



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6-28-07 TIME 4:00

SERVED BY Wanda R. Vigil

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2007 – 12:00 NOON

PLANNING DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2007 – 6:00PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 12, 2007

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW SECTION 14-5.2 (A)(7) TO CLARIFY STAFF REVIEW AUTHORITY IN THE HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

H. OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #H-05-138. 716 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. David Birnbaum, agent for Mr. Douglas Stewart, proposes to amend a previous approval to a Non-Contributing building by extending a portal approximately 210 sq. ft. and opening alterations.
2. Case #H-06-47. 727 Gregory. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Monica Montoya, agent for the Hart Family Partnership, proposes to amend a previous approval of a single family residence by altering a carport to a garage.
3. Case #H-07-15. 126 Quintana. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval for a Non-Contributing building with window alterations, construction of an approximately 166 sq. ft. pergola, and alterations to walls and pedestrian gates.

4. Case #H-07-30. 530 S. Guadalupe. Outside District. Mark Hogan, agent for Barker Realty, proposes to replace a temporary non-historic wood and wire railing with a 3' 6" high steel upright and aircraft cable railing on a Landmark building.
5. Case #H-07-38. 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Wyndham Carlisle, agent for Thomas Parks, proposes to amend a previously approved case by adding dormer details to a Non-Contributing building.

J. STATUS REVIEW

1. Case #H-07-67. 220 Closson. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review for a non-statused building.

K. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #H-07-75-A. 335 W. Manhattan. Transition Historic District. Glenn Ellington, agent for Newby, Susan & Katrina Ellington, proposes an historic status review of a Contributing shed.

Case #H-07-75-B. 335 W. Manhattan. Transition Historic District. Glenn Ellington, agent for Newby, Susan & Katrina Ellington, proposes to remodel a Contributing building with replacement of non-historic windows, restoration of a front portal and hardscaping, replace fences with 34" high picket fences, and to remodel a free-standing shed.
2. Case #H-07-79. 240 Rodriguez. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joe M. Ortega, agent/owner, proposes to enclose an approximately 484 sq. ft. carport attached to a Non-Contributing building to match the existing height of approximately 9' 10".
3. Case #H-07-80. 610-A Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jim McGorty, agent for Ann Hosfeld, proposes to remove a non-historic 2' 6" high picket fence and hardscaping which encroaches onto public right-of-way and replace it with a 36" high stuccoed yard wall, re-stucco and re-paint a Contributing building.
4. Case #H-07-82. 512 Alto #3. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Victor Johnson, agent for Tom Parker & Nina Houle, propose to remodel a Non-Contributing condominium unit including constructing a 162 sq. ft. deck, partially enclosing a two-story portal, replacing all windows and doors, and re-stuccoing.
5. Case #H-07-84. 417 & 419 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Tommy Gardner & Darlene Streit, proposes to construct a 2,680 sq. ft. building to a height of 14' 4" or the maximum allowable height on a Significant and Contributing property.
6. Case #H-07-81-A. 526 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susy Tiffany, agent/owner, proposes an historic status review of a Non-Contributing residence.

Case #H-07-81-B. 526 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Susy Tiffany, agent/owner, proposes to remodel the building by replacing windows, spray-foam insulate the exterior, re-stucco, change the architectural character from Spanish Pueblo to Territorial, construct a portal, and replace a chain-link fence with a stuccoed yard wall. Exceptions may be required to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2,D,5), re-construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2,D,2,c), and to alter the architectural character (Section 14-5.2,D,1,b)
7. Case #H-07-83. 511 Douglas. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Wanda Kapp/Rachel Kelly, propose to remodel a Contributing building with restoration of a front portal and replace non-primary windows, construct a 1,969 sq. ft. free-standing residence to a height of 13' 4" or below the maximum allowable height, and to construct a yard wall and gate to 9' high to re-establish the streetscape where a Contributing building has been demolished. A height exception is requested for the re-established streetscape wall (Section 14-5.2,9).

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

SUMMARY INDEX
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Santa Fe, New Mexico

July 10, 2007

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as published	2
Approval of Minutes: June 12, 2007	Approved as corrected	2
Communications	Discussion	2
Business from the Floor	Discussion	2-3
Administrative Matters		
1. Ordinance Amendment Staff Review Authority	Referred to subcommittee	3-5
Old Business to Remain Postponed	None	5
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 05-138</u> 716 East Palace Ave.	Approved with conditions	5-9
2. <u>Case #H 06-47</u> 727 Gregory	Approved with conditions	9-11
3. <u>Case #H 07-15</u> 126 Quintana	Denied	11-16
4. <u>Case #H 07-30</u> 530 S. Guadalupe	Approved as recommended	16-18
5. <u>Case #H 07-38</u> 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue	Approved with conditions	18-21
Status Review		
1. <u>Case #H 07-67</u> 220 Closson	Approved - upgraded to Contributing ...	21-23

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
New Business		
1. <u>Case #H 07-75-A</u> 335 W. Manhattan	Approved - Downgraded	23-24
<u>Case #H 07-75-B</u> 335 W. Manhattan	Approved with Conditions	24-28
2. <u>Case #H 07-79</u> 240 Rodriguez	Approved with Conditions	28-29
3. <u>Case #H 07-80</u> 610-A Canyon Road	Approved with Conditions	29-31
4. <u>Case #H 07-82</u> 512 Alto #3	Approved with conditions	31-33
5. <u>Case #H 07-84</u> 417 & 419 E. Palace Ave.	Approved as recommended	33-35
6. <u>Case #H 07-81-A</u> 526 Calle Corvo	Upgraded to Contributing	35-37
<u>Case #H 07-81-B</u> 526 Calle Corvo	Postponed	37-40
7. <u>Case #H 07-83</u> 511 Douglas	Preliminary approval only	40-45
Matters from the Board	Discussion	45
Adjournment	45-46

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

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2007 - 6:00PM

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods 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 Sharon Woods, Chair
Mr. Jake Barrow
Mr. Robert Frost
Mr. Charles Newman
Ms. Cecilia Rios

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Deborah Shapiro
One Vacancy

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Historic Planner
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Jeannie Price, City Staff
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Frost moved to approve the agenda as published. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 12, 2007

Mr. Newman requested the following changes:

page 24, 9th paragraph - first sentence between the various drawings. Last sentence insert "units" after "any."

Page 26 , 6th from bottom: add "opening" to that sentence.

Page 30, in the motion, condition #2: should be "wing walls," not "rain walls."

Page 28, 5th paragraph from the bottom: references to "small 2 over 2" should be "2' over 2'."

Mr. Frost moved to approve the minutes of June 12, 2007 as corrected. Mr. Newman seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Rios who abstained.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch reported that at the end of June, he went to workshop on green strategies for historic buildings. Historic preservation was the original green. Trucking material to the landfill uses a lot of energy.

He showed a photo of a new Denver Art Museum and commented that it was not green and was a major waste of material and space. He said it looked like a growth of mineral crystals with skin that looked like lizard skin.

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Ms. Jane Farrar said the Board was aware she had resigned and she wanted to say

farewell. She said she enjoyed the last five years and wished everyone all the best and would be available to help in any way she could.

Present and sworn was Ms. Stephanie Beninato, Galisteo Street told the Board they would have a case coming back at 610 Galisteo. She said she had seen that structure deliberately taken down without being shored up. It had been red-tagged since July 3rd and she guessed the city thought they would be responsible. She said when Owen Nelson comes back in; she would appeal it and ask that findings of fact be established because when they say they have to add on because of zoning, it was not a good reason. She said he was going to block her solar access which was a state property right. She asked the Board to really look at it closely.

Present and sworn was Mr. Rick Martínez 725 Mesilla Road who alerted the Board to the wall in Case 07-81-B. He said they wanted to raise the wall to 60" high and most walls there were about 32" high. He felt their wall height would ruin the streetscape. He said his only concern was about the height of that wall.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. AN ORDINANCE CREATING A NEW SECTION 14-5.2 (A)(7) TO CLARIFY STAFF REVIEW AUTHORITY IN THE HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICTS.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that the packet had a draft of an ordinance and Ms. Jeannie Price was present. He explained that it had two proposed changes: use of a subcommittee and describing staff authority for approvals.

Mr. Newman said he had been in favor of the sub-committee approach and was rethinking it in light of staff review. He thought if the staff part were approved, there might be no need for a subcommittee.

He commented that, as the architect member of this Board he was concerned about giving staff a free hand in non-historic structures. (Paragraph 5).

He said he was most concerned about removing an entire district from the Board's purview.

Ms. Rios said she strongly opposed the sub-committee approach but did believe in streamlining and making it less cumbersome. She felt the subcommittee added a layer that was unnecessary. She felt each Board member had his or her own expertise and she thought they did a good job.

She expressed concern about some of the delegated power given to staff including alterations of new construction not publicly visible. If you have a house that has an architectural style, it was easy to go with another style if not visible. I have lots of confidence in this staff but who knows about staff that might be hired in the future.

She felt the Board was being very careful with walls because they could be very dominant. The style of the walls was important. Fenestration was important. Maybe the wall was not appropriate.

She felt the amendment was unclear about what constituted a minor change. She was also concerned about the replication of historic elements.

Mr. Frost said he agreed with what had been said. Under first section 2, the subcommittee would have authority over applications in the transition district and the second one said staff would have the authority.

Ms. Price pointed out those were two different bills. One was a combination of subcommittee and staff review. The other was just staff review.

Mr. Frost noted they all were working at other jobs and that would mean for some of members that it would be many hours of additional service.

He said the only thing he could see as a benefit with subcommittee was that many, many times, cases were brought before the Board where lighting fixtures, window designs, etc. were not in the packet. He thought those should never come to the Board until the packet was complete.

Mr. Barrow said the problem he had was that the forum they had here allowed public comment and both of these proposed changes would remove public comment. He felt the record reflected that often public comment had a dramatic effect on their decision. He also had minor concerns about language but was opposed to both of them as written on that one issue.

Chair Woods said she had been on both sides of this fence. She agreed they could not take the Transition District away but there were things they could give to staff such as signs. She thought they needed more definition on walls and thought they could come up with approved colors for stucco and trim. She also thought minor changes were okay.

She thought a subcommittee would just be another layer so she thought they should

come up with what was best for staff.

Ms. Price suggested a subcommittee to work with Mr. Rasch and her on those changes.

Chair Woods asked for volunteers. Mr. Newman, Ms. Rios and Mr. Frost volunteered. She said they would have something by next meeting.

Chair Woods thanked Ms. Price.

OLD BUSINESS TO REMAIN POSTPONED

None.

Chair Wood announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board had seven days to file the appeal. She suggested they contact staff for further directions.

Mr. Rasch added that anyone wishing to have a verbatim transcription would have to pay for the costs involved.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-05-138.** 716 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mr. David Birnbaum, agent for Mr. Douglas Stewart, proposes to amend a previous approval to a Non-Contributing building by extending a portal approximately 210 sq. ft. and opening alterations.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The building located at 716 E. Palace Ave is vernacular style and was built after 1945 according to the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The applicant believes construction occurred between 1950 and 1960 with later additions such as the south elevation greenhouse and the northwest carport. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"On July 26, 2005 the HDRB approved the remodeling of the building (please see

packet for the 2005 staff report) with the following conditions:

1. "That the 30' rule and 36" rule be observed for clerestory windows.
2. "That the garage door and gate be made of wood, stained brown, and the design is submitted to staff.
3. "That roof appurtenances not be visible.
4. "That windows have a 2 inch reveal.

"This application proposes amending the original approval with the following alterations:

1. "Extend the portal at the north east corner by approximately 210 sq. ft.. The portal footprint will become L-shaped. Additional windows will be constructed under the portal on the north elevation. Also proposed on the north elevation are three clerestory windows and a window that does not meet the 30-inch window rule.
2. "Two windows will be eliminated from the east elevation as well as sidelights next to the door under the portal. The single door under the portal will become French doors.
3. "One window will be added to the west elevation and the for lob window will be altered to a circular pattern.
4. "A bay window is proposed to replace three windows on the south elevation. The previously proposed clerestory windows have been reduced in size as per the 2005 HDRB approval. The parapet on the south elevation is been removed and the profile on the east and west elevations of the greenhouse will show a sloping parapet.

"All finishes will remain under the original approval. All walls and fences have been altered as occurred at the 2005 HDRB approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that all windows meet the 30 inch window rule, that the final exterior lighting is brought to staff for approval, and that the Board review the streetscape harmony regarding the bay window."

Present and sworn was Mr. David Birnbaum 7727 Old Santa Fe Trail, who said he was confused about the addition of the window on the west side.

Ms. Barrett pointed out the alteration.

Mr. Birnbaum said that was Philippe's [Register] work but he noticed some things that were different and they agreed. He asked if that window was the problem.

Ms. Barrett pointed it out.

Mr. Birnbaum agreed to use divided lights there.

Ms. Rios asked why they were proposing these changes.

Mr. Birnbaum said it was the same family and they would use it themselves. They planned to come here to live. He felt the changes would be much more in harmony with the neighborhood in Santa Fe style.

Mr. Newman felt this should be a contributing structure in the District and it was a shame to do this to it. He said the original design was preferred and the sloping parapet was out of character.

Mr. Birnbaum said he actually agreed.

Mr. Newman said the bay window was also not in keeping with the style of the rest of this design and, on the south elevation, this was where you really could see the bay window on the left but you could see the greenhouse there. You have the fake stucco on the greenhouse and it would be more in keeping with the rest of the massing, that these walls be thickened.

Chair Woods referred to the west elevation of proposed and noted the building had been raised considerably at the garage and over the window. She asked why they were raising it.

Mr. Birnbaum said he was under the impression that the highest parapet had been raised.

Chair Woods explained that it was over the garage and over the windows. It was clear on page 20.

Mr. Frost felt the 2005 design was neater and cleaner than the changes here. He said he would prefer the 2005.

Mr. Barrow agreed with Mr. Newman on the qualities of this building. He asked if

the entire building could be reconsidered.

Chair Woods said no.

Ms. Rios asked if this wasn't a new project with a new number.

Ms. Barrett said it was not. It was discussed at the time and the Board decided it was not contributing.

Mr. Birnbaum suggested there could be a compromise agreeable to his client. He thought the things mentioned would be okay to preserve on the west elevation and make the parapet level. He thought those walls could be thickened. There was plenty of room so the things of most concern could be preserved but allow the changes on the north and east. He said that would allow his clients the changes of use what was important to them. The bay window could go away.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if the south elevation met the glazing rule

Ms. Barrett thought it was discussed and decided that it did.

Chair Woods summarized the discussion: sloping parapet; keeping original west elevation. No bay window, adding massing to the greenhouse, all windows meet the three-foot rule and glazing meet the 30" rule except the greenhouse.

Mr. Birnbaum asked about the three-foot rule.

Chair Woods explained that windows had to be three feet from the corner on both sides.

Mr. Birnbaum said he thought the Board was suggesting the wall be 18" thick all the way back. He asked if that could an alternative to address the skimpiness.

Chair Woods said it would push the glazing rule.

Ms. Barrett asked the Board to look at page 22 in the packet where the greenhouse was discussed and the glazing was considered to meet it.

Chair Woods thought they would have difficulty changing the rule.

Ms. Rios asked about the stucco type.

Mr. Birnbaum said it would be the same as originally approved: Buckskin.

He asked if it was legitimate to force the change in the greenhouse since the only thing that changed was the parapet. He said the side walls were not up for changes.

Chair Woods said they could just say what was originally approved.

Ms. Rios moved for approval of Case #H 05-138 with the following conditions:

- 1. That the west elevation remain as previously submitted,**
- 2. That the sloping wall on the east elevation be straight;**
- 3. That the bay window be eliminated;**
- 4. That glazing on the greenhouse meet the three-foot rule;**
- 5. That all windows meet the 30" rule;**
- 6. That there be no rooftop appurtenances;**
- 7. Colors and stucco type be the same as previously approved.**

Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Newman who voted against.

- 2. Case #H-06-47. 727 Gregory. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Monica Montoya, agent for the Hart Family Partnership, proposes to amend a previous approval of a single-family residence by altering a carport to a garage.**

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"On June 26, 2006 the Historic Design Review Board conditionally approved the construction of an approximately 1,868 sq. ft. single-family residence (2,318 total square feet with portals and garage) to a height of 13'4" where the maximum allowable height is if 13'6". The following conditions were placed by the Board (taken directly from minutes available in your packet):

1. "That the stucco be cementitious Navajo White with a troweled texture:
2. "That the gate be lowered to 4 feet with iron or wooden garden style,
3. "That he canales be lined with tin,

4. "That they eliminate the garage door and make it a carport,
5. "That the windows be divided light in aluminum clad or wood.

"The applicant requests that the Board reconsider the condition placed on the original approval in regard to altering the garage to a carport. The applicant wishes to obtain approval for the originally proposed garage door for safety reasons.

"The construction of the building is in the process of completion and the applicant wishes to be address the garage issue since a year has passed on the original action. Details regarding the garage door were not clarified.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff finds that this application complies with section 14 – 5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards. If the Board approves this application then staff would recommend all material and finished details are brought to staff for approval."

Present and sworn was Ms. Monica Montoya, 1710 Paseo de Peralta, who thanked staff for assistance in processing this application. She said they were very helpful and professional.

She noted that the Board reviewed this case last year and one of conditions was rather than a garage to have a carport. She said they were here to ask the Board to reconsider that condition and allow the garage door. She said the primary reason was for safety, in light of the recent experience of a high incidence of crimes against women. Having a garage door would deter a perpetrator from hiding in the garage and harming a female in the building.

A second reason was that a garage door was more historically characteristic than carports. Being born and raised in Santa Fe she could testify that carports were not the preferred style of the residence but just for financial feasibility. Additionally, garages were sometimes enclosed and carports added to accommodate the family size.

She noted this property had a zero lot line wall so it looked more like a garage without a door as could be seen.

Lastly, they had no objections from any neighbors who agreed with the application.

Present and sworn was Mr. Rock Hart 9950 Florence, Albuquerque, who said he

retired from the Albuquerque Police Department as an officer for 20 years. He said this type of structure was just a magnet to anyone to come in and look for tool a magnet for a crook. It wasn't a matter of if but when.

Present and sworn was Ms. Sarah Rogers, 135 Escondido, who said it was a wonderful house and wonderful place to live but it was not a true carport that would be open on three sides. It was a place where someone could hide.

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

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Montoya for the details on the door.

Ms. Montoya said their original proposal was a wood door

Ms. Rogers handed out pictures.

Ms. Montoya they could entertain a change if the Board would like.

Mr. Newman thought she made a compelling case and it was made easier that the next door had a non-operable door.

Mr. Barrow said he was sympathetic with the case for safety and remembered when they first looked at it that there was a concern about safety. He thought the structures were too dense for the neighborhood and the carport gave some openness. That was the discussion. He lamented that they have to use architecture and bend their ordinance to solve a crime problem in Santa Fe.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 06-047 per staff recommendation and that finish details be brought to staff.

Ms. Rios seconded and asked that the door vary from what was next door.

Mr. Newman added the condition that the garage door must be wood.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H-07-15. 126 Quintana. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Veronica Angriman, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval for a Non-Contributing building with window alterations, construction of an approximately 166 sq. ft. pergola, and alterations to walls and pedestrian gates.**

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The approximately 1,451 SQ. ft. New Mexico vernacular style single-family residence located at 126 Quintana St was according to the 1985 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory constructed between 1933 and 1939. The building has gone through alterations which include replacement of most original windows with aluminum sliders (some dimensions have been altered) and a portal addition. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Westside Guadalupe Historic District.

"This case came before the HDRB at their February 13, 2007 hearing for the following:

"Enclosure of the approximately 87 sq. ft., non-historic portal at the northeast corner of the building. The addition was to have an approximately 2 foot shed roof overhang.

"Alter openings, including both dimension changes and replacement of all windows and doors, throughout the building.

"A portion of the existing building was to be raised to the maximum allowable height of 13'8" where the existing height is 11'8".

"A 2 foot deep pergola addition was also approved over the two doors on the non-publicly visible west elevation. The pergola was to be finished with natural stain and the building was to be re stuccoed with an El Rey brown color.

"Lastly proposed was a small courtyard wall to the maximum allowable height of 6 feet and a pedestrian gate along the southeast corner of the property. A coyote fence to the maximum allowable height was to be constructed along the property lines.

"The HDRB decided at that hearing to approve the remodeling of the building with the following conditions:

1. "Exterior light fixtures are to be brought to staff for approval;
2. "That wall and gate details are brought to staff for approval;
3. "That the coyote fence has irregular latilla ends;
4. "That the roof overhang material is wood and metal painted white.

"In June 2007 the applicant was red tagged by the Historic Inspector for doing work that was not approved by the Board. The applicant now asks to amend the original board approval with the following:

1. "Construct an approximately 166 sq. ft. pergola on the north elevation. The pergola will have wood posts, beams, and carved corbels and will be finished within natural stain.
2. "Add a new window opening on the west elevation to match previously approved material and window pattern.
3. "Alter one window location and pattern on the east elevation. A small window will also be added to this elevation.
4. "The east elevation overhang has been eliminated and the entry door has been inset slightly.
5. "There was an error in the first set of drawings regarding the parapet. The Board did approve a height increase to the maximum allowable height of 13' 8". However, the drawings indicate a 12 foot 58 inch parapet in front of the 13' 8" parapet which was incorrect.
6. "Construct a stuccoed wall to the maximum allowable height of 6 feet along the south property line where a coyote fence was previously approved. The wall will be stuccoed using a cementitious stucco to match the building.
7. "The location of the pedestrian gate at the southeast corner of the property has changed from facing south to facing east. The gate will be made of solid framing fence with stucco pilasters on each side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends approval of this application is it complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all H districts and Section 14-5.2(I) Westside Guadalupe Historic District design standards."

Chair Woods asked what solid framing fence was.

Ms. Barrett said they didn't have elevations for that.

Present and sworn was Mr. Veronica Angriman, 126 Quintana, who said she had nothing to add.

Ms. Rios asked her why she deviated from the original plans.

She explained that she was the owner and during the construction, her land was used by neighbors as recreation for their dogs. She said she could not stop them so instead of coyote, she wanted a stuccoed wall. Then in back, the pergola would be used as a car port. She thought the added fencing looked better. She said she was sorry she didn't follow what the Board approved.

Chair Woods said it was hard for the Board when an applicant did that and then had to come back.

She said she was also concerned about how she was stuccoing the wall.

Ms. Angriman described how she would stucco the wall.

Mr. Frost reminded her that she was talking about the dogs. He said the coyote was designed to keep dogs and animals out and he was not in favor of what she had done to this wall. Some of the other changes like the elevation of that window up to the middle of nowhere did nothing for it. He was not in favor of any of the changes she made.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ann Galloway, 149 Candelaria, Santa Fe, who said her property backed up to this property. She said she didn't know about this construction but knew it had been very quiet in the neighborhood until she took over the property. She said there were construction noises early morning and late at night.

Chair Woods said the Board needed to hear about style.

Ms. Galloway said her property was for sale and this place was a dump. There was garbage all over and it was a mess. It was a triplex. She said she had called on it before but it was still a mess. They curse and were loud way into the night. She said she had worked with the police to get homeless people out of the area. She has people living on the property who were disruptive.

Chair Woods said those things were not the Board's purview.

Ms. Galloway said the coyote fence that was approved was not there and all their garbage was exposed. She showed a picture of it in her camera. She said there was once a coyote fence that gave privacy to that property and she didn't understand why it was taken down but it exposed all the mess.

Present and sworn was Ms. Terri Ives 127 Quintana, who said the east window was built contrary to the original plans. It was quite unattractive and looked right down on her house.

She said she would also like to know how the wall would be constructed. She thought it was not on the applicant's property. And also had questions about what was going to be on the other side there.

Ms. Angriman said that next to the wall was an access easement. It was not coyote on the street and only one house had coyote. She said she installed the window higher because she wanted to see the sun through that window. She said she would like to have a gate there.

Mr. Barrow agreed with Chair Woods on the wall and with Mr. Frost on the window.

Ms. Ives said Ms. Angriman was incorrect about only one house having coyote. There were numerous houses there that had coyote fencing.

Chair Woods said they counted several coyote fences on the street.

Ms. Angriman wanted to show a picture that was on her computer.

Mr. Newman said the photograph with the high window may have inspired her to raise the window but there was very little in common between the two and that was what bothered him; that she moved a big pane window into the wall and not a narrow clerestory as had been approved.

Mr. Frost moved that Case #H 07-15 be denied and the building set back to the originally approved plans; that the wall be taken down and replaced with coyote; that the window be brought down, that overhangs be put back in and the pergola be removed. Mr. Barrow seconded the motion.

Chair Woods asked if staff could help her with findings of fact.

Mr. Newman commented on the motion that he shared the spirit in which it was made. He said he didn't object to the solid wall or the pergola or having no overhang over the front door; but he objected to how they were built. He said his only objection was the window but also was concerned that the wall would not last very long and would be a source of heartache.

Mr. Rasch said since it was non-contributing; the section on Contributing was not relevant. He said that in the Westside Guadalupe Historic District, the Board could go with streetscape harmony.

He read Section 14-5.2 (A) - harmony with the surrounding area.

Mr. Barrow noted that solid walls of masonry were usually built of block or adobe but this design was completely impossible to get that kind of appearance.

The motion to deny passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods told Ms. Angriman that if she wished to appeal the denial, she could appeal to the Governing Body.

4. **Case #H-07-30.** 530 S. Guadalupe. Outside District. Mark Hogan, agent for Barker Realty, proposes to replace a temporary non-historic wood and wire railing with a 3' 6" high steel upright and aircraft cable railing on a Landmark building.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The Spanish Pueblo revival style commercial building known as the Gross Kelly warehouse was built in 1913 according to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. Character defining elements include corner towers with arched parapets, canales in arched parapet openings, projecting viga beams, and docks on the east and west elevation covered by portals. The Official Map lists the building as landmark within the City of Santa Fe.

"In August 2004 the Board approved replacement of temporary wood stairs on the north elevation with concrete stairs and safety handrails.

"On March 27, 2007 an application proposing the replacement of a temporary, non-historic, wood and wire railing and wood steps on the west elevation with a 3'5" high steel railing to meet life safety codes was presented to the Board. The simple style railing was to be similar to the existing rail on the west elevation. The stairs were to be steel with checker plated treads and a metal hand safety rail. They were proposed to be located towards the northwest and southwest corners. The Board postponed this application in order to entertain other design options which could be more transparent such as vertical aircraft cable or simplify the steel rail. The Board also recommended

that the applicant consider not using the existing portal posts in the design.

"The applicant has considered different options in regards to creating a safety rail that will be less visually obtrusive to the landmark building. This application proposes using aircraft cable with vertical steel supports.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application as it complies with Section 14-5.2(C), Standards for the Treatment of Landmark Buildings."

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Hogan, 424 Acequia Madre who commented that this solution didn't completely satisfy anyone's concern. It was not part of the vocabulary of this building, but it did make the clear distinction between what was historic and what was not.

Mr. Barrow asked if on the drawing the exact diameter of the cable appeared to be larger than it actually was.

Mr. Hogan agreed and said it was less than 1/4". He said it would not show up as much as in the drawing.

Mr. Barrow asked if it was reversible without bothering the columns.

Mr. Hogan agreed.

Mr. Frost asked how far apart they were.

Mr. Hogan said they were 4" apart.

Mr. Newman commented there was a note [on the drawings] about 1/8" thickness and verticals at 1/4".

Mr. Hogan said he was not certain of the 1/8" in the note.

Mr. Barrow asked if the cable was reflective or dull.

Mr. Hogan said it comes like galvanized and he would like it not to be reflective.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow moved to approve Case #H 07-030 as submitted with the recommendation that finishes of all materials be dulled and be nonreflective. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. Case #H-07-38. 209 E. Santa Fe Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Wyndham Carlisle, agent for Thomas Parks, proposes to amend a previously approved case by adding dormer details to a Non-Contributing building.**

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

“The approximately 414 sq. ft. vernacular style building located at the rear of 209 East Santa Fe Avenue 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.

“The application to construct an approximately 535 sq. ft. pitched roof addition to the height of 15 feet 7 inches, where the maximum allowable height is 16 feet 8 inches, on the north elevation was approved at the April 10, 2007 hearing with the following conditions: that the roof deck and rails are omitted, that the parapet drops to meet the lower parapet in order to have one continuous line, that the range may be raised 13 feet not to exceed the maximum allowable height of 16 feet 8 inches, that the pitch continues approximately 5 feet 2 inches toward the south, over the flat portion, that the chimney on the flat section of the roof is brought down to normal height, that the vehicular gate is not approved, but rather a coyote fence is constructed as discussed at the meeting, and that all drawings are revised according to these conditions and brought back to staff for approval before a building permit application may be submitted.

“The applicant submitted revised drawings addressing the conditions and staff approved the changes. The applicant now comes before the Board to amend the application to include dormer windows on the pitched section of the building and to reduce the addition to a 490 sq. ft. which includes an alteration to the building footprint and roof line. The original approval was based on a zero lot line affidavit which was unable to be obtained. Therefore the building had to meet the zoning setback requirements resulting in an altered footprint and location of the addition.

“One small dormer with a four light window and one large dormer with two 4 light

windows are proposed for the west elevation. Window material and operation were not submitted.

Roofing material will be metal and colored either brown, sage green, or an earthy red.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that no skylights are publicly visible, that metal roof color is clarified, that the chimneys are redesigned as per the original Board approval, and that the Board examine the streetscape harmony. Otherwise this application complies with section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all H Districts and Section 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards."

Chair Woods asked if a roofing material sample was provided.

Ms. Barrett said no.

Chair Woods suggested that it be brought in for the Board to consider it.

Ms. Rios asked if the proposed building was next to a contributing structure.

Ms. Barrett agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if this proposal would negatively affect those buildings.

Ms. Barrett said the roof line could affect it.

Present and sworn was Mr. Wyndham Carlisle, 113 San Salvador, who said he supported the Board for recognizing the contributing status of the building on East Palace.

Mr. Carlisle said regarding the roofing material that Ms. Barrett asked and he told her it was pro panel. Regarding the dormers, he said he did submit photos. The photos showed that many others had dormers and other roof lines.

Chair Woods asked if this was the same pitch and roofline as the other.

Mr. Carlisle said no, that there was some differentiation among them.

Chair Woods said she saw most were low pitch. She asked if there were any houses

nearby that were pro panel.

Mr. Carlisle said no. He said there was a standing seam roof and the rest were shingle.

Mr. Newman commented that the Board had worked fairly hard with him to come up with a scheme the Board could accept because what was presented before was going to be denied. He felt they had just come full circle. They have a building with dormers and had more of a presence.

Mr. Newman asked about the zero lot line. He thought the Board shouldn't even look at such a project unless the documentation was in hand.

He thought the dormers had to go and the diagonal wall should be squared off.

Chair Woods said that on this west elevation, he showed a window she thought could not be built as drawn.

Mr. Carlisle said he had lowered the parapet to match the one on the left.

Mr. Newman said he objected to the fireplace chimneys the last time. They should be put on the ridge line so they don't have those chimneys sticking up there.

Ms. Rios asked for the height of the proposed building as opposed to what was approved.

Mr. Carlisle said they were the same, 16' 8" above finished grade.

Mr. Newman recalled that one of the strong arguments for allowing him to extend the length was for a loft for storage. He said that now he didn't see that loft or at least a way to get to it. It seemed he was also changing the use.

Mr. Carlisle explained that the loss of a zero lot line decreased the size and the space now had to be accessed by ladder. That was one reason they added the dormer because the width shrunk. The dormer added to the ceiling height.

Chair Woods said it now was no longer a loft but just for storage.

Mr. Carlisle said that "loft" was not a term used in architecture of Santa Fe.

Chair Woods asked if it was storage space there now.

Mr. Carlisle agreed and added that it would be open to the living room area.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-038 per staff recommendations with the following conditions:

- 1. That the metal roof color be clarified,**
- 2. That the roof details be brought to staff,**
- 3. That the dormers be eliminated;**
- 4. That the diagonal wall be squared off;**
- 5. That the chimney be moved to the middle of the north elevation,**
- 6. That the fireplace in the existing building be moved to the north wall so the chimney would be on the ridge line,**
- 7. That the pro-panel style be reviewed and approved by staff.**

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

STATUS REVIEW

- 1. Case #H-07-67.** 220 Closson. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Staff proposes an historic status review for a non-statused building.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

“The multi-residential buildings located at 220 Closson St consists of two structures and seven units. The front building, which contains units one through three and six was first constructed in 1942 and became a multi-residential building by the late 1940s according to research conducted for the 2006 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory. The directories suggest that in the 1950s the rear building units 4, 5, and 7, went by the address 220 ½ Closson St. Both buildings appear on the New Mexico Department of Transportation 1958 aerial photograph in the relative same footprint that is present today.

“The official map lists the front building, units one through three and six, as non-contributing and the rear building units 4, 5, and 7 as vernacular in style which include shed roofs concealed by a parapet, overhanging eaves, and exposed roof joists. Alterations include the replacement of windows with aluminum sliders in the 1980s. Some original doors and windows remain.

"The applicant has provided a notarized letter from the property owner (since 1959) in order to provide further information on the property. The letter states that the building was constructed from cement block and that the replacement of some exterior block walls and the enclosure of a storage area occurred after 1960. The letter continues to explained that the roof was also replaced. In the 1970s a 4 foot high yard wall was constructed in front of the building and attaches to the main structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"The staff recommends that 220 Closson St. Units 4, 5, and 7, are upgraded to contributing historic status based on age and retention of some original material and massing. However, if the new information provided indicates that the loss of historic material is too great then staff recommends that the building is upgraded from having no status to non-contributing status."

Mr. Newman asked if the massing itself was an important aspect.

Ms. Barrett said that most were replaced with non-historic material and the wall also blocked part of that view.

Mr. Newman asked if window and door openings had changed.

Ms. Barrett said she was not sure.

Ms. Rios asked if the footprint was the same.

Ms. Barrett agreed.

Present and sworn was Ms. Yolette Catanach who said the information was her father 's data and she was here to affirm it.

She said he purchased it in 1959 and it was unlivable. He rebuilt it gradually with recycled materials. He used what he could find. The four-foot wall was built by her brother in 1978 and 1979 and attached to the structure. There was a wall attached by the telephone pole. All of that was done in the late 1970s and gradually stuccoed.

She said the roof was totally replaced. As a child, they lived in Unit 6 when their house burned. She said Joe Barela was raised in Unit 1 and that was not there at all. She said Unit 7 on the far right was used for storage. It was not fully enclosed and her father stored materials there.

Mr. Newman asked staff if the consultant was provided with this affidavit.

Ms. Barrett said no because she had been out of state.

Ms. Rios asked if the footprint changed on #7.

Ms. Catanach agreed, saying that #7 was open.

Ms. Rios asked if there were new openings for windows and doors.

Ms. Catanach said the windows might have changed. She said her dad was 80 and had purchased this when he was 28. He had 14 kids so he just did this as he got the materials. That was basically what she remembered. She thought the window sizes stayed the same. The height on #7 went up when they built the roof.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman moved that Case #H 07-067 be approved per staff recommendations with the buildings being upgraded to Contributing status including the walls in front.

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

Ms. Rios clarified that simply because it was upgraded did not mean they could not do something to the building.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #H-07-75-A.** 335 W. Manhattan. Transition Historic District. Glenn Ellington, agent for Newby, Susan & Katrina Ellington, proposes an historic status review of a Contributing shed.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"335 West Manhattan Avenue is a single-family residence that was constructed at an unknown date between 1912 and 1930 in a vernacular style. A freestanding shed at the rear northwest corner was constructed at an unknown date as well. Both buildings are

listed as contributing to the Transition Historic District.

"An historic photograph of the property from the street reveals that the shed had an opening where there is presently a door. From the photograph it is difficult to determine if the entire south elevation was open, which would suggest that the shed might have functioned as a carport.

"Additionally, it appears that in addition on the east doubled the footprint and raised the height of the structure. Photographs of recent dates stamped on construction materials betray extensive remodeling.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff recommends and historic status downgrade from contributing to non-contributing due to significant non-historic character altering alterations."

Present and sworn was Mr. Glenn Ellington, who said the shed looked like it was once a carport. He said it was remodeled in 2001 and the wiring inside looked newer than that. It was very unsecured, open to the elements on the west side, very deteriorated with loose bat of insulation in the ceiling. He wanted to fix it up and make it useable.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 07-75-A, downgrading the shed to non-contributing. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H-07-75-B. 335 W. Manhattan. Transition Historic District. Glenn Ellington, agent for Newby, Susan & Katrina Ellington, proposes to remodel a Contributing building with replacement of non-historic windows, restoration of a front portal and hardscaping, replace fences with 34" high picket fences, and to remodel a free-standing shed.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"335 W. Manhattan Avenue is a single-family residence that was constructed at an unknown date between 1912 and 1930 in a vernacular style. A freestanding shed at the rear northwest corner was constructed at an unknown date as well. Both buildings are

listed as contributing to the Transition Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following nine items:

1. "As revealed from historic photographs, a front porch has been removed at an unknown date. There were several different porches of simple design. The porch will be restored to follow the dimensions of an existing concrete slab. There is a request to copy would work from a nearby Victorian porch in details, photographs are provided.
2. "The metal security front screen door will be removed. The wooden front door will be removed and replaced with a door of the same dimensions.
3. "Non-historic windows, including the large single pane windows on the east porch and doors will be removed and replaced with windows and doors of the same dimensions.
4. "The 3'6" high wooden slat fence along the front, the six-foot high red cedar fence along the west lot line, and the 5 foot high wire fence along the east lot line will be removed and replaced with a 34 inch high white picket fence. Roses and lilacs will be planted.
5. "The front concrete stoop will be restored. Brick sidewalks will be restored in paths from the street and from the driveway to the front door and around to the east porch. Five colors are available for choice.
6. "A mechanical system will be installed on the rear of the pitched roof and not visible from Manhattan. The cooling unit will be ground installed.
7. "The electric and phone service installations will be relocated away from the front of the structure.
8. "The shed windows, all trim, corrugated roof, and flagstones stoop will be repaired or replaced as necessary.
9. "The concrete pool will be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures and Section 14-5.2(G) Transition Historic

District design standards."

Chair Woods asked if it was visible from the public right of way.

Mr. Rasch said it was probably visible.

Chair Woods asked if the windows were divided light.

Mr. Rasch said he thought so.

Ms. Rios noted that the rooftop appurtenances were in violation if they could be seen from the public right of way.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if the 30" rule applied here.

Mr. Rasch said it did not here.

Mr. Ellington said they purchased this at the beginning of the year and it has been the home of the Santa Fe Film Festival. He said he and his wife were lawyers and wanted to have their offices there. It was leaking gas under the building. And all the utilities attached at the front. There have been at least six remodels over the 125 years. He briefly described them.

He said the entire footprint had been there since 1952 including the 2 concrete slabs and it had several porches but none currently.

He said they would like to replace the windows on the back. He briefly described the changes to each of the elevations.

Chair Woods asked about the front door design.

Mr. Ellington said there were several old ones that had oval windows and they wanted to take off the security gate that was put on in the 1970s.

Mr. Frost asked if he was doing mechanicals on the roof with the condenser on the ground.

Mr. Ellington explained that the pitched elevation was on west side so in the L where it came together no one would be able to see it. To put it in the attic would

require opening up the small window in the gable.

Mr. Frost asked if he had looked at the ductless system that required only a 3" hole in the wall.

Mr. Ellington said his concern was that all the ceilings were not original but all the walls were. He thought there might be another way to put it in the attic.

Mr. Newman said there could not be any mechanical on the roof.

Mr. Ellington explained the duct on the north elevation.

Mr. Rasch suggested he could increase the parapet there and not violate the status.

Mr. Newman felt this was a gem. He feared the Victorian details on the front were not appropriate for this simple little building and would be out of keeping. He recommended a simple post design.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow said he might be persuaded the applicant could select among historic porch styles

Ms. Rios called it a vernacular style. She thought they needed to discuss the door.

Mr. Newman said a simplified door in keeping with a simplified porch needed to be selected and submitted to staff. Maybe the two sheets of glass with rounded top or square top, wood panel door.

Mr. Ellington asked if they were suggesting no railings on the sides.

Mr. Newman said he wasn't. He said the deep overhanging eaves would support something more like Victorian.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-075-B per staff recommendations with the following conditions:

- 1. That the front porch be redesigned in a more simplified style more in keeping with photographs of what used to be on the building;**
- 2. That the air handling unit be located in the attic and a minimal amount of duct work be exposed with parapet be raised enough where the duct would sit to block its view;**

3. That the brick choices be reviewed with staff;
4. That a simpler front door be submitted to staff for its review;
5. That any changes to exterior lighting be submitted to staff.

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

2. Case #H-07-79. 240 Rodriguez. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Joe M. Ortega, agent/ owner, proposes to enclose an approximately 484 sq. ft. carport attached to a Non-Contributing building to match the existing height of approximately 9' 10".

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"The two-story single-family residence located at 240 Rodriguez was constructed in the 1960s and has received alterations which include a carport in 1989. The Official Map lists the building as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"This application proposes no alteration to the main residence.

"The applicant seeks approval to enclose the approximately 484 sq. ft. carport to create a garage. There will be no change in the existing height of 9'10". The new garage will have a wood pedestrian door with divided lights and one divided light window on the east elevation. The north elevation will include the vehicular door and the west elevation will have one divided light window. Material and finish details need to be clarified.

"The new garage will be stuccoed to match existing color of the main residence. The stucco type was not clarified.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval on the condition that window, door and garage door materials and finishes be clarified the night of the hearing or approved by staff. Otherwise this application complies with section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all H Districts and Section 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

She clarified that a variance would be needed from the Board of Adjustment, which must be approved prior to building permits.

Chair Woods asked if an approval by the Board provided leverage at the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Barrett explained it needed approval of both Boards regardless. It was a hard variance to achieve.

Present and sworn was Mr. Joe Ortega, 240 Rodriguez, who said there was too much dust out there. Vandalism and graffiti also so he wanted to enclose it to protect his vehicles.

Ms. Rios asked him to describe the type of door he would use and the window.

Mr. Ortega said he had not purchased anything but intended to purchase a 16' wood door and a Pella, wood clad window. The door would be a six light door with panels on the bottom.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Frost moved to approve Case #H 07-79 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

- 1. That the door finish, color of door and window be brought to staff;**
- 2. That the applicant get approval from the Board of Adjustment for enclosing the garage.**

Ms. Rios seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrow asked if the corners of the garage would match those of the house.

Mr. Ortega said they would.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #H-07-80. 610-A Canyon. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jim McGorty, agent for Ann Hosfeld, proposes to remove a non-historic 2' 6" high picket fence and hardscaping which encroaches onto public right-of-way and replace it with a 36" high stuccoed yard wall, re-stucco and re-paint a Contributing building.**

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"610-A Canyon Road was constructed by 1912 in a vernacular style. The building was originally a residential building but it has been converted to commercial use which remains today as a gallery. Alterations of an unknown date are present on the rear of the building and therefore do not impact the integrity of the building's streetscape. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The north elevation may be considered primary.

"At an unknown date before 1984, possibly in the 1960s, a white painted wooden picket fence was constructed along the front, north elevation of the building. The fence is readily visible in photographs on both the 1984 and 1993 Historic Cultural Property Inventories. At an unknown date after 1993, all but the western end of the fence was removed and replaced with river rock, a blue painted flat topped picket fence and the rounded cement steps. The rock and steps encroach into the right-of-way.

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

1. "The river rock, concrete steps, replacement of picket fence, and the last remaining section of the previous picket fence will be removed. A 36 inch high stuccoed adobe wall and flagstone covered cement steps will be constructed to not encroach on the right-of-way.
2. "The building front and the newly constructed wall will be stuccoed with cementitious 'Kokanee'.
3. "The doors and window trim will be repainted in a light blue Watergate to match an existing previous color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

Mr. Frost asked for the height of the existing portion of picket fence.

Mr. Rasch said it was 3'.

Ms. Rios asked for the proposed height of the wall.

Mr. Rasch said it would be 36" high.

Mr. Newman asked if that was measured from the sidewalk.

Mr. Rasch said it was from where it would hit the ground.

Present and sworn was Mr. Jim McGorty, 905 Camino Santander, who said he had nothing to add.

Ms. Rios asked if, since they have a little portion of original picket fence if he would consider keeping that

Mr. McGorty agreed.

Chair Woods asked if the proposed color was the same as this blue.

Mr. McGorty said no, that they found the original blue underneath.

Mr. Rasch showed a sample of the color.

Mr. Frost asked if the wall would go to the picket fence.

Mr. McGorty agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 07-80 per staff recommendations and the following conditions:

- 1. That the portion of the original picket fence remain and be white;**
- 2. That the wall be 36" high and turn slightly as it meets the fence.**
- 3. That the trim be painted Watergate blue.**

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

- 5. Case #H-07-82. 512 Alto #3. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Victor Johnson,**

agent for Tom Parker & Nina Houle, propose to remodel a Non-Contributing condominium unit including constructing a 162 sq. ft. deck, partially enclosing a two-story portal, replacing all windows and doors, and re-stuccoing.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"610 Alto Street #3 is one unit of a four unit two-story residential building that was constructed in 1988 in a simplified Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Westside Guadalupe Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to remodel the building with the following five items.

1. "All doors and windows will be removed and replaced with true divided light doors and windows, except the single light door on the rear. A new window opening will be made in the second-floor east elevation.
2. "The existing east elevation first-floor portal and second-floor deck will be remodeled. The second-floor deck will be moved over with a portal that includes square posts, carved corbels, and exposed header beam, and a parapet that will be lower than the existing adjacent parapet height.

"The existing second-floor wood deck will be removed and replaced with Trex simulated wood decking and the existing wood balcony will be removed and replaced with a redwood balustrade.

"Half of the first-floor portal will be infilled with a new entry door on the north elevation and a window on the east elevation. A small shielded porch light is proposed under the portal, but details were not provided.

3. "The triangular firewall parapet at the join between the two 2-story units will be removed and replaced with a stepped parapet at both ends of the east elevation.
4. "A 162 sq. ft. low deck will be constructed on the rear elevation at the ground floor height.
5. "The building will be we stuccoed in El Rey cementitious Buckskin.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Victor Johnson, P.O. Box 1866, Santa Fe.

Mr. Newman asked if on the detail of deck he would have the exposed end of the Trex showing. He said he was concerned about seeing the sawn edge of it.

Mr. Johnson said it cuts like wood, and would not be ragged. He was not sure a redwood edge would work. He thought it would fall off. He added that they could treat the end with acrylic paint.

Mr. Frost asked if when he redid the firewall parapet, he would not eliminate the firewall on the interior.

Mr. Johnson agreed.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-082 per staff recommendations and that efforts be taken to make the edge of the Trex match other parts of the woodwork. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. Case #H-07-84. 417 & 419 E. Palace. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Tommy Gardner & Darlene Streit, proposes to construct a 2,680 sq. ft. building to a height of 14' 4" or the maximum allowable height on a Significant and Contributing property.

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"417 and 419 E. Palace Ave are two adobe buildings that were constructed before 1928 in the Craftsman style and in 1951 in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style respectively. A freestanding garage was constructed in 1928 in a vernacular style. The buildings served as the Catholic Maternity Institute from the 1950s to the 1960s. At an unknown date during this period, perhaps of a non-historic date, a flat roof addition was constructed on the rear of 417. Three porches and two additions were removed from 419. The 417 building is listed as Significant and 419 building and the garage are listed as Contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"The applicant proposes to construct a 2,680 sq. ft. freestanding building on the southeast corner of the property next to 419. The building will be 14'4" high where the maximum allowable height is 18'10" as determined by a two-street frontage visual truncation linear calculation.

"The building was designed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style with wall dominated massing broken into blocks of varying heights. Portals will have wooden posts, carved corbels, and exposed headers. Casement windows and doors will have divided lights in vertical orientation.

"The building will be stuccoed with Suede and the trim color will be white. Rooftop mechanical equipment will be hidden behind the highest parapet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Mr. Barrow asked if, when you have a 3-D arrangement and new construction on Armijo, would it have an impact on the classification of the structure with respect to landscape.

Mr. Rasch clarified that Armijo was not primary and whether it blocked the main building too much was up to the Board. He said it would not block it entirely.

Present and sworn was Mr. Chris Purvis, 227 E. Palace Ave.

Ms. Rios asked if there were any walls proposed.

Mr. Purvis said there was no need for any wall requirement here. Part of the Master Plan was approved a couple of years ago and this space remained vacant. He explained that the dark rectangle on upper left was actually a portal.

Ms. Rios noted this was at 14' 4" and asked how high the one behind it was.

Mr. Purvis said it was substantially higher.

Ms. Rios asked if it would have rounded corners.

Mr. Purvis said it would, to be compatible with the building behind.

Ms. Rios asked about window reveal.

Mr. Purvis said it would be about 3".

Mr. Frost if exterior lighting was proposed.

Mr. Purvis said there would be none other than under portals. There was already some lighting on the site.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if it would have true divided lights.

Mr. Purvis said they would be simulated to look like true.

Mr. Newman moved to approve Case #H 07-084 per staff recommendations. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-07-81-A.** 526 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Suzy Tiffany, agent/owner, proposes an historic status review of a Non-Contributing residence.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"526 Calle Corvo is a single-family residential structure that was constructed in 1949 in a vernacular style with approximately 1200 sq. ft. An addition was constructed on the northwest corner to fill in the square footprint had an unknown date between 1958 and 1969. Another addition was constructed on the rear of the building at approximately 1973, at which time the iron front porch may have been constructed. The additions total approximately 600 sq. ft. Finally, in 2004, the current owner removed all of the historic wood windows and replaced them with noncompliant windows in the existing openings. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

"A 2007 inventory of the property suggests that the building should retain its non-contributing status due to substantial non-historic massing addition and alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

"Staff defers to the Board regarding the historic status of this non-contributing building which has relatively good integrity of the streetscape massing, additional non-historic massing on the rear, though alteration of opening dimensions, and replacement of all historic windows."

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

Mr. Newman asked if the removal of the original windows in 2004 was approved by the Board.

Mr. Rasch said no; that it was without permit and a stop order was issued.

Present and sworn was Ms. Suzy Tiffany, 526 Calle Corvo, who said she had nothing to add. She said she was doing an interior remodel and the architect never told her she had to have a permit. She said she wasn't trying to get away with anything. The gentleman across the way who opposed her said nothing; no one told her she had to have a permit. She said she kept it with the original openings and didn't think she was doing anything wrong. She added that the real estate agent didn't advise her either.

Chair Woods reminded the Board that all they were discussing now was the historic status.

Mr. Rasch said it was borderline for him but the inventory said non-contributing.

Mr. Frost asked when was applique applied.

Ms. Tiffany said she did not know.

Mr. Rasch explained that it has been a Contributing but the most recent inventory suggested non-Contributing.

Mr. Frost asked if there were any pictures of the original portal.

Mr. Rasch said there were none. He said the porch looked non-historic to him.

Mr. Barrow asked if they designated it as Contributing, wouldn't it be incumbent on the Board to define the parts that contributed. He said that, in addition, this streetscape had a character. And asked if this house was reflective of that character.

Mr. Rasch said he felt it was.

Mr. Frost asked if any window openings had changed.

Mr. Rasch said he didn't know but the east elevation windows didn't appear to have changed.

He referred to page 12 and noted that the French doors and side light were not traditional size but he didn't have any proof. He noted they were on the side, not really visible from the street.

Mr. Rasch identified the additions onto the structure, none of which affected the streetscape.

Chair Woods asked if additions exceeded 50%.

Mr. Rasch said they were exactly 50%.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Rasch said the inventory showed the original façade.

Mr. Newman noted it stopped at a point there and wondered if the parapet was rebuilt.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H 07-81-A upgrading this property to Contributing status for these reasons:

- 1. The openings remain the same.**
- 2. The house contributed to the neighborhood.**
- 3. The primary façade remained the same with the exception of a porch. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Case #H-07-81-B. 526 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Suzy Tiffany, agent/owner, proposes to remodel the building by replacing windows, spray-foam insulate the exterior, re-stucco, change the architectural character from Spanish Pueblo to Territorial, construct a portal, and replace a chain-link fence with a stuccoed yard wall. Exceptions may be required to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2,D,5), re-construct an addition on a primary elevation (Section 14-5.2,D,2,c), and to alter the architectural character (Section 14-5.2,D,1,b)

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"526 Calle Corvo is an approximately 1,800 square foot single-family residential structure that was constructed in 1949 with several non-historic additions. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District with a potential for historic status upgrade to contributing.

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

1. "All original wood windows have been removed and replaced with noncompliant windows that are not true divided light or simulated divided light and several panes exceed the 30 inch rule. None of the opening dimensions were altered. The Realtors Association checklist on the building does not indicate that the windows were in operable or in poor condition.
2. "The existing supposedly non-historic portal with iron supports and railings will be removed and replaced with a wooden portal and a similar simplified design, in the same location, and in similar dimensions.
3. "The windows and door on the east elevation will be installed with Territorial surrounds, including triangular pediments. Additionally, the wood paneling on the west elevation will be removed and the walls stuccoed.
4. "The exterior of the building will be foam insulated and re-stuccoed with a taupe color.
5. The 34 inch high chain-link fence and gate will be removed and replaced with a 60 inch high stuccoed yard wall, where the maximum allowable height is 52 inches. The Board may grant up to an additional 20% of the height for the wall to meet what is requested. An arched two leaf wooden pedestrian gate is proposed to be installed between flanking pilasters.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"This application complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards, except for the noncompliant windows with snap-in muntins and excessive glazing dimensions."

Mr. Rasch noted that Rick Martínez spoke at beginning of the meeting about this case.

Chair Woods said she did not agree with staff that it needed an exception. She asked if there were any photos of the original portal.

Mr. Rasch said there were none.

Mr. Frost asked if that applique was part of the primary façade.

Mr. Rasch said it was but that the applicant was proposing to foam insulate.

Ms. Tiffany said she needed clarification of what the status would mean to her.

Mr. Rasch said the change to Territorial would require an exception as well as the non-compliant windows.

Chair Woods agreed.

Ms. Tiffany said it appeared she could not go forward with any of these things.

Mr. Newman asked if the configuration of the replacement windows were three over one and if that was what the windows were like originally.

Ms. Tiffany said no. She said she would have preferred Pella windows. There were a lot of people who could have advised her and the whole thing would have cost her \$25,000 and she couldn't afford that. She said the realtor got her commission and didn't say anything to her and now she couldn't do any of these things.

Chair Woods said she was ultimately responsible. It was unfortunate. But it would not cost as much just to replace the sashes.

Mr. Rasch said with a true hardship, she could also consider some alterations to permanently affix muntins on the outside and inside.

Ms. Rios asked about the style of the windows.

Ms. Tiffany said they were basically a craftsman style.

Mr. Frost asked what was around the windows.

Ms. Tiffany said they were just roughed out. She said the former owners had ten kids and one could see where the frames were by the blue paint remaining.

Regarding the porch, she said she was not going to replace it but just put in new columns, simple posts.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Barrow moved to postpone Case #H 07-81-B to give the applicant time to consider options and come forward with exceptions. Mr. Frost seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Rios who voted against.

Chair Woods suggested the applicant work with staff so they could help guide her through what she must do. She thought she would need that guidance.

Ms. Tiffany agreed.

6. **Case #H-07-83.** 511 Douglas. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Wanda Kapp/Rachel Kelly, propose to remodel a Contributing building with restoration of a front portal and replace non-primary windows, construct a 1,969 sq. ft. free-standing residence to a height of 13' 4" or below the maximum allowable height, and to construct a yard wall and gate to 9' high to re-establish the streetscape where a Contributing building has been demolished. A height exception was requested for the re-established streetscape wall (Section 14-5.2.9).

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

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

"511 Douglas St was a group of the three residential structures that were constructed before 1950 in a vernacular style. A bathroom and the porch addition were constructed on the front, west elevation of unit B after 1958, as determined by examination of aerial photographs. Unit C was demolished without permission or a permit by the previous owner in 2005, after the Board requested repair of extensive structural damage. All three buildings are listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The east elevation is considered to be primary on units A and B, since this elevation holds the most historic character and has been altered the least.

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

1. "The two contributing buildings will be remodeled, submitted drawings are difficult

to read and the proposed letter does not itemize in each alteration. The Board should carefully itemize and discuss each alteration with the applicant.

"A 332 sq. ft. portal will be constructed on the rear, east elevation. If the Board agrees that the east elevation is primary, then no exception was requested to construct an addition on the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D., 2, c) and there are no details submitted regarding historic and non-historic square footage to determine if the addition exceeds the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2 (D, 2, d). The existing east elevation will have opening dimensions altered and existing historic windows removed. No exception has been requested to alter opening dimensions and to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2 (D., 5).

"The non-historic portal on the front, west elevation will be removed and replaced with a portal that is designed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. Two other alterations on the front elevation include removing the door and replacing it with a window of narrower height removing a spur wall, and perhaps altering the dimension of a window opening.

"Other slight changes include door and window changes that should be clarified as to primary elevations.

"Drawings also indicate that the parapet will be increased in several areas. It appears that the height will match existing height. The maximum allowable height of this building is 13'10" as determined by a linear calculation.

2. A 1,969 sq. ft. residential building will be constructed at the rear of the lot to a height of 13 feet 4 inches, where the maximum allowable height is 13'7" as determined by a radial calculation. The building is designed in the Spanish Pueblo revival style. It features wall dominated massing with various heights of room blocks. Portals will have wooden posts, carved corbels, and exposed header beam, and stuccoed parapets. The windows will have divided lights in a vertical orientation. The stucco color was not specified and trim color will be a sage green.
3. A 9 foot high stuccoed yard wall with two-leaf wooden gates will be constructed in the location of the previous unit C. This proposes to re-establish the streetscape. Unit C was probably approximately 9 feet high. The maximum allowable height for a streetscape yard wall is 13'10" as determined by a linear calculation. An exception is required to exceed the maximum allowable wall height of 6 feet (Section 14-5.2 (D, 9).

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

"Staff recommends approval of the request to construct the freestanding building, postponement of the remodel to the existing building unless the board has sufficient information along with the applicants clarifying testimony to grant the request, and denial of the wall height exception request unless the board needs to have a positive finding of fact to grant the exception to reestablish the streetscape with a tall yard wall. Otherwise, this application complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards."

Mr. Rasch pointed out that on the site visit, the Board did not agree on the primary elevation.

Present and previously sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, who said he was representing Rachel Kelly and found out yesterday that she was not going to buy the property. With that said, an effort to address the new building, ignore the part on the right side. It was a long low building behind the existing building. It has blank walls. He said he wasn't aware that the east elevation was primary. He added that he thought the windows would be Sage green.

Chair Woods asked if this was hypothetical. She suggested maybe they should look at it as a preliminary submittal where he would come back later with details.

Mr. Purvis agreed that was a good idea. The replacement of the Contributing building that was lost was very important.

Mr. Frost agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if they would then consider no detail.

Mr. Rasch explained that preliminary would approve height, location and massing but no detail.

Mr. Barrow felt they had enough for a preliminary approval.

Chair Woods suggested they consider the wall. She said this reminded her of Mr. Purvis' unique interpretation of adding on to a contributing structure.

Mr. Purvis said one could still make out the footprint of where that building was. He said it was a streetscape based on buildings being very close to the street. He said he was treating it as a ruin and trying to re-establish it. He admitted he was struggling to accomplish it.

Mr. Frost suggested they start with the nine foot wall.

Ms. Rios said he would have to comply with the height of an acceptable wall.

Mr. Purvis said that was correct but it was not all a tall wall. Most that you would observe would be within the height regulations.

Mr. Newman liked the idea of re-establishing the streetscape but was not convinced that creating a ruin was it. He felt it needed to be more straightforward: a low wall with a gate; not be quite so literal and not make it tall.

Mr. Purvis agreed it didn't need to be tall.

Mr. Newman said if it were lower, he would feel better about it.

Mr. Barrow said that all around the globe were various guidelines with historic preservation. Reconstructing ruins was not acceptable but having said that, the marking of a ruin or marking of a wall was acceptable.

He asked if the gate was a reference. He noted it was a total fabrication; non-functional. What reference. was there a history of having gates of this scale. He said he was kind of lost on this one.

Mr. Purvis said he was trying to make it look like the hand-made garage doors and that was the reference. The truth was it didn't need gates. It could exist at a much smaller scale and just mark where the building was.

Mr. Rasch recommended the yard wall not exceed on south line and not exceed 4' on the west.

Mr. Newman asked for the floor plan to clarify. He asked what the rainbow colors walls were.

Mr. Purvis said they were hedges.

Ms. Rios asked what the length of the 6' wall and 4' wall were.

Mr. Purvis said the opening with gates was 12' wide. On each side it was about 12' long on south and a little more than 3' and then the return was approx 6'.

Chair Woods said the next issue was the contributing building.

Mr. Rasch said they didn't have the detail.

Mr. Newman said they work was all on the other side except the portal. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Purvis said no. He said there was- a door and a moving of a window from the back side to the front side.

Chair Woods wanted a little more research into the history of the building.

Mr. Purvis said he had the HCPI but it didn't give enough information. He explained that they just connected two contributing buildings. He asked where the primary elevation was because that was important. They were moving a little quickly on it.

Mr. Purvis added that there was a roof on the back side and he proposed putting a portal on it. On the street-facing façade, they would just take off a 1970's portal and put on one that was more appropriate.

Mr. Purvis suggested if they were close, the Board could ask him to come back to address some things.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Newman asked if they were going to make some determination about primary façade.

Chair Woods said yes. She said she disagreed with Mr. Rasch but she didn't vote.

Ms. Rios asked him why he felt it was primary.

Mr. Rasch said it was because there were less alterations and more historic windows.

Mr. Newman moved to grant preliminary approval to Case #H 07-083 for the new building with regard to height and massing which although close, would not affect the status of the existing building; with regard to gates, to have a simpler, more straightforward approach that would create but remember the other building but would not create a ruin; that gates would be problematic; and regarding the existing

building, that the primary façade be the street-facing façade. Mr. Frost seconded the motion.

Mr. Newman said the wall was a good idea but not at that height.

Mr. Purvis said he understood.

Mr. Barrow said he had to abstain because he didn't go on the site visit.

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

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Chair Woods said she was tired of having to spend so much time on colors, trim, stucco.

Mr. Rasch said he thought the requirement of providing samples before getting on the agenda would help. He noted that exterior light fixtures were not in the ordinance.

Chair Woods asked if they could they entertain a motion.

Ms. Rios offered to draft a check list.

Chair Woods thought they could do this as a subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Frost moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Newman 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 10:15 p.m.

Approved by:

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer