation. He said there was a big pile of dirt to be removed and they would be cutting into hill that would be used to level the northeast portion of the building.

Ms. Woods asked if he was then raising the northeast corner.

Mr. Vassau agreed and said he was moving the earth from the hill.

Ms. Woods asked how much it would raise the shelf.

Mr. Vassau said it would be four feet at the corner and deck.

Ms. Woods asked for the ceiling height.

Mr. Vassau said the main room was ten feet.

Ms. Woods asked if he could raise it two feet instead of four because he was perching this building up over Lorenzo Lane.

Mr. Vassau said he would have to sink the deck of that house and he was already using quite a few steps in the house already.

Mr. Frost asked if he was trying to keep one floor level.

Mr. Vassau agreed.

Mr. Newman asked if the large entry courtyard was now at existing grade.

Mr. Vassau said it was.

Mr. Newman said he was hearing 18' 6" but he was getting 19' 6".

Mr. Rasch said the garage was not connected.

Chair Rios asked how it related to surrounding homes.

Mr. Vassau said the yellow house was 14-15' at the top of the shed, so his home was lower. This building was long and low like most of the rest in the neighborhood.

Mr. Barrow thought the set back made it have not much impact.

He asked if Bamboo was a cementitious color.

Mr. Vassau agreed.

Mr. Newman said in the discussion about how to reduce the height of the high point of this house, it seemed the only way was to lower the height of the ceiling and then somehow step down into the house. But then you'd have to step back up into the bedroom portion. He felt that would add interest in the house.

Mr. Frost asked if the height was not over the limit.

Mr. Rasch said it was just compliant.

Ms. Woods questioned the choice of stucco color and asked if he would consider Buckskin or Driftwood.

Mr. Vassau said he liked Driftwood but just thought Bamboo would fit.

**Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-31 with the staff recommendations and the conditions that have been addressed as explained and with the condition**

- 1. That louvered lights be used on the deck,**
- 2. That stucco be Driftwood color,**
- 3. That the standing seam roof be acid washed to reduce glare.**

**Ms. Shapiro seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes but Ms. Woods who voted against.**

- 2. Case #H-07-33. 161 S. Armijo Lane. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan, agent for Shirley Jordan, proposes to construct an approximately 814 sq. ft. roofed carport and storage area to a height of 11' where the existing height was 11' 6" to a Non-Contributing building and to construct a 4' high yard wall and pedestrian gate.**

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

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"This application proposes to construct an approximately 814 square foot enclosed carport and storage area to a height of 11' where the existing non-contributing Contemporary Vernacular style building on the zero lot line is 11' 6". The building will match the existing style and color. The vehicle entry (no door) will be on the north elevation and a wood pedestrian door will be on the west elevation. The north elevation at the vehicle entry will have a river rock apron. Three skylights are proposed for the building.

"Also proposed is a 4' high coyote fence where the maximum allowable height is 6' (setback approximately 20 feet from the street) and a wood plank pedestrian gate. The pedestrian gate will be flanked by river rock columns. Wood finish for the gate was not submitted.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the skylights are not publicly visible, that the coyote fence have irregular latilla ends, and that wood finish and stucco color are specified. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Present and sworn was Mr. Trey Jordan, 161 S Armijo Lane, who said the skylights wouldn't be visible, and the coyote would have irregular ends. He brought samples of stucco and wood finish and passed them around.

Ms. Shapiro asked how he would lay the river rock.

Mr. Jordan said they retained the rocks from the house on the lot.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he would get with Mr. Rasch on the style.

Mr. Jordan said he would. He said it would have some looseness to it.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he would have any exterior lighting.

Mr. Jordan said no, only the recessed lights above the opening to wash the ground for the vehicle.

**Ms. Woods moved for approved per staff recommendations. Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

3. **Case #H-07-34.** 645 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Mr. Frost & Kelli Glazier, propose to remove an approximately 381 sq. ft. portal, to construct approximately 1,364 sq. ft. of additions to a height of 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 14' 9", to construct approximately 566 sq. ft. of portal additions, replace doors and windows, to construct an approximately 775 sq. ft. free standing guest house to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height was 14' 9", and to construct a yard wall to a height of 4' 6" where the maximum allowable height was 4' 6" on a Contributing property.

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The 1,945 square foot Stamm building located at 645 Camino del Monte Sol is Spanish Pueblo Revival style and was built by 1949 according to the 2005 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI). The building has had moderate alterations which include construction of an approximately 384 square foot sun room in 1959, an approximately 24 square foot addition on the primary, south elevation and alterations to windows on the north and south elevations of the 286 square foot living room. Dates of the addition and living room alterations are unknown. The HDRB reviewed the status of this building at the January 23, 2007 hearing and upgraded the historic status from non-contributing to contributing.

"This application proposed the following alterations:

- "1. Remove the approximately 381 square foot portal on the non-publicly visible north elevation and approximately 11 square feet from the north elevation of the sunroom addition.
- "2. Construct approximately 1,364 square feet of adobe additions to the non-publicly visible north and east elevations to a height of 14' 6" where the maximum allowable height is 14' 9".
- "3. Construct an approximately 566 square foot portal addition to the non-publicly visible north elevation. The portal will be simple in style and will have three

square openings in the roof in order to meet the 50% footprint rule (all new construction under 50% by approximately 5.5 square feet).

- "4. The windows on the primary south elevation will be rehabilitated. One historic window on the west elevation (entry bump-out located in the middle of the south elevation) will be relocated to the south elevation. The window will replace the non-historic glass block while retaining the historic opening.
- "5. Replace windows and doors on the east and north elevations. Opening dimensions will be altered and some opening will be closed and stuccoed over while new openings will be created. Replacement doors and windows as well as new windows in the additions will be aluminum clad simulated divided lights in a brown color.
- "6. The parapet on the south elevation over the garage will be raised 2' to a height of 11' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 9".
- "7. The building will be stuccoed to match the existing color. Stucco type was not specified. Skylights were not indicated on the plans or in the proposal letter.
- "8. Construct an approximately 775 square foot guesthouse 20 feet from the south property line to a height of 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 9". The guesthouse will be built from adobe and will be Spanish Pueblo Revival in style. Windows and doors will be aluminum clad simulated divided lights in a dark brown color. Skylights were not indicated on the plans or in the proposal letter. The building will be stuccoed to match the existing residence. Stucco type was not submitted.
- "9. Lastly proposed is a yard wall along the south, Camino del Monte Sol elevation not to exceed the maximum allowable height of 4' 8". The wall will continue along the west and east property lines at a height of 4' 8" for the first 30 feet and then increase to the maximum allowable height of 6'. The walls will be stuccoed to match the buildings.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that stucco type is clarified and that any exterior light fixtures are brought to staff for approval. Otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulations for Contributing Structures, Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."



Present and previously sworn was Mr. Chris Purvis.

Chair Rios noted that the existing building was now contributing and asked if the alterations would change the status.

Ms. Barrett said no because the primary elevation was retained.

Chair Rios asked the applicant if he agreed with Ms. Barrett's opinion.

Mr. Purvis said it was a significant change but from the north side, one would have the same view. He clarified that the stucco would match in type and finish.

Chair Rios asked if this house had non-historic portions to it.

Ms. Barrett said the entire house was considered Contributing. The sunroom might have been built before 1959.

Mr. Purvis said the sunroom was built a little later but not much.

Chair Rios asked about the portal.

Mr. Purvis said it was still standing and the proposal was to remove the carport and use it on the portal on the east side.

Chair Rios asked if it exceeded 50% of the historic footprint.

Ms. Barrett said it would not if they remove and replace the portal.

Mr. Purvis admitted that the idea of the portal came late but it met the intent.

Ms. Farrar asked how tall the building itself was.

Mr. Purvis said it was about 12 feet.

Ms. Farrar asked if the proposal to raise roof of garage would make it equal to the height of the house.

Mr. Purvis said no, that it would be only two feet higher.

Ms. Farrar asked if the arroyo existed where the guesthouse would be.

Mr. Purvis agreed and said they would move it a little.

Ms. Woods remembered when Mr. Purvis held her feet to the fire on the very same issue and asked for help here. She said the existing heated area was 1,945 sq ft. and the total new square footage was 1,364.

Ms. Barrett said the total footprint was 2,326 and asked what the total new footprint would be.

Mr. Purvis said it would be 3,483.5.

Ms. Woods said that it was okay, then.

Ms. Barrett said the existing height was 13' 4".

Mr. Frost asked if the three open holes in the new portal were not included.

Mr. Purvis said that was right.

Ms. Barrett explained that the Code didn't say one could not do that.

Mr. Frost asked what size the openings were.

Mr. Purvis said they were 8x8.

Mr. Frost asked if it wouldn't be better to make the portal smaller.

Mr. Purvis said his clients were from California.

Ms. Barrett corrected that the openings were 6x6.

Chair Rios felt introducing those openings was contrary to the ordinance.

Ms. Woods asked if they were taking down any Ponderosas to build the guesthouse.

Mr. Purvis said the guesthouse was mostly in the driveway. He said that portion of Monte Sol has set backs all along.

Mr. Barrow found the guesthouse was imposing on the Contributing house on the streetscape side.

Chair Rios asked how low it was and what the set back was.

Mr. Purvis said it was 20 feet back from street and there were some buildings on that street that come out that far. He added that there was dense foliage before you get to the house and it was hard to see much of the house because of vegetation. It was not a large piece being put there.

Mr. Barrow asked if they needed a 2-bedroom guesthouse.

Mr. Purvis said they have children so they use all the bedrooms. He said the guesthouse was 775.

Mr. Frost asked for the height of the wall.

Mr. Purvis said it was four feet.

Mr. Frost asked what one could see of the guesthouse in the driveway.

Mr. Purvis said probably you would not see any of it.

Mr. Frost asked if one could see the guesthouse from the street.

Mr. Purvis said yes because 50% of guesthouse was on the driveway and the driveway would become a circle.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he would try to move the piñon trees.

Mr. Purvis said he was not sure the big ones could move so the current foliage in front of house would be in front of guesthouse.

Ms. Shapiro was concerned that one would see it from Monte Sol.

Mr. Purvis didn't think there would be a dramatic difference. He said it was too steep behind their home to put the guesthouse there.

Chair Rios asked about roof top equipment.

Mr. Purvis said the mechanicals would go underneath.

Chair Rios asked if it would have rounded corners.

Mr. Purvis agreed.

Mr. Barrow said on the topo it looked like there were lots of places in back for the guesthouse like on the northwest corner, so he took issue with that.

Mr. Purvis said that was the beginning of an arroyo that ran down to Camino Santander and they needed a driveway to the guesthouse. He said no one was using any of that land back there.

Ms. Shapiro asked if he would consider looking at that. She was nervous about putting it on that corner. The vegetation was unique to that house and it was very dense vegetation there. She wanted to look at that wall too, since the wall would change it.

Mr. Frost noted there was maybe one property to the south that had a serpentine like wall and not many others along there. He asked if they could justify the wall there and could they use vegetation instead of a wall.

Mr. Purvis said there was a wall next door and the next one was down by Santander. He said it was not a high wall at 4' 6". He said that Monte Sol changed block by block.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Farrar commented that she thought the wall did affect the streetscape and the relationship it had with the landscape.

Mr. Newman did not feel the guesthouse compromised the contributing elevation but the wall at the corner with the curved thing seemed out of character, sort of Texas-French. He felt if they eliminated some of the wall and opened up the corner, it would be more similar.

Mr. Purvis said the wall was not integral to the rest of the project and this was not piecemeal.

**Ms. Woods moved for approval of Case #H 07-34 for additions to the house with staff recommendations, and ask the applicant to explore other places for the guesthouse and without the wall. Mr. Frost seconded the motion with the added condition that portal be reduced 108 sq ft. Ms. Woods agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

4. **Case #H-07-35.** 517 Abeyta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joseph Spinden, agent/owner, requests a preliminary hearing for a proposal to construct an approximately 3,500 sq. ft. single-family residence on a vacant site with sloping grade at 4' above the maximum allowable height of 16' 5".

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"517 Abeyta Street is a single-family residence that was constructed before 1912 in a vernacular style. A hipped roof with skylights was installed in 1983, which significantly altered the character of the building. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant intends to construct an approximately 3,500 square foot free-standing building on the vacant lot behind the existing building. Since there is more than 2' of sloping ground (actually 4' shown topographically) along the proposed footprint, the applicant requests that the HDRB grant an additional 4' of height to the maximum allowable height of 16' 5". The preliminary hearing is requested for action on the general location, size and height of the proposed building. In an attempt for fairness to both the applicant and the HDRB, the chair and staff considered a preliminary hearing to best serve this type of request.

"The proposed building will not have street frontage and it will have minimal public visibility in the distance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends approval of the preliminary request for an approximate size and placement of the building along with a maximum allowable height of 20' 5".

Present and sworn was Mr. Joseph Spinden, 517 Abeyta, who said he prepared a fairly extensive submission for this project. He explained that he needed a new house for his family. He said it worked for his mother as a single woman but not after she became ill and it was not suited for a couple and definitely not a family with children. He explained that there was only one direction of change possible and he was trying to preserve as much open space as possible. He said lot coverage would be about 25%.

Chair Rios asked if he felt this was the best location for the house.

Mr. Spinden said he did and had been thinking about it for years.

Chair Rios asked him to address the roof on the south side.

Mr. Spinden said that for different reasons, he concluded a shed roof would be the best fit to meet the historic design style of a wall dominated façade and at same time have a slope to move snow off the roof. He said that a neighbor called to complain, not understanding what he was doing so he asked an architect to make it clear.

Chair Rios asked what the length of the roof area was.

Mr. Spinden handed out a drawing [attached as Exhibit A] and also brought a photograph. The bottom picture was from the south side of the property. The shed roof was roughly half of the length of the structure.

Chair Rios asked if that was what the neighbor would see.

Mr. Spinden agreed and said they would have windows but not necessarily where they were shown.

Mr. Barrow asked what style he was calling this.

Mr. Spinden said it would be Pueblo style.

Present and sworn was Mr. Blaine Young, 114 Hickox who said there were many shed roofs.

Mr. Barrow said he was not convinced that was part of pueblo style.

Mr. Rasch said they would be more on portals. But there were mixed styles.

Ms. Farrar said the ordinance defined shed as a pitched roof so she believed there would have to be a calculation of pitched roofs in the area.

Mr. Young said there were numerous examples all over town.

Mr. Rasch said they would not do a calculation because it was an accent. He said if the building required four additional feet because of the pitch, then how would that fit into the ordinance. You would need the calculation to determine if it could be done.

Mr. Young said there were some across the street.

Mr. Rasch said staff would say the whole building would have to be shed to be subject to the calculation.

Mr. Frost pointed to the rear bottom view and asked what the height of that building was.

Mr. Young said it was about 20' from the other side and here would be somewhat less.

Mr. Spinden said it was about 14.5' on this side.

Mr. Frost said if he did Pueblo, it would be about 12' on that back wall.

Ms. Woods noted this was a preliminary review.

Mr. Rasch explained the four feet was not an exception but discretionary for the Board.

Ms. Woods felt they could spend the rest of the night on something that wasn't even drawn. She agreed with Ms. Farrar.

Chair Rios said they were only doing location, height, and size of the building to give some direction.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Forest Moses 837 El Caminito who said he submitted a rather complete letter.

He said his primary objection was having a substantial building five feet from his property line. He felt if it was on the north perimeter, the southern exposure would add to the beauty of the house but facing north was not as good.

He said this proposal would give him a thirty-foot shed roof to look at. He thought if it were a flat roof style, it would be better. He said most of them were flat there and modest in scale. He said he had lived in his house since 1961 and it never leaked. He said he has had the privilege of looking at a meadow his mother planted there and now was going to lose that. He has the right to build whatever he wants but it was a push to look at 30' of tin roof. He said it would be like living out on Siler Road.

Present and sworn was Mr. Guy Barnes, El Caminito, who said he was across the street from Forest. He thought the height was very high since most of the houses there were 13' low houses, very traditional, very much pueblo style. This deviates considerably from the neighborhood and should be looked at carefully before being approved.

Present and sworn was Mr. Ricardo Mozel, 841 El Caminito who also wrote a letter and hoped he was not being redundant. He said it was hard to state his opinion on such a vague project. He explained that his home was at the back of it and faced this lot. He said his lot sloped down toward this lot at the back of their houses, the garden, was this beautiful back yard and the location for this massive volume. He felt there were many other ways to site it and, if it were on the north, it would be much better and not so imposing on him. He said this would certainly cut off his views of the mountains. He said he basically opposed it because the style would not go well with their neighborhood.

Present and sworn was Mr. Paul Holton, Don Miguel Place who said the problem he had with this was how the Board could approve anything.

Chair Rios explained that they were simply trying to give the applicant direction. He was telling the Board where he wanted to locate the house without going to the expense of the design with a lot of detail. She said he would come back with the details later.

Mr. Holton said there has not been a proposal submitted that complies with the ordinance. He said he lived a half mile from there and walked through that neighborhood and he felt it was not typical with what was already there. He thought there was only one pitched roof in that section of town.

Mr. Young responded that the siting of this would preserve two major trees in the center along with the meadow. He noted that the houses to the south were as high or taller than this one. The house to the east was also higher. He said this kind of sits in a bowl. He felt the idea to preserve the trees and meadow was consistent with the general context of the houses there.

Mr. Spinden pointed out three pitched roof houses within 25' and others further down Abeyta Street so he felt those statements were not correct.

He noted that Forest Moses' building was in the height data base at 20.4' in height and that building had a base elevation at least three feet higher.

He showed the Board pictures of the neighbor's building that showed it was not in



the appropriate style.

Mr. Spinden said the garden was in his property and the neighbor had at one time had a beautiful garden and built over it. He said his neighbor's building was about 20.5 feet and was five feet higher than his building. He said that at 20' high, his building would not be out of character with the height of these buildings.

Mr. Frost said he didn't know what was one the east side. They were dealing with siting. He asked if there was a different siting that would appease the applicant and the neighbors. He asked if the applicant would you look at others.

Mr. Spinden said they could. He pointed out that on the east side, he could not see his meadow. He said that Mr. Moses enjoyed the view of this property for 30 years and he thought he should enjoy it as well.

He said he stepped it back thirty feet to help preserve Mr. Moses' view. Anything built here would impede views. There was no way to avoid that.

**Ms. Woods moved to deny the applicant's request in Case #H 07-35 with findings of Section 14.5.2, to deny the request for additional building height and to request that staff look into allowing the pitched roof, that the Board would need more information and request the applicant to reconsider the siting. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion.**

Mr. Frost requested a friendly amendment to ask him to look at reducing the size. Ms. Woods did not accept hat because it was only 25% of lot coverage.

**The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

5. **Case #H-07-36-A.** 618 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Apryl Miller & Joseph Walfish, agents/owners, propose an historic status review of this Non-Contributing property.

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory lists the two buildings located at 618 E. Alameda Street, Unit 1 approximately 990 square feet and Unit 2 approximately 500 square feet, as New Mexico Vernacular in style with a construction date of pre-1928.

The HCPI also states that Unit 2, the building furthest south, is listed on the 1912 Kings Map indicating it may have been built before 1912. The 1985 HCPI forms suggest both buildings are contributing. The City database has a listing of five buildings with the 618 Alameda address, two of which are listed as contributing. The Official Map lists the buildings as non-contributing which staff believes may have been a database error.

“Both buildings have had little alterations since the 1985 HCPI except for some maintenance and repair and according to the applicant, possible window/ door replacement between 1963 and 2006, although proof was not provided. The buildings have retained some single pane divided light wood windows (according to the applicant they are from salvaged materials and were installed in the late 1950s), projecting viga ends and rock walls. The massing of both buildings are relatively the same in square footage and height. A small portion of the eastern section of Unit 2 may have been a later addition as per interpretation of the 1958 aerial.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

“Staff recommends upgrade of both Unit 1 and Unit 2 from non-contributing to contributing buildings based on little massing alterations, retaining most of the historic material, and that both the architectural and historic integrity remains.”

Present and sworn was Mr. Joseph Walfish, 618 E. Alameda.

Chair Rios asked if he agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. Walfish said he did.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-360A per staff recommendations to upgrade the historic status of this property to Contributing. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**Case #H-07-36-B.** 618 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Apryl Miller & Joseph Walfish, agents/ owners, propose to remodel two Non-Contributing buildings by altering doors and windows, constructing a parapet to match the existing height, and constructing yard walls not to exceed the maximum allowable height of 6’.

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

## **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"This application proposes the following changes to Unit 1, the building furthest north. Staff recommends that the north, river-facing elevation is primary.

"Replace the non-historic door on the north elevation with a four light, two-panel wood door, similar to others on the property, and repair the historic windows. Replace three non-compliant windows on the west elevation with four-light windows to match the existing one that will be repaired. Also proposed for the west elevation, as well as the south elevation, is the replacement of the non-historic, non-compliant doors with a four-light, two-panel wood door and the replacement of any rotten viga ends. One non-compliant window on the east elevation will be replaced with a divided light window, one window will be repaired, and one new window opening will be created and a 6/6 double-hung window will be installed to match existing.

"The building will be stuccoed in El Rey Buckskin to match the existing. Two trim options are provided which are Teddy Bear, a light brown color and Sand Dollar, an off-white color. The original color is believed to be a medium green shade. Plans do not indicate any new skylights or exterior light fixtures.

"The following alterations are proposed for Unit 2, the southernmost building. Staff recommends that the south and west elevations are primary.

"Create a new door opening on the north elevation. The door will be a four-light, two-panel wood door to match others proposed. The west elevation divided light windows will be repaired or replaced to match. All divided light windows on the south elevation are proposed to be repaired or replaced where needed. The non-historic window on the south elevation will be replaced with a window to fit the original opening (header height will remain and the sill will be lowered). A non-historic wood panel door will be replaced with a four-light, two-panel wood door on the east elevation.

"The overhang (a character-defining element) on the east and south elevation will be eliminated and a parapet will be constructed to match the existing height of 9'. One new canale will be constructed on each elevation. The applicant proposes the construction of the parapet to hide the proposed ridged insulation for the roof.

"The building will be stuccoed in El Rey Buckskin to match the existing. Two trim options are provided which are Teddy Bear, a light brown color and Sand Dollar, an off-white color. Plans do not indicate any new skylights or exterior light fixtures.

"Lastly proposed for the property is the replacement of an approximately 7' high coyote fence on the north elevation of Unit 1 with a CMU stuccoed wall to the maximum allowable height of 6'. Replacement of an approximately 7' height coyote fence along the west elevation of the property to the maximum allowable height of 6'. The wall will have two pedestrian wood gates, one located in front of Unit 1 and the second south of Unit 2. A CMU stuccoed wall is also proposed along the south property line to the maximum allowable height of 6'. The walls will be stuccoed to match the buildings. Gate finish was not submitted.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends that all windows on primary elevations (Unit 1, north elevation; Unit 2, south and west elevations) are retained and repaired, that the parapet on the south elevation of Unit 2 is not permitted, and that the gate finishes are clarified. Otherwise the application complies with Section 14-5.2 (C) Regulations for Contributing Structures, Section 14-5.2 (D) Regulations for Contributing Structures for all H-districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards."

Mr. Walfish said he was ready for questions.

Mr. Barrow said one issue was the fencing. Along the river, it was a natural feel. There were some coyote and some stucco. The coyote was softer and more natural. Hard walls have a conflict on the river scape.

Mr. Walfish said he was flexible on everything. He thought there was an overabundance of coyote fencing and was way too much. He added he was applying for a wall right along Alameda to screen the parking area.

Mr. Barrow said his point was on the river side. Fences were everywhere. He was just saying along the riverside. He felt the wall should step down to the height on the street.

Mr. Walfish said the bulk of his property was on this private drive and the only part on Alameda was where he proposed the wall. He said that to the east was a condo development with a 14' wall, to the west were continuous walls at 8' plus, and he would like to be considered the same as those had been.

Mr. Newman noted that along the driveway, he remembered what was being proposed earlier but staff has determined that the west elevation along the driveway was primary.

Ms. Barrett said that was for Unit 2.

Mr. Newman thought the wall all along both units was really changing the character of those buildings along that driveway and the fence there was more successful.

Mr. Walfish said he wanted to have his wall be different from the others and was willing to change things. He felt Mr. Newman came up with a good proposal last time.

Chair Rios asked if the protruding vigas would be covered with anything.

Mr. Walfish agreed. He said they were rotted and he would replace them and cover with metal viga covers.

Mr. Frost said he would like to see that they be replaced in kind, match diameters.

Mr. Rasch asked if the protruding lengths were uneven.

Mr. Walfish said they were originally the same length.

Mr. Rasch said that in historic buildings, the ends were usually not even.

Mr. Walfish proposed removing the deteriorated galvanized trim and if he got to put in the parapet, that would bring the exposed vigas back.

Mr. Barrow advised him to check on-line for boric rods.

Mr. Walfish said that was the way he planned to do it.

Chair Rios asked how many windows he wanted to replace.

Mr. Walfish said on the west elevations windows they had three with plexiglass. He wanted to duplicate the original of 2 over 2 and restore that one original. He said he would prefer insulated glass explaining that they were right on the alley and noisy and the windows were extremely degraded.

Ms. Shapiro said the bedroom windows have to meet egress.

Mr. Walfish agreed and didn't know if the door would qualify.

Ms. Shapiro said it wouldn't meet the requirement.

Mr. Walfish said he would use the place where there was once a window.

Ms. Barrett said he could do bigger windows on the west elevation to meet egress.

Ms. Farrar clarified it could be a longer window. She suggested the window that might be historic could be moved to the other opening.

**PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Present and sworn was Ms. Apryl Miller, 618 E. Alameda, who said she had spent a lot of time walking there and it has become dangerous because of people driving too fast. She said this was the only coyote fence from Delgado past Palace and it looked so out of place and uncared for. She said it was uncomfortable how much it was out of character and how much it has become a very public area there. It was just the reality of the neighborhood there.

Ms. Woods recognized the sensitivity of the applicant to preservation.

Mr. Newman said if the fence moved out to Alameda and then there were no walls and used landscaping to screen the cars so that you could see the north elevation it would be better. He didn't think it should be all river rock.

**Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-36-B as staff recommended, with the conditions:**

- 1. That parapet walls be allowed on that section of the shed roof to expose and/or repair viga ends,**
- 2. That the windows on the west elevation of Unit 1 have the windows be replaced for egress,**
- 3. That the vigas on the south be replaced and repaired with covers to be galvanized tin with acid wash,**
- 4. That the walls be postponed for redesign.**

**Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting yes but Mr. Barrow who voted against.**

**Ms. Woods moved to reconsider the motion just voted on. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**Mr. Newman amended the original motion to eliminate the proposed masonry wall along the driveway on the west side of Unit One and eliminate the north wall on Unit Two and to construct the wall on Alameda.**

**Ms. Woods seconded the motion with the addition of the wall for the courtyard as proposed. Mr. Newman said okay and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 6. Case #H-07-38.** 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Wyndham Carlisle, agent for Thomas Parks, proposes to enclose approximately 414 sq. ft. Non-Contributing covered patio and to construct an approximately 535 sq. ft. addition to a height of 15' 7" where the maximum allowable height was 16' 8" and to construct a 5' 6" high mechanical vehicular gate.

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

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

"The approximately 414 square foot Vernacular style building located at the rear of 209 E. Santa Fe Ave. was constructed in the 1980s. The building has no doors and windows and has a sloping flat roof with an overhang. It has been used as a covered patio and is located on the property where two contributing buildings exist. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

"This application proposes the following alterations:

- "1. Construct an approximately 535 square foot addition to the height of 15' 7" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 8" on the north elevation. The addition will have a pitched roof, which is allowed according to the pitch calculation (56% of streetscape has pitched buildings). Roofing material will be metal and colored either brown, sage green, or an earthy red. Three skylights are proposed for the west side of the pitched roof.
- "2. Remodel the existing building by increasing the height over the middle portion to 15' 7" where the maximum allowable height is 16' 8". A shed roof, to match the proposed pitched in style, will be constructed over the raised portion of the building. The remaining roof height will be increased as well and will have a parapet height of 10' 6". A roof deck will be constructed on the east elevation of the second story and may be entered from habitable space. Single light French doors and a single light door are proposed for access.
- "3. Wood divided light windows and doors are proposed throughout the building and will be painted a color similar to the existing structures. The building will be stuccoed using a light earth tone cementitious stucco similar in color and texture to the existing structure.

- "4. Remove an approximately 25' section of a 6' high yard wall and pedestrian gate at the north property line and replace with a 25' long 5' 6" high sliding vehicular gate. Gate material and finish was not submitted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that no skylights are publicly visible, that wood trim color, stucco type and color, roofing material and color, and gate material and finishes are clarified, that any exterior light fixtures are brought to staff for approval, that a zero lot line affidavit is provided as per preliminary zoning review conditions, and that the Board examine the streetscape harmony of the building and vehicular gate."

Present and sworn was Mr. Wyndham Carlisle 115 San Salvador, who said the windows were casements, gate was steel frame with weathered wood to match existing pedestrian gate.

Chair Rios said she did not see any vehicular gate in the neighborhood.

Ms. Barrett said she didn't see any.

Mr. Carlisle that two doors east was a gate same size and style, yellow in color. One door west of the 3-story monstrosity.

Mr. Barrow asked about the vehicular gate. He said the proliferation of these mechanical operated gates has been astonishing and didn't know how they continue approving them because they have no historic precedence and look like a prison. He said he saw one wooden gate manually operated. He didn't think it was in keeping with Santa Fe to keep approving them.

Mr. Rasch said that gate was to have come down at the passing of the mother.

Mr. Carlisle pointed out three parking spaces on the alleyway. He said if the Board would allow them to install a coyote fence from northeast to southwest, that would be acceptable.

Mr. Newman asked how they intended to use the roof deck.

Mr. Carlisle said Thomas Parks was a photographer and the concept was to increase storage space, so they were considering the attic for storage of painting and flat photos.



Mr. Newman said the shed portion of the roof and deck should be eliminated. He pointed it out. He also asked about visibility.

Mr. Carlisle said if you were standing on Santa Fe or alley, you wouldn't see the skylights unless standing in the driveway at 211.

He said the skylights were introduced because they were at zero lot line and could not have any penetrations in that wall so they were to give light.

Chair Rios asked if he would agree to eliminate that shed roof.

Mr. Carlisle said Mr. Newman's suggestion would eliminate the storage space so he would like the chance to redesign for storage.

Ms. Woods asked about a basement.

Mr. Carlisle said because of lot coverage issues, a stairway inside would be disadvantageous for bedroom and living room.

Ms. Woods agreed there was a lot going on with the roof.

Mr. Carlisle said that raising the pitch might give him the space needed.

Ms. Woods asked about just taking the roof forward and no shed. And no metal roof deck.

Ms. Barrett said the viewshed would be impacted.

Mr. Carlisle said that would be acceptable.

Mr. Frost asked how far he would extend it.

Mr. Carlisle said 5 feet.

Mr. Newman asked if there was any skylight in the eliminated extension.

Mr. Carlisle said no.

Ms. Shapiro wondered about sq. ft. for this compared to the main house.

Mr. Newman said it was 1,300 sq. ft. total roofed area.

Ms. Barrett said it was 38%.

Mr. Carlisle clarified they called it a second primary structure on site.

Ms. Woods asked for the ceiling height on flat part.

Mr. Carlisle said it was 8 feet.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Woods moved to approve Case #H 07-38 with these conditions:**

- 1. That the roof deck be omitted and the parapet of flat part was dropped to meet the other flat section;**
- 2. That they raise the ridge 13", extend it 5' 2";**
- 3. That they eliminate the railing;**
- 4. That the lower chimney be at standard height on flat section;**
- 5. That they change the vehicle gate to a coyote fence as proposed by applicant;**
- 6. That they submit new drawings to staff.**

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

Mr. Carlisle said his client asked if a manual gate would be acceptable.

Chair Rios said the motion was for no gate.

- 7. Case #H-07-37-A. 138 Park Avenue/513-B W. San Francisco. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Tom Agnew/MIFSUD Architects, agents for 138 Park Avenue & 513-B W. San Francisco Partnerships, propose an historic status review of this Contributing, Non-Contributing, and structures without status on the property.**

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

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

"138 Park Avenue is a single-family residence that is now part of the Casa Pueblo Inn. This building known as the Emilio Duran House was constructed by 1928 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. There has been very little alteration while retaining its historic integrity. The 1985 Historic cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) suggests contributing status for the building and the 1996 HCPI recommends significant status. A recent review of the HCPI also recommends significant status.

"138 Park Avenue Units 12-13, previously known as 140 Park Avenue, was constructed in 1948-48 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The 1985 HCPI did not have a known date of construction which was less than 50 years and it was considered to be a non-contributing building. With the known date of construction to be sixty years ago and minor alteration of the structure with replacement of windows in 1996-97, the building is recommended for status upgrade to contributing.

"Units 1-11 and 14-21 were constructed in 1996-97 and should be considered as non-contributing due to lack of historic age.

"Units 22-32, previously known as 513-B West San Francisco Street, have an unknown date of construction, but were substantially remodeled in 1996-97 and are recommended for non-contributing status.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends that the Duran House be upgraded to significant status due to high integrity, that Units 11-12 be upgraded to contributing status due to moderate integrity, and that the remainder of the units be retained at non-contributing status."

Present and sworn was Mr. Tom Agnew, who agreed to a point. He said the fire shutters were added ten years ago, the west windows, new closet, range hood were also added. He said they didn't have any strong feeling about it because they were not planning renovations.

Ms. Farrar asked about the fire shutter.

Mr. Agnew explained that they come down if there was a fire to protect.

Ms. Woods asked staff if that was a removable portion.

Mr. Rasch said yes and the antennas also.

Ms. Woods asked what else had been added.

Mr. Agnew said it was a big mechanical closet on the west side.

Mr. Frost asked if the roof top equipment was visible.

Mr. Rasch said not from that view.

Chair Rios asked if the footprint remained the same.

Mr. Rasch agreed, as far as they could tell.

Chair Rios asked for the significance of owners.

Mr. Rasch said there was none that he knew.

Ms. Farrar asked if there was no updated survey.

Mr. Rasch said they took the 1996 survey to Mary Ragins and she agreed with it.

Ms. Shapiro asked where the fire shutters were.

Mr. Rasch said they were on the west side and the new building was very close.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-37-A per staff recommendations with the Duran House upgraded to Significant, Units 12 and 13 to contributing, and that rest remain non-contributing. Ms. Woods seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**Case #H-07-37-B.** 138 Park Avenue/513-B W. San Francisco. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Tom Agnew/MIFSUD Architects, agents for 138 Park Avenue & 513-B W. San Francisco Partnerships, propose to remodel existing buildings and to construct a hot tub with perimeter fence. An exception was requested to exceed the maximum allowable height of 55" (Section 14-5.2,D,9).

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"An historic status review of the property resulted in the previous hearing actions. Now, the applicant proposes to construct a hot tub in front of the Duran House at the streetscape with an enclosing 6' high fence that is required by the New Mexico Environment Department.

"The hot tub will be located in the existing front courtyard. An existing stuccoed

yardwall mostly encloses the area but it is not as tall as needed. The maximum allowable height for the streetscape wall/fence is 55" and the side lot line wall/fence is 8' high. The Board may grant an additional 20% of height, or 11", to the streetscape maximum for a total of 66", where 72" is required under state law. An exception is requested and the required criteria responses will be presented at the hearing.

"The existing wall height will be extended with either coyote or wrought iron fencing. Coyote is preferred for increased privacy of the bathers. A 6' high fence with a 3' wide coyote pedestrian gate will be constructed along the east side of the hot tub courtyard.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends denial of the exception request to exceed the maximum allowable height plus 20% for the hot tub enclosure unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to support the exception required for this application."

Mr. Rasch referred to the height calculation map.

Mr. Frost said it seemed that there were changes made to the ground of the property that would visually impair the streetscape of the significant property.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Farrar asked Mr. Rasch to read the criteria responses which he did.

Ms. Woods asked for the ordinance section for exceptions.

Mr. Rasch said it was Section 14-5.2 C 5 c I - vi.

**Ms. Woods moved to deny the request for an exception of Case #H 07-037-B based on finding of fact that of the ordinance, specifically states the applicant meet all six criteria and on the first, it would damage the streetscape and the hardship response does not meet the intent of the ordinance and doesn't provide the least negative impact. Ms. Farrar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

8. **Case #H-07-39.** 2214 Wilderness Meadow. Historic Review District. Stephen Velie & Hannah McCaughey, agents/ owners, request a preliminary hearing for a proposal to construct an approximately 3,000 sq. ft. single-family residence on a

vacant site with sloping grade at 4' above the maximum allowable height of 16'. Exceptions were requested to exceed the maximum allowable height plus 4' (Section 14-5.2,D,9,c) and to construct a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2,D,9,d).

Mr. Rasch asked for clarification on the property and decided it was outside the boundaries and should be removed from the agenda.

**Chair Rios moved to remove it from the agenda. Ms. Woods seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

9. **Case #H-07-32.** 116 Laughlin. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Jessica Lucas, agent/ owner, proposes to remodel a Contributing building by replacing historic windows, constructing gates and fences, stuccoing yard walls. Exceptions were requested to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2,D,5,a,ii), and to alter distinctive features (Section 14-5.2,C,1,c).

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

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

"116 Laughlin Street was a single-family residential building that was constructed in a vernacular style by 1944. The structure is now a duplex. The building is listed as contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The north and west elevations are primary.

"The property was remodeled without a permit and a stop work order was issued to the developer on February 19, 2007.

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

"1. All original historic windows, except two 8-light wood casements on the north elevation and three 6-light fixed on the south elevation, will be removed and replaced with thermal pane windows with snap-in muntins. Two window openings on the east end of the north elevation were increased in size to meet emergency ingress/ egress. An exception is requested to remove historic material on primary elevation and the required criteria responses are attached.

"2. The east elevation parapet was increased to meet existing adjacent height.

"3. Exterior light fixtures were installed flanking both entrances on the north and west elevations.

"4. Chain link and bamboo fences were removed and replaced with coyote fences.

"5. The building was restuccoed with Sto elastomeric 'Tumbleweed.' The original stucco type and color is unknown.

"6. Wooden gates were installed in archways in the existing historic slump block yardwall. The yardwall will be stuccoed to match the building. An exception is requested to alter the character of the slump block wall and the criteria responses are attached.

"7. The applicant may ask for minor additional 'clean-up items.'

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

"Staff recommends denial of the exceptions requested unless the Board has a positive finding of fact to support the required exceptions for this project."

Ms. Woods asked if the stucco walls had all been done.

Mr. Rasch said they had.

Ms. Woods asked if it has lost its status because of this.

Mr. Rasch said it was severely damaged. The parapet was raised.

Chair Rios asked if the window openings changed.

Mr. Rasch said they didn't know but the two on the garage were altered for egress. He said the inventory described the previous windows.

Present and sworn was Ms. Jessica Lucas, 8 Camino del Centro.

Chair Rios asked why this was done without a permit.

Ms. Lucas said it was total ignorance and that she believed people.

Chair Rios asked if she was the person who went forward with these changes.

Ms. Lucas said she was. She said she was told it was not historic. She hired a contractor and said she wanted it to be totally legal. She said the contractor was not licensed but told her he had connections in City Hall.

Mr. Barrow asked how long it has taken.

Ms. Lucas said it took three months. She said she bought it for investment purposes.

Mr. Barrow asked if she got to see it before.

Ms. Lucas agreed.

Mr. Barrow asked what the stucco was.

Ms. Lucas said it was pink and cracked.

Mr. Rasch noted that pink was a very popular color of cementitious stucco from the 1940s.

Chair Rios asked what happened to the windows.

Ms. Lucas said the contractor burned them and that they were in very bad condition

Ms. Woods asked if it was for sale.

Ms. Lucas said one side was already sold.

Ms. Woods said this had financial implications. She suggested that Ms. Lucas replace the windows with true divided light windows. The snap-ins were not even the right color. Not all of them but just on the primary elevations so they would have a chance to retain the historic status.

Ms. Lucas said she ordered windows with sashes and was told the true divided windows didn't come in.

Ms. Woods said she should have taken them back.

Ms. Lucas said they couldn't because they got them from Direct Buy.

Ms. Shapiro told her to go to Windsor on the Internet. She said she would postpone the case until she does this. She asked if there were pilasters at the gate.



Ms. Lucas said they were not constructed.

Ms. Shapiro said they needed to be rebuilt.

Ms. Lucas said she would do away with the gates.

Mr. Barrow asked if she could get the photos from the realtors.

Ms. Lucas said she included photos from the appraiser in the packet.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Mr. Jeremy Jones 3 White Boulder Lane, who said he was currently under contract for the front unit and tended to agree; He said he understood the issue and that everything was subject to the Board's decisions. He said they had a closing date in early May and he didn't have a problem with the windows recommendation. He said the fencing and door was what made them fall in love with the property. He thought this was in line with a lot of properties on the street and if that were to be taken away, it would affect the property. He felt that it was a tremendous improvement and asked that the Board consider leaving these features.

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

Chair Rios said that in this area, you don't really see this style. She wished to know the history of this wall because this was rare. Most of them were low or had wire fence.

Mr. Barrow asked if they couldn't find some photo documentation.

Ms. Lucas said that Robert Rhoades knew about it and told her that someone ran into it and it had to be replaced but Lance Bell's father built the house and said it was always there.

Ms. Woods thought they were in a tough position here. This was one where everyone would have to give a little

**Ms. Woods moved for approval of Case #H 07-32 with these conditions:**

- 1. stucco over the ox eye on the garage,**
- 2. replace window sashes with true divided lights matching as close as possible.**
- 3. Remove the light fixtures around the doorway with traditional fixtures to be approved by staff,**

4. leave the gate and stuccoed arch and continue construction with existing archway. Mr. Barrow said he would second it with replacing the gates with the historic iron gates.

Ms. Woods accepted the amendment and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Frost requested that if she could find the original stones and put them back as the picture shows it would be great.

#### MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

---

The Board briefly discussed the poster.

Ms. Barrett she believed the artist was deceased.

Ms. Farrar thought they would do something related to John Gaw Meem

Ms. Barrett thought they were going to do another poster at 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

---

Having completed the Agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 p.m.

Approved by:

  
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer