



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 11/6/13 TIME 10:35a

SERVED BY Cynthia Vey

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 22, 2013
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-048 703 Alto Street  
Case #H-12-089B 613 W. San Francisco Street  
Case #H-13-089A 833 E. Palace Avenue  
Case #H-13-089B 833 E. Palace Avenue  
Case #H-13-090 1469 Canyon Road

Case #H-13-092 505 Apodaca Hill  
Case #H-13-093 644 W. San Francisco Street  
Case #H-13-058 451 Camino del Monte Sol  
Case #H-13-094A 1027 W. Houghton Street  
Case #H-13-094B 1027 W. Houghton Street

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

1. Case #H-12-028. 309 ½ Sanchez Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marc Pacheco, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct additions on a non-contributing residential building by increasing the height from approximately 11'0" to approximately 12' 6", where the maximum allowable height is 17' 3". (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-13-063B. 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jesse and Lisa Roach, agent/owners, propose to construct a 180 sq. ft. and a separate 280 sq. ft. addition, build a portal, replace windows and doors, and make other changes to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).
3. Case #H-13-080A. 777 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, requests a historic status review for a non-statused yardwall and proposes a project to build a 480 sq. ft. addition, construct a small portal and carport totaling 512 sq. ft., change a window into a door, replace a roof, restore a portal, stucco walls and make other changes to this contributing residence. An exception is requested to build on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to alter an opening on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2 (5)(a)(i)). (John Murphey).



Agenda DATE 10/25/13 TIME 3:51 pm

SERVED BY David Rasch

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2013 at 12:00 NOON**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL**

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 22, 2013
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-048 703 Alto Street  
Case #H-12-089 613 W. San Francisco Street  
Case #H-13-089A 833 E. Palace Avenue  
Case #H-13-089B 833 E. Palace Avenue  
Case #H-13-090 1469 Canyon Road

Case #H-13-092 505 Apodaca Hill  
Case #H-13-093 644 W. San Francisco Street  
Case #H-13-058 451 Camino del Monte Sol  
Case #H-13-094A 1027 W. Houghton Street  
Case #H-13-094B 1027 W. Houghton Street

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

1. Case #H-12-028, 309 ½ Sanchez Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marc Pacheco, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct additions on a non-contributing residential building by increasing the height from approximately 11'0" to approximately 12' 6", where the maximum allowable height is 17' 3". (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-13-063B, 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jesse and Lisa Roach, agent/owners, propose to construct a 180 sq. ft. and a separate 280 sq. ft. addition, build a portal, replace windows and doors, and make other changes to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).
3. Case #H-13-080A, 777 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, requests a historic status review for a non-statused yardwall and proposes a project to build a 480 sq. ft. addition, construct a small portal and carport totaling 512 sq. ft., change a window into a door, replace a roof, restore a portal, stucco walls and make other changes to this contributing residence. An exception is requested to build on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)). (John Murphey).

4. Case #H-13-080B. 777 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, proposes to demolish a non-historic addition, build a 518 sq. ft. garage and a 243 sq. ft. portal, replace windows and a door, and re-stucco a contributing blacksmith/workshop and demolish a non-contributing shed. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)). (John Murphey).
5. Case #H-13-096. 5 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. D Maahs Construction, agent for Lex Gillan and Cathy Nunnally, owners, proposes to install pedestrian entry gates, build a 6'0"-high coyote street fence at the maximum allowable streetscape height and a 5'5" or 6'0" high coyote perimeter fence, and reconstruct a stone wall at this significant residence. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-13-097. 539 B Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for Scott and Annie McManis, owners, proposes to replace all windows, install an ingress/egress window on the west elevation, install exterior insulation, and re-stucco with synthetic stucco on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-13-098. 325 Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc, agent for FEDCO LLC, owner, proposes to construct an ADA-compliant ramp with an iron railing on the west elevation of a non-contributing commercial structure. (David Rasch).

#### **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **J. ADJOURNMENT**

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

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

4. Case #H-13-080B. 777 Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, proposes to demolish a non-historic addition, build a 518 sq. ft. garage and a 243 sq. ft. portal, replace windows and a door, and re-stucco a contributing blacksmith/workshop and demolish a non-contributing shed. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)). (John Murphey).
5. Case #H-13-096. 5 Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. D Maahs Construction, agent for Lex Gillan and Cathy Nunnally, owners, proposes to install pedestrian entry gates, build a 6'0"-high coyote street fence at the maximum allowable streetscape height and a 5'5"-high coyote perimeter fence, and reconstruct a stone wall at this significant residence. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-13-097. 539 B Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for Scott and Annie McManis, owners, proposes to replace all windows, install an ingress/egress window on the street-facing south elevation, install exterior insulation, and re-stucco with synthetic stucco on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).
7. Case #H-13-098. 325 Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc, agent for FEDCO LLC, owner, proposes to construct an ADA-compliant ramp with an iron railing on the west elevation of a non-contributing commercial structure. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-13-099A. 511 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent for David Lamb, owner, requests an historic status designation for this non-statused garage. (John Murphey).
9. Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent, David Lamb, owner, proposes to remodel a non-statused garage by installing clear glass windows on the garage door, creating a new window opening, and changing the operation of an existing vehicular gate. (John Murphey).

#### **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

#### **J. ADJOURNMENT**

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

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

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
November 12, 2013

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION TAKEN</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE(S)</u></b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
Approval of Minutes – October 22, 2013	Approved as amended	2
Communications	None	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	2
Business from the Floor	None	2-3
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-12-028</u> 309½ Sanchez Street	Postponed	27
2. <u>Case #H-13-063</u> 1224½ Cerro Gordo Road	Approved with conditions	3-6
3. <u>Case #H-13-080A</u> 777 Acequia Madre	Approved partially with conditions	6-16
4. <u>Case #H-13-080B</u> 777 Acequia Madre	Approved with conditions	16-22
5. <u>Case #H-13-096</u> 5 Cerro Gordo Road	Approved with Option 2	22-24
6. <u>Case #H-13-097</u> 539B Hillside Avenue	Approved as submitted	24-26
7. <u>Case #H-13-098</u> 325 Paseo de Peralta	Approved as submitted	26-27
I. Matters from the Board	Comments	27-28
J. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:40 p.m.	28

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FÉ**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**

**November 12, 2013**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair  
Mr. Bonifacio Armijo  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair [excused]

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. John Murphey, Senior Historic Planner  
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Interim City Attorney  
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 22, 2013**

Mr. Rasch clarified that Case 4 was not postponed but item 1 in that case was postponed; adding the coyote was denied and the rest was approved.

**Mr. Armijo moved to approve the minutes of October 22, 2013 as amended. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

<b>Case #H-13-048</b>	<b>703 Alto Street</b>
<b>Case #H-13-058</b>	<b>451 Camino del Monte Sol</b>
<b>Case #H-12-089B</b>	<b>613 W. San Francisco Street</b>
<b>Case #H-13-092</b>	<b>505 Apodaca Hill</b>
<b>Case #H-13-093</b>	<b>644 W. San Francisco Street</b>
<b>Case #H-13-089A</b>	<b>833 E. Palace Avenue</b>
<b>Case #H-13-089B</b>	<b>833 E. Palace Avenue</b>
<b>Case #H-13-090</b>	<b>1469 Canyon Road</b>
<b>Case #H-13-094A</b>	<b>1027 W. Houghton Street</b>
<b>Case #H-13-094B</b>	<b>1027 W. Houghton Street</b>

**Mr. Katz moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for all of these cases. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**F. COMMUNICATIONS.**

There were no communications.

#### **G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

There was no business from the floor.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board could file the appeal to the Governing Body within fifteen days after the date the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for that case were approved by the Board.

#### **H. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Case #H-12-028.** 309 ½ Sanchez Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marc Pacheco, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct additions on a non-contributing residential building by increasing the height from approximately 11'0" to approximately 12' 6", where the maximum allowable height is 17" 3". (David Rasch).

The applicant for this case was not present.

**Mr. Katz moved to table this case to the end of the agenda. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

2. **Case #H-13-063B.** 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jesse and Lisa Roach, agent/owners, propose to construct a 180 sq. ft. and a separate 280 sq. ft. addition, build a portal, replace windows and doors, and make other changes to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Rasch began giving the staff report for this case until Mr. Murphey returned and finished it as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Located along a dirt drive paralleling South Armijo Lane, 1224 ½ is a large, single-story, multi-addition vernacular house taking on the appearance of the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The Board downgraded it to noncontributing status to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District at the July 23, 2013 hearing.

Mr. Murphey continued with the report.

#### **Project**

The applicant proposes a remodeling project, to include construction of additions and a portal, replacement of windows and doors, and other alterations.



## **Family Room**

To the southwest corner is proposed an approximately 280 sq. ft. addition, creating a family room. The addition will be at 11'-1" to 12'-1", depending on the grade. It will be higher than the adjacent mass but not taller than the highest point of the house. It will be fenestrated across the south elevation with a grouping of four fixed simulated divided light units. Like all new windows of the project, the cladding will be a teal colored vinyl, matching the home's existing windows. The windows will be shaded by a shallow (1'-5") unsupported overhang.

## **Master Bedroom**

At the northeast corner is planned an approximately 180 sq. ft. addition, providing a master bedroom. Its construction will require removing a non-historic shed. It will be at 11'-0" and blend in with the existing house. All three exposed elevations will be fenestrated with a mixture of casements and fixed units. The south elevation will be shaded with a shallow (1'-5") unsupported overhang.

Both additions will be stuccoed to match the house, a color coat that approximates El Rey's "Buckskin."

## **Portal**

A new portal is projected for the west elevation. Running along the entire façade, it will extend 10'-0" from the wall as a shed roof supported by wood posts. The roof will be made of rusty corrugated metal.

## **Other Alterations**

Aside from the effect of the additions, fenestration will be altered on the west elevation with two door openings becoming windows. A small window will be added to the current southeast bedroom when it is converted into a bathroom. The roof will be replaced in-kind as part of the project.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

## **Questions to Staff**

Ms. Mather asked about the simulated divided light windows.

Mr. Murphey explained the windows had a piece on the inside and a piece on the outside.

Ms. Mather asked if on the proposed east elevation for the window whether they were putting in divided light windows or just on the south elevation.

Mr. Murphey said some of the units were surviving from the original house. He understood all would be divided lights.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Ms. Lisa Roach, 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Mather asked about the windows being replaced or moved which ones would be divided and which ones would not.

Ms. Roach believed all the new windows would be. They would be casement windows on the west elevation.

Mr. Armijo asked what type of metal would be used on the shed roof.

Ms. Roach said it would be rustic corrugated metal. There were two existing portals on the west and they had that material now.

Mr. Boniface referred to page 14 (sheet A-4) and asked if the door in that elevation was a sliding door.

Ms. Roach said it was an existing French door.

Ms. Mather asked if the applicant would have anything on the rooftop or any exterior lights.

Present and sworn was Mr. Jesse Roach, 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road, who said there were no exterior lights planned and they would have none unless required by code.

Chair Woods said if they did they could show them to staff for approval.

Chair Woods pointed out the three pair of lights on the drawing and asked what that was.

Mr. Roach said that was overhang for solar gain.

Chair Woods asked how far out that went.

Mr. Roach said it was 18".

Mr. Boniface advised them to make it lower and longer to get that solar gain. They were trying to use the roof structure for that cantilever and he believed they would have to raise the windows or have a lower overhang.

Mr. Roach said it was to be used for passive solar.

Mr. Boniface agreed but was not sure that was the best way to situate it.

Chair Woods said it was just suggested it be closer to the windows.

#### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-13-063B with the conditions that no rooftop appurtenances be allowed, that any exterior lighting be reviewed by staff, and if there were changes for solar gain, the design be brought to staff for review and approval. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Roach said that due to budget considerations, they might do the project in two phases.

Mr. Rasch said the approval was good for three years.

- 3. Case #H-13-080A. 777 Acequia Madre.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, requests a historic status review for a non-statused yardwall and proposes a project to build a 480 sq. ft. addition, construct a small portal and carport totaling 512 sq. ft., change a window into a door, replace a roof, restore a portal, stucco walls and make other changes to this contributing residence. An exception is requested to build on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)) and to alter an opening on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2 (5)(a)(i)). (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Arranged along a bend of the Acequia Madre, the Benjamin B. and Josefita P. Alarid house is a one-story, rectangular plan, pitched roof adobe dwelling. Originally constructed in 1928, with a subsequent addition, it exhibits a modest expression of the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style across its front portal; otherwise it is vernacular in form and style. The house is contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The Board designated elevations #2 (east) and 3 (south) the primary facades at the September 24, 2013 hearing.

#### **Evaluation of Status: Yard Wall**

At the September hearing, the Board requested that the decorative yard wall be evaluated for status.

The home's front yard and part of the east side yard are framed by a low block wall topped with sections of wrought-iron panel and finial lamps on each post. The owner's son, Benjamin B. Alarid Jr., indicated his father built the wall, but was unclear when. A 1966 aerial, the first with any clarity, clearly shows a wall at the same alignment as the current structure, with the exception of the north section, which postdates the aerial. Additionally, strong shadow indicators suggest the existence of the wrought-iron panels and the lamps in 1966.

While more than 50 years old, and representing vernacular building traditions, the wall, in staff's opinion, does not help "to establish and maintain the character" of the historic district.

### **CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE**

A structure, located in an Historic District, approximately 50 years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of the Historic District. Although the structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations and/or historic architectural design qualities for which a District is significant. The structure may have had minor alterations, however, its integrity remains. (Ord. 2004-26 § 5)

Staff recommends designating the wall noncontributing.

### **Project**

The applicant requests review of a remodeling project, to include construction of additions and restoration of a portal, and other alterations.

### **East Elevation**

#### **Master Bedroom**

Proposed for the back of the east elevation is an approximately 480 sq. ft. addition to create a master bedroom. It will project from the house as a side-gable with a similar pitched roof. The windows will consist of, as of all new units of the project, metal-clad wood casements with turquoise color exterior. A triple set of existing wood casements windows, removed from another part of the house, will be placed on the addition's east elevation.

Its south, street-facing elevation will feature an approximately 240 sq. ft. shed-roof portal with a corner fireplace. The portal will be covered with a standing seam metal roof finished in a dull gray, a treatment that will be used throughout the project. Its wood members will be stained a natural dark brown color. Underneath the portal will be an undivided light patio door.

As an addition to a primary façade, the applicant has requested an exception under Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c).

**Small Portal**

Near the southeast corner, the applicant proposes to remove a set of triple casement windows (referenced above) and replace them with an undivided light patio door. The doors will be sheltered by a shallow, approximately 40 sq. ft. shed-roof portal with the same roofing material as the master bedroom portal.

The applicant has requested an exception to alter an opening on a primary façade under Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i).

**South Elevation****Front Portal**

The front portal will be partially reconstructed and restored to a more district-compliant style. At the September hearing, the owner's son couldn't recall if the portal parapet originally had a curved form. He did remember it once having projecting vigas. The applicant would like to approximate the assumed original appearance by re-introducing the vigas and removing the curve of the parapet. This would involve increasing the parapet height to the apex of the curve (approximately 4'-0") and having the straight parapet continue along the side elevations. While some of this reconstruction is conjectural, it introduces a treatment that is closer to the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style.

**North Elevation****Carport**

To the rear of the house is proposed a single-vehicle carport. Approximately 260 sq. ft., it will be constructed of wood and covered with a standing seam metal roof.

The fenestration of this elevation will change with windows being replaced, and in some instances deleted.

**West Elevation**

The original windows along the west elevation, which include grouped 3/1 double-hung units and steel casements, will be replaced with new casements. In one instance, at the northwest corner, the opening will be reduced in width. Otherwise, the original window dimensions will remain.

**Miscellaneous****Roof**

The original standing seam metal roof, which is deteriorated, will be replaced with a similar roof with a dull-gray finish.

**Stucco**

The entire house will be re-stuccoed with a cementitious application to match the existing color, which approximates El Rey's "Palomino" or "Sand."

### **Yard Wall**

The front yard wall will be re-stuccoed to match the house; the finial lamps will be removed as part of the process.

### **Exception Responses**

*An exception to place addition on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)).*

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

The character of the streetscape is not damaged because the addition is not on the street but is visible from the street. The addition is in the style of the main house which will enhance the streetscape rather than detract from it.

**Staff Response: The relative streetscape will not be affected by the addition. Staff agrees with response.**

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

Karen and Paul Galindo have purchased this house for the purpose of enhancing and updating it. The circulation patterns within the house are very insular and do not open to the existing courtyard which this addition will do.

**Staff Response: Staff does not believe the applicant has justified a hardship. Staff does not agree with response.**

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

This addition strengthens the unique character of the city because it allows us to add to this house in the only place an addition can be placed and in a way that opens on to the existing outdoor space.

**Staff Response: Staff agrees with response.**

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

The only existing courtyard space is on the east side of the existing building. Because of the configuration

of the land the addition can only be on the east side of the existing house. The fact that the addition has to be on the east side of the main house is particular to this property.

**Staff Response: Withstanding the perceived need for an addition, the house was habitable as-is under previous ownership. Staff does not agree with response.**

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

The condition and configuration of this building and the lot is not the doing of the Galindos. They have not created the conditions that we now seek to alter.

**Staff Response: Withstanding the perceived need for an addition, the house was habitable as-is under previous ownership. Staff does not agree with response.**

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

This addition is set back from the street and provides minimal impact to the streetscape. The impact of this addition is positive in nature and enhances the use and preservation of this historic structure.

**Staff Response: Staff agrees that the addition is set in the least intrusive location.**

**Staff believes the applicant has met three of the six exception responses.**

*An exception to alter an opening on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)).*

(i) Do not damage the character of the district.

The modified opening is not on the street facade, though it is visible from the street. The existing street façade of the main house will be restored to its historic appearance. The modification to the opening on the east facade is in character with the architecture of the district and with the style of the existing house and opens the living room of the house to an existing outdoor courtyard.

**Staff Response: The changed opening (and the addition) alter this primary façade, to the point that nearly half of the elevation is affected. This could affect the contributing status of the house, but not the “character of the district.” Staff agrees with response.**

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare; and

The modification to the opening is required to prevent hardship to the applicant because it allows this house to contain a circular pattern that accesses the existing outdoor space. This modification is necessary to make the outdoor area accessible and useable and without this door the outdoor space cannot be accessed or used.

**Staff Response: Staff does not agree with response, as the current window configuration does not cause a hardship.**

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

The proposed modification strengthens the unique character of the city by allowing this house to be occupied in a more open style. The house does not now open onto its existing outdoor space. The modification allows this house to embrace that outdoor space and open to it in a very graceful way. The window removed will be relocated to the master bedroom in the addition and will still be visible from the street.

**Staff Response: Staff agrees with response.**

***Staff believes the applicant has met two of the three exception responses.***

In sum, while staff believes the basic design of the addition is benign and placed at the least negative location, cumulatively it has the potential to adversely affect a primary façade and potentially the contributing status of the house.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends designating the yard wall noncontributing, finding it does not meet the criteria of a Contributing Structure. Staff defers to the Board on whether the application complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards and the standards of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Section 14-5.2 (E). Staff does not believe the applicant has met the requested exceptions to build an addition on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c)), or alter an opening on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)).

#### **Questions to Staff**

Mr. Boniface said in looking at the lovely photos of the house, he could see the viga ends so obviously there were projections from the portal but he didn't see the outline of the carport on that portal. He asked if it was staff's opinion that the shape was conjectural.

Mr. Murphey agreed it was conjectural. The viga ends could be brought back but he didn't know if they were squared or rounded.

Mr. Boniface asked if Mr. Murphey's opinion was that one or the other could be allowed without affecting the status but perhaps not both.

Mr. Murphey said if something more happened there would be very few openings in the center. The



most benign would be the addition to the rear.

Ms. Mather asked regarding the portal with the faux viga ends if it was known whether they were taking off the pitch behind the parapets. Mr. Murphey didn't know.

Ms. Mather was concerned because the parapet was not that harmonious.

Chair Woods asked if the roof was pitched. Mr. Murphey agreed.

Chair Woods asked how much of that portal was reconstruction as part of the façade.

Mr. Murphey suggested she could ask the architect about what would be replaced. The bones of the portal would remain.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn were Mr. Richard Martínez, P.O. Box 925, Ms. Karen Galindo and Mr. Paul Galindo, 1100 Governor Dempsey Drive.

Mr. Martínez said it was very hard to prove hardship in any case. The addition has to go on the east side of the house because the only available land was there. To the south and to the west was not possible for lack of space; to the north was the casita, garage and the workshop was in the back so it had to be on the east side. They would like to use the courtyard and make it available to the rooms of the house. That room behind the portal would be public and open to the courtyard. To get there now you have to go out in the front yard and around the side of the house.

The curve that exists now, in response to the pitch of portal behind it, is not in the style of putting vigas through it. They also intended to leave all the material from the front portal except some of the wood that is rotten and wrapped in cloth.

The houses in Santa Fé traditionally wrapped around an exterior space and allowed use of it. But this house is not very open to the outdoor space as it is now and the portal and addition would make that available.

#### Questions to Applicant

Ms. Mather asked if the viga ends were faux. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if he would remove the pitch of the porch. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if he could modify the curve on the front portal so it maintained the curve but not so overwhelming.

Mr. Martínez said it was possible and viga ends would help.

Ms. Mather commented that many houses on Acequia Madre had vigas that protruded - sometimes several feet. She was not personally inclined to put in faux viga ends.

She explained that her concern was around to east elevation. She agreed the only logical place for the master suite was on the east side but she was not convinced they should also remove the historic windows on the entire façade there. Otherwise it might not retain the contributing status and the Board would have to deny it.

Mr. Martínez understood. The window removed in the front would be used on the east elevation. It would still be on the same façade but further from the street. The addition covered some windows but the more traditional windows were in the front.

Ms. Mather asked if they were removing all the windows on the west side. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Walker asked what the cubicles were on the east side.

Mr. Martínez said it was a metal covering of the door. The doors would be divided light wood doors.

Ms. Mather asked if both of those were French doors.

Mr. Martínez said no - they were solid wood.

Ms. Mather read from the application, "undivided door under portal."

Mr. Martínez turned to his elevations and after a moment agreed they were undivided light doors under the portal.

Mr. Katz said he would rather they not change anything on the east side but understood the owners' concern. He wondered if it could be narrower without the portal and vestibule and that would save that nice window.

Mr. Martínez said it was not possible because the opening into the vestibule didn't correspond with the window. So it was not possible to combine the master bedroom with the rest of the house in that narrow space and it would be nice to open it up to the courtyard. The addition behind was really open and not a wall but a portal.

Mr. Boniface said it appeared it was one access to the courtyard off the vestibule and portal. Using French doors there would not be a hardship. You could still go into the rest of the house. Mr. Martínez agreed it was possible but you would have to go through the kitchen.

Chair Woods said she thought all exception criteria had to be met. Ms. Brennan agreed.

Chair Woods suggested if he left the size of the opening the same and used the overhang of the roof instead of another portal and overhang it would possibly have less impact.

Mr. Murphey agreed that keeping the opening the same and having no overhang would solve that.

Chair Woods said they had overhang above the original door.

Mr. Martínez didn't believe that was a code issue.

#### Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. Gary Grabowski, 36 Rancho Mañana, who said this was a very special property and deserves what the Galindos were doing to it. The landscaping will be special and it deserves what they are going to do to it and it would help the neighborhood

Present and sworn was Mr. Tom Davis 918D Acequia Madre, who said he came here to express that he loved Santa Fé and their neighborhood. He met with the Galindos and Mr. Martínez prior to this meeting to review their plans for this property. It has always seemed a little odd - the front façade was not in keeping with the historic styles with that pitched roof and round portal. It was like a sore thumb. So he came to express that he wholeheartedly supported what they proposed.

Present and sworn was Ms. Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601. This is a special house and the front façade is odd and overbearing but it was part of the historic structure. What concerned her was the obvious statement by staff that not all of the exception criteria were being met. It was not a hardship case as admitted by the applicant. There was very little testimony as to why it would be a hardship case. There was no added testimony as to why it would be a hardship case or that the other provisions would be met. She thought the Board was going down a slippery slope whether that was going to improve the house or not. That was a primary façade. It was designated as such before they purchased the house or when they were purchasing the house. A lot of people have to live and deal with and be creative around how they add on because of primary façades. So there needs to be consistency. She thought the record was clear that they did not meet the criteria for each exception. She thought there would be no problem with the door but if it was the same width as the existing window it would be better. It is clearly affecting the primary façade if wider with no justification for doing so.

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

Mr. Paul Galindo said it was their desire to maintain the historic fabric of that street and this city. But it was also their desire to be able to use the courtyard area. An entrance would be great and we want it to be livable for the next 50 years, not only for them but beyond their time there. One way was to increase the size of the master bedroom. All the rooms there were tiny and there was only one restroom there and I would take a lot to reorganize the entire inside, especially on a house that was built one part in one year and the next part in another year. They really wanted to maintain the historic integrity of the house.

They found out from the family that the wall was built for flood protection from the acequia.

Ms. Karen Galindo said they loved the neighborhood and this house. They felt like their house didn't quite fit the historic nature of the neighborhood. In restoring the house, they felt the street was a beautiful street. Part of their reason for choosing this area was for outdoor living and use of the courtyards. Her husband served on the historic board in Austin. Mr. Martinez did some research on the historic style of the area and the L shape was more consistent in style than the shotgun design they had now. They had become friends with Mr. Alarid - next door and he felt their proposal was better than its current state.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan to speak to the discretion of the Board.

Ms. Brennan said if the Board finds the applicant's responses were sufficient, it should state that in the record.

Mr. Katz said he was having trouble with the proposed changes. He was not in favor of any change to the front. He shared the feeling of people that it was odd and not traditional but it defined that house and he had grown to like it. Regarding the series of windows on the east side, the Board made that primary because it did express what the house was about. So he was distressed about turning one of them into a door whereas all they had to do was walk out the other door onto the deck and out and around. It was not such a big distance. He was very sympathetic to the desire to have the master bedroom suite. But he thought there was a way to design it so it could be further back. Last session, the Board approved an addition on a primary façade but that was because it was way back. He would prefer to send them back to rethink the master suite on the north and maybe where the carport was located.

Mr. Armijo said on the character of the house that this house was unique in itself and offered certain features than were getting changed considerably. He had a hard time accepting all the changes. A couple of weeks ago the Board designated the primary façade and this design goes against what the Board decided on the façade. The changes he saw here he was not sure were right for this structure.

Ms. Mather found it was a hardship not to be able to put the addition on that logical place for it. The Board's job was to make homes more livable. But making the window a door was not a hardship and she was concerned about the overhaul of the front portal which was not very sensitive to that.

Mr. Boniface agreed the front portal was obviously an issue. He complimented the applicant regarding the hidden gabled wall that was existing on the house and for trying to copy that on the master bedroom. It was an important element. He thought the front portal as it existed was in harmony with what existed and also in harmony with what they proposed for the master bedroom addition.

Chair Woods asked if there was a driveway on both sides. Mr. Martinez agreed.

Ms. Galindo said the driveway was very new on the west.

Chair Woods agreed with the Board members on the portal and hesitated to wrap it in a square parapet. She thought that would change how it feels. She would be okay with the same size door in the window opening and not having an overhang. And she was okay with having it on that façade although, ideally it would be pushed back but they couldn't get into the carport then. It seemed to be only place they could put an addition.

Ms. Walker asked about swapping the den in front for the master bedroom. That would put the den across from the dining and then take the existing bedroom in the rear and enlarge it and use some of the eliminated space of the third bedroom and bump out on the northeast corner. The fireplace could go somewhere else. That would bring up that primary façade and have a vestibule to get to the den.

Mr. Martínez said having the bedroom where the den was on the front façade would not appropriate for such a private space to be on the front façade.

#### Action of the Board

**Mr. Boniface moved in Case #H-13-080A to designate the yardwall as non-contributing; to deny the change to the existing shape of the parapet at the entry portal as the existing portal is in harmony with the rest of the structure and that the proposed change is conjectural; to accept the responses to the exceptions; to allow the bedroom suite onto the east addition; to deny removal of historic material at the new proposed east portal including denial of the portal itself because the combination of the changed opening plus the addition could adversely affect the primary façade and jeopardize the historic status of the building, itself. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.**

Ms. Walker summarized his motion.

**Mr. Murphey pointed out that there were still the carport and window to include and asked if that was accepted.**

**Mr. Boniface agreed.**

Mr. Murphey added that there were rotted beams and posts.

**Mr. Boniface said the motion would allow replacement of those rotted parts. The primary part of his motion was to deny changing the existing shape of the parapet or to wrap it but to allow change out of rotten materials - vigas, beams, and especially if the applicant brought that to staff.**

Ms. Walker asked what the east-west length of addition was.

Mr. Martínez said it was equal to the section of the courtyard - the width of courtyard to driveway.

Ms. Walker was a little confused about the drawings and Mr. Katz clarified the drawings for her.

Mr. Armijo reasoned that on the north elevation, the motion accepted it as drawn. Mr. Boniface agreed.

Mr. Armijo asked if it was okay to have those skylights exposed.

Mr. Murphey clarified that they were not open to a public way.

**The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Mr. Armijo voted against because the criteria were not all met.**

Ms. Brennan said the Board had the discretion to accept them even though staff did not.

- 4. Case #H-13-080B. 777 Acequia Madre.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Paul and Karen Galindo, owners, proposes to demolish a non-historic addition, build a 518 sq. ft. garage and a 243 sq. ft. portal, replace windows and a door, and re-stucco a contributing blacksmith/workshop and demolish a non-contributing shed. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)). (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Behind the main house at 777 Acequia Madre is a mostly adobe-constructed, rectangular plan building. It was here that Benjamin B. Alarid built a blacksmith shop where he and his sons forged metalwork, including ornamentation used on the property. It was additionally employed as a garage and repair shop. Built in c.1940, it has a vernacular design with only its rounded front parapet and stucco finish suggesting the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The Board designated elevation #3 (south) the primary façade at the September 24, 2013 hearing. Constructed at an unknown date, is a small building near the northwest corner of the property which originally functioned as a horse barn. The Board moved to maintain the noncontributing status of this shed at the same hearing.

#### **Project**

The applicant requests review of a remodeling project to convert the blacksmith/workshop into a guesthouse and to demolish the shed.

#### **BLACKSMITH/WORKSHOP**

##### **South Elevation**

The applicant proposes to remove the two windows and pedestrian door on the primary façade. The windows consist of 2/2 double-hung wood units set deep within the frame. The entry is a two-panel wood door with vintage hardware, also set deep within the casing. Both are probably original to the building. The only reason given for their replacement is that they are not weather proof. These will be replaced with units

of a similar design. The original wood plank vehicular doors will remain, but behind them a glass wall be installed.

An exception is requested to remove historic material on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)).

## **North Elevation**

### **Garage**

Across the north elevation is proposed a garage and a portal. The approximately 518 sq. ft. two-car garage will bump out from the northeast corner as a stuccoed box. It will open on the east with an overhead paneled door. A window and door will be located on the north elevation; another door on the south elevation. Like the main house, all new windows for the guesthouse will be metal-clad wood casements with turquoise color exterior.

### **Portal**

Attaching to the garage is an approximately 243 sq. ft. shed-roof portal. It will have a dull-gray standing seam metal roof supported by wood members stained dark brown.

### **Windows/Doors**

As part of the conversion, the north elevation will turn into an entry and living area for the guesthouse. This conversion will include adding new openings for grouped patio doors and removing all the existing 2/2 double-hung wood windows.

## **East Elevation**

As part of the upgrade, a non-historic shed attached to the east elevation will be removed.

## **West Elevation**

Two of the three original windows along the west elevation, which include three 2/2 double-hung wood windows, will be removed with their openings filled in.

## **Miscellaneous**

### **Parapets**

The roof at the north, west and east elevations will change from a shed to a flat roof. This will involve creating parapets set at the height of the existing south façade parapet.

### **Stucco**

The guesthouse will be re-stuccoed with a cementitious application to match the existing color, which approximates El Rey's "Buckskin."

### **Shed**

The applicant plans to demolish the small noncontributing shed at the northwest of the property.

### **Exception Responses**

*An exception to remove historic material on a primary façade (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)).*

(i) Do not damage the character of the district.

The replacements do not damage the character of the district because the replacements of the windows and the door will maintain the configurations of the existing windows and door. The primary façade which contains these features is far from the public way and the details are difficult to see.

**Staff Response: Staff agrees with statement.**

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

The replacements are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant because the existing windows and doors are not weatherproof. The existing garage doors will have new insulated walls or glass built behind the historic door panels but these windows and door are not constructed to allow that solution.

**Staff Response: As per HDRB practice, the applicant has not demonstrated that more than 30% of the window and door parts are deteriorated and beyond restoration. The applicant has neither demonstrated how the existing units could or could not be upgraded to improve insulation. Staff does not believe a hardship has been established.**

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

The proposed replacements strengthen the unique character of the city by allowing this garage to be modified into a guest house. This garage was built oversized because it was built to be an ironworker's workshop, the proposed conversion to a guest house allows this historic building to be maintained for residential, not commercial use.

**Staff Response: Staff agrees with response.**

*Staff believes the applicant has met two of the three exception responses.*

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the majority of the application, as it complies with Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards and the standards of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Section 14-5.2 (E). However, staff does not believe the applicant has met the exception to remove historic material on



a primary façade (Section 14-5.2 (D)(1)(a)).

#### Questions to Staff

Ms. Walker asked if before removing historic material it would be analyzed to make sure 30% was rotten.

Mr. Murphey said when they made the site visit, the doors and windows were not discussed.

Ms. Mather noticed in the staff report that the applicant had requested a "review" of the project. She asked if the Board was just reviewing this or acting on it.

Mr. Murphey said the Board would be voting on it.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Martínez said the review happened at the last meeting. This was part of the same application. The workshop to be converted into a casita had many structural problems and doors and windows in the middle are being replaced because they were not made to be used on a heated space and they were now making it a heated space. They were keeping the tile doors, the car doors. The windows and doors were deteriorated badly. It wasn't that they wanted to remove them but for heating they had to.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Boniface asked if on the existing south elevations the three doors would slide opposite each other. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Mr. Boniface asked if the left leaf would cover the window. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Mr. Boniface asked if the door would too.

Mr. Martínez said no. The rail in the picture showed where it would go.

Mr. Boniface didn't see what the French doors would look like in any of his drawings. He asked what the French doors and the side lights would look like.

Mr. Martínez said the windows were from top to bottom - all glass. He said he could make them wood but didn't consider them something that needed to be approved by the Board because they were behind the existing doors that he was keeping.

Mr. Boniface asked Ms. Brennan about it.

Ms. Brennan said considering that it would be open to see when the doors were opened that the Board

should consider what the design would be.

Mr. Katz figured they would be open most of the time.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Martinez if he would like to come back to show those drawings.

Mr. Martínez said he hoped not and if the Board included their design in the motion, he would accept that. The side lights would be the same as the doors - a metal system (colored) and be behind the existing wood doors.

Chair Woods said she would have to see them. She asked if they would be two French doors with divided lights with French doors on either side that did not open with true divided lights she could imagine what it would look like. But for what he was proposing she would need to see what they were talking about and what it would look like when open.

Mr. Martínez apologized that he didn't draw anything behind the doors.

#### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker asked if Mr. Martinez, when he came back, could demonstrated that more than 30% of the windows and doors were deteriorated beyond repair.

Mr. Martínez was sure that he could.

Mr. Katz said he was willing to make a motion for approval as long as the applicant was willing to have the doors and side lights as the Chair described. But he asked if Mr. Martínez would rather come back and show the Board an alternative to that.

Mr. Martínez asked if he meant the doors and side lights.

Mr. Katz agreed.

Mr. Martínez said he could come back or have staff approve them, unless the Board just wanted them to be wood metal clad true divided lights.

Chair Woods said okay - true divided lights as opposed to a more contemporary metal and glass design unit.

Chair Woods asked if he had considered using storm windows those beautiful, deep-set windows he wanted to replace.

Mr. Martínez considered storm windows to be more obtrusive.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Murphey about it.

Mr. Murphey said they had seen them in this district attached in the front for cold seasons and obviously custom built to the aperture.

Mr. Martínez said they were not salvageable.

Mr. Katz asked if the replacements would change the openings or depth of the windows.

Mr. Martínez said it was just the windows and doors themselves and they would look just as it is now.

Ms. Mather asked if they would have the same trim color (white).

Mr. Martínez said they would be turquoise to match the main house as well as the sliding doors.

Ms. Mather was feeling uncomfortable with all the changes on this building. Windows changed; colors changed - sliding doors would be open most of the time. It was getting overwhelming to her. She would favor postponing to see what those doors would look like.

Mr. Martínez said the proposed drawings would be what it looked like. The same sliding doors would be retained.

Ms. Mather understood but the Board didn't know what the windows and doors behind them would look like.

Chair Woods added that the Board didn't have to support that palette and didn't have to approve those windows. Or the applicant could come back later and say 30% was gone.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve the application in Case #H-13-080B with the conditions that the original historic windows in the center of the building shall not be replaced unless the applicant substantiated that 30% of the windows and doors were beyond repair; that the doors behind the doors shall be two French doors with a true-divided light pattern and that the original white and tan colors shall remain. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Katz asked for a friendly amendment that the sidelights also be true divided lights. Ms. Mather agreed it was friendly.**

**Ms. Mather added that the front door be the same size and style as existing and that the shed could be demolished.**

**The motion passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Walker who voted against.**

5. **Case #H-13-096. 5 Cerro Gordo Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. D Maahs Construction, agent for Lex Gillan and Cathy Nunnally, owners, proposes to install pedestrian entry gates, build a 6'0"-high coyote street fence at the maximum allowable streetscape height and a 5'5" or 6'0" high coyote perimeter fence, and reconstruct a stone wall at this significant residence. (John Murphey)

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Composed of a long, linear mass, ranging from one to two stories, the c. 1920, Spanish-Pueblo Revival Sheldon Parsons House is significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

### **Project**

The applicant requests review of a project to construct fences and install gates. The goal of the work is to provide security, as currently all the pedestrian entries to the property are unprotected.

### **Cerro Gordo Fence and Gate (A)**

Along the street is proposed a 6'-0"-high coyote fence, starting at a point where an existing fence is located and moving in a northwest direction. The fence meets the maximum allowable street height and will be built with irregular poles, in terms of height and shape. The fencing assembly will face toward the house. This is true for other coyote fences planned for the property.

A decorative, two-leaf wood gate will occupy a space where a pedestrian path meets the street. The entry will approximate a gate that stood at the same location during Parsons' ownership. The custom built gate will be based on a photograph of the historic entry pictured in a 1925 issue of *El Palacio*. This design will be used for other gates on the property.

### **Park Lot Gate (B)**

At the general parking area, the project will remove a small, one-panel wrought-iron gate and replace it with the same type of wood entry to be installed along Cerro Gordo Road.

### **East Wall Gate (C)**

Adjacent to the east wall of the southeast corner of the house, the applicant proposes to remove a non-compliant section of coyote fence and replace it with a 6'-0"-high section of latilla. This will frame a reproduction of a Sheldon Parsons-era wood gate attached to the building. Work will involve removing and

reconstructing a section of low masonry wall.

### **Montoya Circle Fence (D)**

Planned for the east property boundary along Montoya Circle is a coyote fence, its placement suggested as two options.

Option 1 would be at the property boundary at a height of 5'-5", the de facto maximum streetscape height.

Option 2 would be set back about 20'-0" from the property line at of 6'-0" high, the maximum underlying zoning height.

Staff does not recommend one option over the other.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

### **Questions to Staff**

There were no questions to staff.

### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Mr. Doug Maahs, 2008 Tecolote, who said on behalf of the owners that the primary reason for the fences was security. They were part-time residents and have a lot of exposed space - much of which was along Cerro Gordo Road. The gardens inside were quite beautiful and a partial fence from the garage to Cerro Gordo was stopped by a tree. So it would go forward and give it a nicer appearance at the same time.

### **Questions to Applicant**

There were no questions to the Applicant.

### **Public Comment**

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### **Action of the Board**

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-13-096 per staff recommendations. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and asked about the two options for fence location.**

Mr. Maahs said they wanted it at this height because sleeping quarters were on the second floor. It would give a little more privacy by having it set back and they would have fewer erosion problems.

Mr. Armijo asked about trash build up down there.

Mr. Maahs agreed there was and was why the upper fence location was preferred.

Mr. Armijo said he supported the option 2. Also there were escarpment issues.

Mr. Maahs agreed.

**Ms. Walker accepted option 2 as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

6. **Case #H-13-097. 539 B Hillside Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Harvey Monroe, agent for Scott and Annie McManis, owners, proposes to replace all windows, install an ingress/egress window on the west elevation, install exterior insulation, and re-stucco with synthetic stucco on a non-contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

539 B Hillside Avenue is a single family residence that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. All non-historic windows will be removed and replaced with divided-lite 3-over-1 and 2-over-2 units that will be clad in a "bronze" color. The 2-over-2 unit on the west elevation window will meet ingress/egress dimensions.
2. Exterior wall 2" deep insulation will be installed.
3. The building will be restuccoed with elastomeric material in "Pueblo".
4. The front steps will be reconstructed to meet building code dimensions.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

### Questions to Staff

There were no questions to staff.

### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Harvey Monroe, P.O. Box 1183, who said it was a fairly straightforward project. The most notable change was to the west elevation and the rest were hidden from view and that was replacement of a 2x2 slider with a slightly larger egress window with wood clad finish. The rest were similar or lesser sized. Changed lights were driven by the owner for more light into the home. Otherwise there were no changes.

### Questions of the Applicant

Mr. Armijo asked what the stack was on the elevation.

Mr. Monroe said it was a telephone pole and not part of the building.

Mr. Armijo said the application showed synthetic stucco and asked if it met historic requirements.

Mr. Rasch said the code only recognized that as an issue when it was replacement in-kind on the historic structures. This was not an adobe structure.

Mr. Monroe said it was partly adobe but they were foam insulating and the breathing was on the interior.

Mr. Armijo said he was not a fan of synthetic stucco.

Chair Woods asked if it was elastomeric or STO.

Mr. Monroe said STO was elastomeric.

### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### Action of the Board

**Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-13-097 to make a finding that the changes in the windows are harmonious with these buildings, preserve the historic character and conform to the standards in general and that conforming to the standards improves the look of the building and approve the application as submitted and recommended by staff. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it**

**passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 7. Case #H-13-098. 325 Paseo de Peralta.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance Inc, agent for FEDCO LLC, owner, proposes to construct an ADA-compliant ramp with an iron railing on the west elevation of a non-contributing commercial structure. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

325 Paseo de Peralta is a commercial building that was constructed in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century in the Territorial Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to construct an ADA-compliant ramp on the west side of the building. The ramp will be 59' long rising up from grade to the height of the west portal at the north end. It will be earth-tone painted concrete with a brick coping to match existing adjacent conditions. A simple metal rail will be installed on the ramp at 42" high and painted black to match existing adjacent conditions.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

#### **Questions to Staff**

There were no questions to Staff.

#### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fé Trail who said this building originally was built as a single tenant building. Since then the downstairs was cut into three portions for tenants. Once it was had the primary entrance on the west side and it now housed a financial management firm. Brick coping would match existing. They went over 30" with the west side ramp so they had to have a 42" rail with pipe rail at the handicap entrance and they had to have a rest stop to meet code.

#### **Questions to the Applicant**

Chair Woods asked if it was not on Paseo.

Mr. Enfield agreed. It was on the west side.



### Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### Action of the Board

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-098 as submitted and per staff recommendations. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

1. **Case #H-12-028. 309 ½ Sanchez Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Marc Pacheco, agent/owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct additions on a non-contributing residential building by increasing the height from approximately 11'0" to approximately 12' 6", where the maximum allowable height is 17' 3". (David Rasch).

**Mr. Katz moved to remove Case #H-12-028 from the table and postpone it to the next meeting. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

### **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Chair Woods said in the early 1990's when she was on the HDRB they didn't have a preservation ordinance. That ordinance was started when the owners of the Eldorado wanted to expand part of the Eldorado into San Francisco Plaza. The Board said no because it was a historic area. So it kicked off the preservation ordinance. Our plaza has status - historic status. Now the Board is asked to see if it could look into a historic designation for San Francisco Plaza.

Ms. Brennan was not sure the ordinance addressed that in the same way but she could research it. She asked if they were talking about a status review.

Chair Woods said she was talking about the plaza and not a specific building.

Ms. Brennan said the ordinance addressed structures. The Santa Fé Plaza was a national monument but not a historic structure in Santa Fé.

Chair Woods assumed there were historic plazas elsewhere but asked if Ms. Brennan was saying the ordinance didn't allow anything outside of a structure to be designated historic.

Ms. Brennan said there was the compound but it was not identified historic by the Governing Body. For an investigation, she wasn't sure it needed a motion but the Board could direct staff to investigate the status.

Mr. Armijo said there was a limited time to protect it.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The ordinance clearly states the Board must act within 65 days on demolition cases. At the last time, when the Board asked for confirmation on demolition it stopped the clock. They would have a hearing within the time line.

Mr. Armijo asked about all the mobile barbecues that were popping up and how the Board should treat them. He thought the trailers that were selling food and things had to meet certain criteria.

Mr. O'Reilly said they did have criteria but they were not structures so they were not part of the historic ordinance. That would require a change in the ordinance.

Chair Woods thought they had understood that with an electrical hook up it was considered a structure.

Mr. O'Reilly said he was not prepared to talk about the national building code. They didn't have permanent electric power and most were self-contained so they were not considered a structure. Members of the Governing Body have looked at it in the past and decided not to pursue them.

#### J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 pm.

Approved by:

  
Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer