



Agenda

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 26, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 26, 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: November 12, 2013

E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-063B 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road

Case #H-13-080A 777 Acequia Madre

Case #H-13-080B 777 Acequia Madre

Case #H-13-096

5 Cerro Gordo Road

Case #H-13-097

539 B Hillside Avenue

Case #H-13-098

325 Paseo de Peralta

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-13-095. 321, 325, 329 W. San Francisco Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates Architects, agent for Columbus Capital dba 1640 Hospital Dr., LLC, owners, proposes an historic status review of 329 W. San Francisco and 109 N. Guadalupe, to demolish non-contributing structures, and requests a preliminary hearing to construct approximately 11,000 sq. ft. in four structures with a potential height exception above the maximum allowable height of 20'4". (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-13-064A. 127 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, agent for Terri Ives, owner, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
4. Case #H-13-064B. 127 Quintana Street Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, , agent for Terri Ives, owner, proposes a remodeling project, to include reconstruction of a portal, replacement of windows and doors, and other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).

5. 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).
6. Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes to remodel a non-statused garage by replacing the vehicular entry door, creating a new window opening, and changing the operation of an vehicular gate. (John Murphey).
7. Case #H-12-100. 603 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond, agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct additions totaling 912.5 sq. ft. to match existing height, and replace all doors and windows, construct a 6' high fence and wall with pedestrian gate, and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
8. Case #H-13-101A. 862 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent, for Maïel Nanasi, owner, requests an historic status review and assignment of primary elevation(s) for a non-contributing garage. (John Murphey).
9. Case #H-13-101B. 862 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent for Maïel Nanasi, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing garage into a guesthouse by replacing a window and creating a door opening. (John Murphey).
10. Case #H-13-102A. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
11. Case #H-13-102B. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, proposes to create additions of approximately 847 sq. ft. increase parapet heights to approximately 18'7", below the highest point of the structure, replace windows and doors, re-stucco and make other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).
12. Case #H-13-103. 125 West Coronado Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Aaron Cordova, agent for Candice Johnson, proposes to construct additions totalling approximately 737 sq. ft. to match existing height, replace all doors and windows, increase yardwalls from 2' to 4' high and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (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.



Agenda CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
DATE 11.7.13 TIME 2:48pm
SERVED BY Carmella Vega
RECEIVED BY Carmelina Sparr

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, November 26, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, November 26, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 12, 2013

E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-12-028 309 ½ Sanchez Street
Case #H-13-063B 1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road
Case #H-13-080A 777 Acequia Madre
Case #H-13-080B 777 Acequia Madre

Case #H-13-096 5 Cerro Gordo Road
Case #H-13-097 539 B Hillside Avenue
Case #H-13-098 325 Paseo de Peralta

F. COMMUNICATIONS

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-13-095. 321, 325, 329 W. San Francisco Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates Architects, agent for Columbus Capital dba 1640 Hospital Dr., LLC, owners, proposes an historic status review of 329 W. San Francisco and 109 N. Guadalupe, to demolish non-contributing structures, and requests a preliminary hearing to construct approximately 11,000 sq. ft. in four structures with a potential height exception above the maximum allowable height of 20'11". (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-13-066. 537 Hillside Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. RM Sandrin, agent for Erica potter, owner, proposes to remove and reconstruct a historic garage at this contributing residence. An exception is requested to remove historic material (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)). (John Murphey).
3. Case #H-13-064A. 127 Quintana Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, agent for Terri Ives, owner, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
4. Case #H-13-064B. 127 Quintana Street Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, , agent for Terri Ives, owner, proposes a remodeling project, to include reconstruction of a portal, replacement of windows and doors, and other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).

5. Case #H-13-076A. DeFouri Street Bridge. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Totto, agent for City of Santa Fe, Public Works Department, requests an historic status review for a non-statused bridge. (John Murphey).
6. Case #H-13-076B. Defouri Street Bridge. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Richard Totto, agent for City of Santa Fe, Public Works Department, proposes to replace this non-statused bridge. (John Murphey).
7. 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).
8. Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes to remodel a non-statused garage by replacing the vehicular entry door, creating a new window opening, and changing the operation of an vehicular gate. (John Murphey).
9. Case #H-12-100. 603 Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond, agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct additions totaling 912.5 sq. ft. to match existing height, and replace all doors and windows, construct a 6' high fence and wall with pedestrian gate, and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).
10. Case #H-13-101A. 826 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent, for Maïel Nanasi, owner, requests an historic status review and assignment of primary elevation(s) for a non-contributing garage. (John Murphey).
11. Case #H-13-101B. 826 Don Cubero Avenue. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent for Maïel Nanasi, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing garage into a guesthouse by replacing a window and creating a door opening. (John Murphey).
12. Case #H-13-102A. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).
13. Case #H-13-102B. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, proposes to create additions of approximately 847 sq. ft. increase parapet heights to approximately 18'7", below the highest point of the structure, replace windows and doors, re-stucco and make other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).
14. Case #H-13-103. 125 West Coronado Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Aaron Cordova, agent for Candice Johnson, proposes to construct additions totalling approximately 737 sq. ft. to match existing height, replace all doors and windows, increase yardwalls from 2' to 4' high and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (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.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
November 26, 2013

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1-2
Approval of Minutes – November 12, 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. Case #H-12-028. 309 ½ Sanchez Street.	Approved as submitted	3-6
2. Case #H-13-095. 321, 325, 329 W. San Francisco Street	Postponed with directions	6-19
3. Case #H-13-064A. 127 Quintana Street.	Approved downgrade to non-contributing	19-22
4. Case #H-13-064B. 127 Quintana Street	Approved with conditions	22-24
5. Case #H-13-099A. 511 East Palace Avenue.	Approved as Contributing	39-40
6. Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue.	Approved with conditions	40-41
7. Case #H-13-100. 603 Garcia Street.	Approved with conditions	25-27
8. Case #H-13-101A. 862 Don Cubero Avenue.	Designated contributing	27-29
9. Case #H-13-101B. 862 Don Cubero Avenue.	Approved with conditions	29-32
10. Case #H-13-102A. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4.	Downgraded to non-contributing	32-33
11. Case#H-13-102B. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4.	Approved with conditions	33-35
12. Case #H-13-103. 125 West Coronado Street.	Approved with conditions	35-38
Matters from the Board	Comments	42
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:50 p.m.	42

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

November 26, 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. Edmund Boniface
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Bonifacio Armijo [excused]
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

Mr. Rasch noted that case 3 and case 4 were switched in the Board packet. And the caption on #7 should be changed from 12-100 to 13-100

Ms. Walker moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 12, 2013

There were no minutes to consider.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-13-063B	1224 ½ Cerro Gordo Road	Approved
Case #H-13-080A	777 Acequia Madre	Postponed
Case #H-13-080B	777 Acequia Madre	Postponed
Case #H-13-096	5 Cerro Gordo Road	Approved
Case #H-13-097	539 B Hillside Avenue	Approved
Case #H-13-098	325 Paseo de Peralta	Approved

Mr. Katz moved to postpone the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Case #H-13-080A and Case #H-13-080B and approve the rest as presented. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Rasch said the Governing Body had not yet approved next year's meeting calendar and would get it to the Board as soon as he could.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Present and sworn was Ms. Stefanie Beninato, 604½ Galisteo. She wanted to bring to the Board's attention some problems at 610 Galisteo. They were installing a gate on a primary wall that they claimed had administrative approval. She was concerned that the owner thought he had a permit for the gate on the

front façade. Mr. Murphey told her just now that there was no administrative approval and he would follow up on it.

At 610-B Galisteo, the north side was a primary façade and he decided to put 2½ feet of dirt to keep water off and the wall would get damaged. Her wall was not designed to be a retaining wall and was now flaking and falling apart. She was convinced it was water damage. And the historic adobe wall wasn't designed to take in that water. She watched what happened there and it needed follow up with that or require them to remove the dirt.

There was no other 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).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

309½ Sanchez Street is an accessory structure to a primary residence that was constructed between 1935 and 1940 in the Territorial Revival style. At an unknown date, the building was changed to Spanish-Pueblo Revival along with other alterations including changing windows and constructing a portal. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On February 26, 2013, the HDRB conditionally approved remodeling of the property including the construction of three additions at 11' high where the maximum allowable height is 17' 3".

Now, the applicant requests an amendment to the approval proposing that the additions be increased in height to 12' 6" high. The additions will be taller than the existing non-contributing structure, but the Santa Fé style room-block massing is enhanced by this change.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked if this was something that was already approved.

Mr. Rasch agreed. This was caught during an inspection.

Chair Woods asked then if they knowingly built it higher than allowed or something else.

Mr. Rasch deferred to the applicant.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Mark Pacheco who said he went a little higher than expected and it was not done intentionally. He said his purpose in going higher, not intentionally, was because his little home sat almost 16 inches lower than the two houses up front. Originally his ceilings were going to be much lower. He was doing the work himself. They had two roofs up there. Once he got to the parapet area, he realized that it was over what he planned. So it wasn't really intentional but once he got the two roofs there, he was up higher.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Katz asked what he would do if the Board told him he would have to lower it to the approved height.

Mr. Pacheco said he would pretty much have to cut the side roof off. It would take a lot. The two houses up in front were level with his home. It didn't look very odd or anything.

Mr. Katz asked if he could lower the parapet.

Mr. Pacheco said if he did that, then he would have only six to 8 inches for the parapet.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch about his comment that in a way it seemed like a happy accident that the massing still worked out in this case to the benefit of the overall appearance. Her question was when an applicant discovered that they had made an error like this, what the best course of action for them to take might be. Obviously they wouldn't want to wait until the inspector noticed it and caught their mistake. She asked if it wouldn't be best to call his office and explain what happened.

Mr. Rasch said staff often tell applicants that this Board has authority over the final design and once this Board approves them, the plans could not be changed. So the applicant should call staff immediately. It was much more costly once inspections were done.

Chair Woods noted this applicant was still considerably under the maximum height. Mr. Rasch agreed and added that it was not a contributing building.

Mr. Boniface said this was the third time in four meeting the Board had people coming and begging forgiveness for doing what the Board didn't approve for them to do. He asked Mr. Pacheco if he was a building contractor. .

Mr. Pacheco agreed and said he had built homes before.

Mr. Boniface questioned how this contractor could not do it deliberately if he looked at the drawings.

Mr. Pacheco said it wasn't deliberately done. The grade dropped down and sat right by the acequia. Without realizing it, the adobes went up a little bit higher than they thought.

Mr. Boniface asked if he had come before the HDRB in the past.

Mr. Pacheco said he had and got denied.

Mr. Boniface concluded that he was familiar with the historic code. In the future, the Board would keep an eagle eye on him.

Mr. Pacheco said he hoped the Board would do that.

Ms. Walker asked if when an applicant was going to be doing the construction of the project, staff asked them if they owned a tape measure.

Mr. Rasch said he didn't.

Chair Wood said that was facetious and not appropriate.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato said Mr. Boniface just said that repeatedly people were not following the Board's own approval of the plans. And as Ms. Walker pointed out, a measuring tape was essential to construction. Currently, the Board now required a parapet to be about 2½ feet high for fire protection reasons. He recalled she had to add on to hers for that reason.

In this total disregard for approved plans, the Board heard excuses over and over. It showed a total disregard for the Board.

Action of the Board

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-12-028 with a height increase to 12' 6". The motion died for lack of a second.

Chair Woods asked if there was another motion.

Ms. Mather thought if this had come to the Board and the applicant had asked for 12' 6" it would have been granted. That's why she made her motion.

Mr. Boniface said he want to include in a motion his displeasure with this but he would move for approval because it was four feet below the allowed height. He added that he was only doing so under duress.

Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-12-028 as submitted. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Walker who was opposed.

2. **Case #H-13-095. 321, 325, 329 W. San Francisco Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates Architects, agent for Columbus Capital d.b.a. 1640 Hospital Dr., LLC, owners, proposes an historic status review of 329 W. San Francisco and 109 N. Guadalupe, to demolish non-contributing structures, and requests a preliminary hearing to construct approximately 11,000 sq. ft. in four structures with a potential height exception above the maximum allowable height of 20'4". (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

San Francisco Plaza includes four structures on the corner of San Francisco Street and Guadalupe Street. Building addresses are as shown on the attached map.

321-323 San Francisco Street is a Spanish-Colonial or Spanish-Pueblo building that was constructed in the late 19th century and additions in the 1920s with a central courtyard design. It is listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. There are presently no requests for exterior alterations on this structure.

325 San Francisco Street is a Territorial building that was constructed before 1902 and additions between 1921-1930 and after 1945. It was downgraded to non-contributing due to non-historic alterations by the HDRB in 2012.

329 San Francisco Street (also referred to as 107 North Guadalupe Street) is a Territorial building that was constructed before 1902 and additions after 1945. It is listed as non-contributing due to non-historic alterations. A resurvey of the building was completed last week which recommends non-contributing historic status due to non-historic alterations including loss of historic material, an addition on the north, and opening dimension changes.

109 North Guadalupe Street (attached to rear of 329 San Francisco Street) is a vernacular structure that was originally constructed between 1930 and 1948 with a large addition to the south between 1960 and 1965. It is listed as non-contributing. A resurvey of the building was completed last week which recommends non-contributing historic status due to non-historic alterations including loss of historic material, an addition on the south, and opening dimension changes.

* The applicant proposes to remodel the property by demolishing the non-contributing structures and requests a preliminary review of proposed new structures with a potential request for a height exception. The applicant provided verified building heights and a topographic survey to show slope on the site. The maximum proposed height will exceed 25' and the maximum allowable height is 20' 4".

He referred to page 22 of the application packet that had a topographic representation of the site showing more than two feet change in grade and the Board has discretion to grant four additional height without requesting a height exception response. If the Board granted four feet, the maximum height would be 24' 4".

Mr. Rasch showed the layout of the buildings on the site map and identified each one of them. The significant building was 321- 323 San Francisco. 325 was what once a Contributing building but was downgraded last year. The status review was on 329 San Francisco and 109 N Guadalupe. He recommended first taking action of the historic status reviews.

The second part of this case was the applicant requesting permission to demolish all three buildings that were not designated significant.

Finally, the applicant was requesting for preliminary review of the new proposed drawings. He showed the floor plans and elevations and the Board could talk about specifics of the design. The preliminary view was intended to give the applicant advice on what the Board would like or not like in the proposal and what code issues there were.

Chair Woods understood the Board didn't have to vote on the preliminary review but could each comment on them.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The review was an informal review and the Chair could poll each Board member to give advice to the applicant...

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends retaining the non-contributing historic statuses for 329 West San Francisco and 109 North Guadalupe Streets, approval of the demolition request for the three non-contributing structures, and defers to the Board for guidance on the preliminary proposed structures which will need to comply with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D)(9) General design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District design standards.

Questions to Staff

Mr. Katz asked for the definition of Contributing to be read.

Mr. Rasch read the definition from chapter 14 under definitions.

Mr. Boniface understood it was a preliminary approval on the south elevation for construction and the Board could ask the applicant to come back later.

Mr. Rasch said it was what the Board felt did or did not meet code in the application.

Mr. Boniface clarified the code said regarding heights and slope that the "increase in height shall only be constructed only in stepbacks from the street." So he asked if they met the stepback requirements.

Mr. Rasch said in this instance, stepping back from the front was acceptable. He also believed that a portal structure in front on the ground provided that massing relief so that the second story would appear to be a step back.

Mr. Boniface understood there was no hard number for the step back. Disregarding the portal if it was a two-story building. Without a portal there would be no hard number to indicate what that step back had to be.

Mr. Rasch said the code said the increase in height shall be a step back.

Ms. Brennan agreed that there must be a step back for that second story.

Chair Woods believed there was an amount of setback required and asked if someone could look that up.

Mr. Boniface had one last question. According to the code, it said additions were permitted to the side from a primary façade if set back at least 10 feet and shall not exceed 50% of the footprint. The applicant was proposing to extend out ten feet but he asked if it also was the 50% rule.

Mr. Rasch said they had a series of structures on the site. He assumed there was a fire wall between to separate these two structures. But on a significant buildings, all elevations were primary so the setback rule did apply. As drawn, it did come proud of this east elevation of the significant structure. This, as drawn, would require an exception.

Mr. Boniface understood that with the firewall, the 50% rule would not apply.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It would only be considered an addition if it had a pass-through and then the 50% rule would apply.

Ms. Mather had two questions. One was about the streetscape on San Francisco Street. This part of it was a place that retained strong Spanish style up to the street. She was concerned that at least in preliminary plans that element would be radically altered. She asked what the code said about that. It deteriorated the original streetscape of that historic building.

Mr. Rasch said in the relevant demolition standards, the Board must determine if all three standards

were met to grant demolition. The second standard was whether the structure for which demolition was requested was an essential part of the unique street section or block front and whether the street section or block front would be re-established by the proposed structure. His advice to the Board was if they thought there was an essential street section here, the Board should define that so they would know in the proposal if it met that street section or not.

There were also BCD standards to meet which was an underlying zoning issue. The Attorney and he had looked at those standards they were similar to what the Board was saying. The BCD standard says the building shall be built to front property line. For this section of the BCD, it said buildings should be built to the front property line and if not, the front wall should still retain a massiveness OR the front yard had to be at least 80% paved for pedestrian use. He opined that a portal was typically paved for pedestrian use. So as designed, the application met the BCD standards but it pointed to that street zero lot line.

Ms. Brennan read some sections of the code noting that normally she wouldn't point to underlying zoning but here there were parts that spoke to defining streetscapes in the subdistricts of the BCD. In this subdistrict it said for this portion between Sandoval and San Francisco they shall be built to the property line and elsewhere should also be built to the property line but where a building was set back from the street right of way, a wall should be built at the property line unless thirty percent of the yard was designated for pedestrian use. She also said in the code it said that the design objectives for the individual town scape subdistricts shall be preserved while encouraging diversity of design in individual town scape districts. New development should be harmonious with the specific physical characteristics in developing a design - objectives were listed which, for the San Francisco subdistrict it was continuous street façades encouraging additional portals for pedestrian use and provide continuity of building mass with building to building height characteristics of existing buildings, encourage high walls to separate open or vacant areas from the public ROW and provide continuity of street façade and, except for the plaza and cathedral areas confine landscaping to interior patios or walled courtyards and emphasize verticality of façades on San Francisco Street.

So the underlying zoning in this area has defined some of those qualities the Board might also regard as essential.

Ms. Mather said her second question was about impact on the significant building. They were not making changes to the significant building but the other changes might have a significant negative impact.

Mr. Rasch agreed. He read in the next paragraph of the code that the status of significant structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration might cause an adjacent structure to lose its significant status the application may be denied.

Chair Woods asked that the Board talk about the status of both buildings first.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Wayne Lloyd, 100 North Guadalupe. He said he could see the Board put a

lot of careful thought into this application. Last time, the Board tabled the application with three requests - to measure the buildings which reduced the maximum height by 8" to 20' 4". The second request was to have a structural engineer look at the buildings. The report was in the packet. The engineer found joists would fail under a live load of snow. The third request was to request a status review by an independent consultant and that report was done by Ms. Gail Bechtol. Her report continues to list them as non-contributing. The windows and doors were constantly replaced during 20th century.

Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Walker said her inclination was to designate the building contributing, given the form to this corner, because there were other buildings nearby that mimic each other with this excessive brick coping and this corner was very distinctive. So she was not inclined to have it be non-contributing.

Mr. Lloyd countered that these two were already non-contributing.

Ms. Walker acknowledged that they were in the 1980's and 28 years later she thought it was contributing.

Mr. Lloyd said the report took that into account. All doors and windows were changed out. Ms. Bechtol followed the City's criteria.

Chair Woods asked, if a building maintained its massing and its walls and the openings have changed that the rest of the building had a significant coping, she had to assume that the Board had voted both ways on that. When openings had been changed to that extent she asked if that would always impact the building's status.

Mr. Rasch said as he read the contributing definition, the buildings were not unique. But the Board should determine if the alterations were minor or not. Back several years ago, the Board considered loss of material more important and today massing was more important.

In this case they had evidence that the primary elevations had loss of historic material and change of openings and the Board would have to consider that strongly.

Mr. Murphey said this was not his case. But generally, all historic buildings had certain components: footprint, form, fenestration, architectural detail. We have a photograph of this building from the early 20th century that showed considerable differences so in his opinion he thought it had gone through a lot of alteration but retained its form and function.

Mr. Katz asked, if the Thai Café were considered Contributing, if a second floor could be set back ten feet from the south façade...

Mr. Rasch said by code the Board could increase a height of a Contributing building with an additional story. However, the Board had never allowed that during the ten years he had worked here with the Board.

Mr. Katz said if the addition was to be ten feet back from the primary façade the Board could find that the characteristic of the streetscape was as Ms. Mather mentioned that it comes right up to the property line. It had a narrow sidewalk but wouldn't necessarily preclude them from leaving the façades of those two buildings as they were but building a second story back somewhat from it.

Mr. Rasch agreed. And if the Board made the south elevation primary, the second story addition would have to be ten feet back to avoid an exception.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Lloyd if he had anything to add.

Mr. Lloyd said there were two issues on status. Yes it was changed in the 1980's and they were already Non-Contributing but he didn't know if those changes came to the Board or not. But had that building been listed as Contributing, the changes that occurred then would have made it Non-Contributing under the standards he read. So it happened recently enough that the consultant could say they were Non-Contributing.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no other questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Chair Woods said they got some written comments about this case and cautioned the public that right now the Board was only considering historic status of these two buildings and asked speakers not to get into any other things.

Present and sworn was Mr. Steve Arias, 115 Circle Drive, who said his father many years ago in the 1950's sat where Board members were sitting now. Decisions were made then about keeping things the same in downtown Santa Fé and he asked his father why so many people were coming here and he said they could not build a fence around the town but they could keep it the way it was now. In the 1950's when Santa Fé High School was moved out of downtown to build Sweeney Convention Center after they took out an entire furniture store to build the Hilton Hotel. They decided to build Sweeney Convention Center at that time to bring people to the city and to develop Loretto Academy, the Inn at Loretto and then purchase Big Jo Hardware to build the Eldorado Hotel. Those decisions were all made by Santa Fé fathers to make the city more robust and to keep native Santa Fé people here. The Spanish Table was once the Silver Dollar Bar those families all went to Carlos Gilbert with his sister.

They wanted to make the downtown more robust. He thought this development intended to do that. The buildings there were deteriorated and needed to be replaced. They were ready to fall down. It would take a major investment to continue to have that type of architecture. He didn't think the Eldorado or Hilton took that away although he felt four stories was a bit much.

This historic character was still going to be there and this developer would maintain the place. It needed help. He appreciated the Board giving him time to express his thoughts.

Ms. Beninato [previously sworn] thought this complex was an example of what happens when doing things piecemeal. In doing that the owners had been allowed to take away historic material. However, the footprint and the massing and the coping were still original. It was significant with this row of buildings located to the street. And if demolished and allowed to be set back, the Board would be destroying the streetscape. The fire wall was just a supposition. The Board could be justified in changing them to Contributing and we don't even know if these doors and windows were approved by the Board or granted an exception. So changes were made and then the people could come in and second stories were allowed. She would urge the Board to reconsider their historic status and make them contributing

Present and sworn was Ms. Louise Spencer, 131 Duran Street, who said she lived in the neighborhood and walked by them several times each week. The Board's discussion about them hugging the street and that streetscape were the real character of that corner whether they were contributing or not. The character of the neighborhood was enhanced by them.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Costick, 329 West San Francisco who said he was speaking to property rights.

Chair Woods told him this public hearing was not about property rights but about historic status.

Mr. Costick, said regardless, the owners bought the property and they had a right to do with that property what they wished as non-conforming property. The Board wanted to change the rules. I had never been part of downtown Santa Fé for 35 years. He asked if they were willing to compensate the petitioners for the property they bought and owned. It did matter what they wanted to do with it. It was nonconforming when they bought it and was nonconforming now.

Mr. Costick said he owned the Thai Café. He knew the structural situation with it. Right now if someone wanted to upgrade it, there would be problems inside. It was not a safety hazard but it needed work to a point that doing it was cost prohibitive for anybody. A floor collapsed in the middle of the kitchen. There were four floors underneath it that they replaced. There was sand, plywood, etc. and all of it collapsed. He thought they needed to look at what was really going on with the buildings, the law and his land lord. He asked what the owners' rights were when they bought it as non-conforming. They should do whatever they wanted with their own property unless the Board was willing to compensate them for it.

Ms. Mather said there were three buildings - all separate structures. The fact that they were separate - and one structure was to replace them on the street would make it a monolithic structure.

She asked Mr. Lloyd about them not being structurally sound and asked for which building that was the case.

Mr. Lloyd said the letter addressed both structures. Specifically, the study was done on the Spanish Table only because they didn't want to put the ceiling in the Thai. Café. That roof would not meet today's code either way.

Ms. Mather asked if he meant each building.

Mr. Lloyd said they had not gotten to the monolithic building yet.

Mr. Lloyd said the City staff did a report and listed it as non-contributing and the Board asked for an independent review and it was done so the Board had at least two professionals that say they were non-contributing. It was hard to come up with a different approach, given those reviews.

Mr. Katz said there were two aspects of what the Board was doing. One was to determine if the buildings were contributing. And if the buildings were considered contributing, they were talking about what could be done to them. The other part though was that the standard for demolition was whether the structure was an essential part of a unique street section and whether that would be re-established.

He thought the façade on San Francisco and that corner were essential parts of the streetscape. That didn't mean they couldn't have a second story or couldn't clear out anything behind that front and totally rebuild. He felt that could be done either by saying it was contributing building or by saying this was an essential part of the streetscape and could not be changed. It would have to be maintained, and it was probably better to maintain the façade rather than to rebuild it. With the closeness to the street, the parapet and that aspect of it, he thought were essential. So he wasn't sure which way they should go.

Chair Woods said the motion had to be based on whether these buildings met the contributing criteria. Then the next step was to consider what would be done with them.

Mr. Katz noted the opinions the staff and the experts were for Non-Contributing.

Chair Woods asked for a motion on the Spanish Table status.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved to designate the Spanish Table building at 109 North Guadalupe as Non-Contributing. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods - 329 motion.

Mr. Katz moved to maintain the Non-Contributing status of the building at 329 W. San Francisco. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Walker who voted against.

Applicant's Presentation (on demolition)

Mr. Lloyd said there were three criteria for demolition. The board just made them Non-Contributing. The second was whether the structure was essential to the block front. So in demolition it was important to review what was being proposed. The third was the condition of the structure which was already reported.

Mr. Katz had a question for Ms. Brennan. He said if the Board decided it was not essential then it didn't matter what would replace it. But if the Board considered it essential, they would need to consider what was to be put in its place. He didn't feel what they were proposing did take its place. He asked what he should say - demolish it or go back and make the proposal work so it would reestablish the streetscape.

Ms. Brennan thought the Board could just say these were the elements the Board considered to be essential elements of the streetscape and then in the preliminary plan the Board could say what was proposed didn't replace that character because it doesn't come up to the property line. She thought defining the essential elements was the important factor when they were looking at any subsequent design, if they approved demolition.

Chair Woods believed there were two ways to read that part of the ordinance. She thought all the Board members were confused about what that ordinance was saying.

Ms. Brennan said there were two parts for that criteria - whether it was an essential portion and whether it would be replaced by the proposed structure. That, in some respects, was whether it has importance. Whether it was an essential element of the streetscape and whether it could be reestablished and then the state of repair. It was an issue for the Board to weigh.

Ms. Walker said this building was probably essential to the streetscape with its single story. So the Board would have to automatically say that two stories would not be possible if that had to be replaced. So it couldn't be demolished if it was an essential element. They were intertwined too much.

Ms. Brennan said the Board had the application for demolition in front of them. So if the Board found in favor of demolition and had described the streetscape adequately, then the Board would use that definition to review the preliminary plans that were submitted. If the Board believed it was essential that they had to be one-story, that would agree they couldn't be demolished because of the other standards, then the review of the plan in a preliminary manner the Board would say it had to reestablish that streetscape would require a single-story building.

Mr. Lloyd was sympathetic to the Board's position. The ordinance says two different things. If they were so unique, then they have to remain. He didn't see how they could have a unique character-designed element in a building that was not contributing.

Chair Woods disagreed. The massing was still there. It had retained that massing. These were three separate one-story structures and they all went to the property line which reflected also what the BCD talked about as important. Looking at what was being proposed that was a very different streetscape.

Mr. Lloyd said he had not had a chance to talk about what he was proposing now.

Chair Woods said no because they needed to talk about the demolition. She said that was what was confusing the Board as well because what was shown as proposed was so different.

Mr. Katz responded that first, the phraseology of the demolition standard said the essential part of the unique street section or block front was not part of the criteria for historic status consideration. It was a completely different standard. There could be a portion of a structure that was an essential part of a street section that couldn't be Contributing because it was not old enough. It was a completely different standard and initially when it was discussed, he had said it didn't make sense because it was a completely different standard.

Ms. Brennan read the definition of streetscape.

Ms. Mather said due to the historic nature of this very old part of Santa Fé that has maintained over hundreds of years actually this typical building pattern of abutting buildings having all the same level of façade up against the street. It was a unique part of Santa Fé and certainly a part of this particular streetscape. So to remove that, since they were not offering a plan that mimics that, the City would be losing structure or element of that streetscape. So she saw no way she could vote for demolition because it was not reestablishing that streetscape. Regardless of first or second stories, to her it was the way the buildings were defined along the street.

Mr. Lloyd asked if the Board was allowed to review what was proposed but without his opportunity to speak to that.

Chair Woods understood and didn't know how the Board could go from here. She asked if it was relevant to allow the applicant to talk about what he wanted to put there as part of the demolition consideration. She asked Ms. Brennan about that issue.

Ms. Brennan said the Board could consider it and might want to go into more detail later. But because of this discussion of whether this street section would be re-established by a proposed structure - there was a proposed structure was considered essential would be re-established. Perhaps the Board could look at the proposal and by looking at the proposal the Board could define what it considered to be those essential elements.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Lloyd to present.

Applicant's Presentation (on re-establishing the streetscape)

Mr. Lloyd said the first thing he did was to assume the two buildings were Non-Contributing and therefore he could remove them. He then immediately turned to those subdistrict standards for this area and tried to follow them as much as possible. The subdistrict urged a continuous street façade and encouraged the addition of portals for pedestrian use on the streets. The height of 24' 4" would be without

an exception if the Board granted the extra 4' for slope.

Wall heights would be increased to better shield the parking area to the north. Landscaping would be limited to the courtyards and not on the streetscape. Verticality was to be emphasized for this district and they had done that by the verticality of the portal. And by stepping back the second floor, they could meet the height requirements the Board could allow.

He added that he walked that street a lot because his office was just a block away. He didn't think anyone felt comfortable when encountering a person coming the other way because the sidewalk was only three feet wide. He thought it was important to widen the sidewalk for people to pass each other without waking in the street.

His elevations had a plain portal without corbels. It was stained wood so he was picking up very much on the character there with a continuous façade all around it and it would be five feet away from the significant building. He provided more description but not at the microphone so it was inaudible.

He pointed out that the whole point here was that there were no identifiable standards and this was preliminary, not final.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan whether the Board had jurisdiction over BCD subdistrict standards.

Ms. Brennan said both standards reinforced each other and the BCD standards still applied except when there was a conflict, the historic standards applied. The reason she pointed out the BCD standards was because there was a survey done and that talked about the specific qualities for this area. They were applicable although the HDRB decision would take precedence.

Chair Woods asked if she saw a conflict between what the subdistrict said about this area and the responsibility of the Board to maintain the streetscape.

Ms. Brennan said in this case she read what the underlying zoning district standards were because she felt they actually reflected some of what they saw on that street. But the Board's definition of streetscape was what controlled their decision. The Board was not basing its decision on BCD standards.

Mr. Lloyd shared a perspective section [attached as an exhibit] with a person standing on Water Street. What he wanted to describe were the portal columns on the corner and then a dashed line in green. He described it as a perspective. That would be the face of the existing buildings. So the portal columns would set at the curb and the proposed first section or cut through the wall was where they were proposing to set the building back so they would have a six foot portal. The parapet would be fairly seen with where the buildings were now. The six foot portal and the parapet would be within inches of where the building was now and then stepping the second floor back. It varied from 15 to 20 feet and the west side was about 12 feet. It showed that you would see just a little over four feet of the second floor from the opposite side of the street.

He said they could build to the green line or leave the wall at the green place and could go to 24' 4" and he pointed out the sight lines. So the second floor was set back to far that it was not a big factor. A lot of buildings in the area were both Territorial and Pueblo at the same time. He pointed out examples.

He tried to define architectural elements in the area and the street was very Territorial and Pueblo. The mix was there and he tried to pick up on that mix.

The other key element he called an iconic element was not addressed in the Code. Throughout town these iconic elements were used to add emphasis as in La Fonda. It seemed to go seven stories right on the corner. At Inn on the Alameda it was not just 2-3 feet. The one he liked best was the Gross-Kelly building that had nice little corners but those were not addressed in the ordinance anywhere. That corner element created that iconic element. People get as far as Il Vicino and say that was far as they wanted to go. So it would give an iconic element to the corner. The standards actually gave bonuses to residential downtown. He set it back 15 or 20 feet. There were already people that were interested in living in these. It was good for the core of Santa Fé.

Public comment.

Chair Woods noted they had three pages of written comments submitted [attached as exhibits].

She invited other public comments.

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said it was hard because they couldn't see this handout. She thought the Board should table this until they had a plan in front of them to determine if the proposed design replaced the streetscape. The standards for contributing and standards for BCD were different. We don't need for everything to look the same. There were no portals in this block and what was there was characteristic of construction at a certain time. So the elements might include a setback second story. It was part of the historic fabric of that era and she thought it should be maintained.

She said the Board was not being consistent. "Last week you totally ignored the staff report with 777. Consistency is really good because it protects you later on. We should not even be talking about demolition until you see what was actually going to happen. A portal doesn't make them more palatable. They want another four feet and don't need parking. There were many condos downtown that were all vacant. And we should be able to provide them parking."

Mr. Lloyd said regarding parking that commercial use was different from residential. They were not proposing to reduce parking.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch to read the written comments and he did.

He said the Board members each received a postcard that said the same thing.

Mr. Lloyd said in response to comments by Ms. Beninato that this was not a duplication of a plaza

portal. They were all over town. They were characteristic and part of the ordinance. More importantly, they kept the code requirements. On San Francisco he explained the slope. When he turned in the application, he thought it would take them to 24' 11". That only existed at the far west end. Working back to the east, that second story wasn't as high as the existing building. So it was a pie-shaped piece. The average increase over the entire length would be 2 feet. So it was a zero increase request at the east end. The tower was 26'.

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

Chair Woods polled the Board.

Mr. Katz said he would vote against demolition at this point because it was an essential element. He had no problem with the two story proposal.

He didn't think the design shown to the Board did preserve the essential part of the streetscape and he would have problems with building anything on the northeast corner. The rule was ten feet back from a significant building so it needed to be ten feet back from that part.

Ms. Walker said she would also vote against demolition. They couldn't encroach into the historic plaza. Sena Plaza was a fine location for them. It was possible to have some second story and still have preservation.

Mr. Boniface believed the structural engineer and staff that the applicant had met the criteria for demolition. However, in the testimony, board members and staff felt the south elevation was an essential part of the streetscape. That would lead him to vote in favor. He couldn't vote for it right now because he didn't know what would replace it and did feel it was an essential part of the streetscape. He would like to see what the applicant came back with. At the northeast corner of 323 he was concerned about the ten foot setback to know what was historic and what was not. He wanted to know what was different.

Ms. Mather agreed with her colleagues. This was the streetscape they were trying to preserve. This flat and humble character was essential to the streetscape on this street and was what the Board was trying to preserve. As much as she enjoyed walking under portals, this type was equally important and it must be maintained. What the applicant was proposing did not re-establish that.

Chair Woods said her concerns were that the streetscape merited preservation. It would be a significant change to read as one large building there. She was also concerned about any encroachments on the plaza. She was on the Board when the Eldorado was done. The Board decided this property was historic and preserving that plaza was very important. She was also concerned about having two-story façades right on that plaza. She proposed postponing demolition and give Mr. Lloyd the opportunity to take this feedback into consideration and have the case come back.

Mr. Lloyd said he needed to hear the Board define those key identifying features the Board wanted. He heard to stay at the sidewalk; stay at the building line.

Chair Woods said a feature was to stay and read as three distinct buildings; mixed feelings by the Board on the second story; protection of San Francisco Plaza - not to encroach; and the biggest was to look at the pictures that spoke clearly.

Mr. Lloyd understood that and clarified what his approach was. It sounded like there were three items.

Mr. Katz added the distinctive parapet on the Thai Café would be preserved.

Mr. Lloyd questioned that it was historic but acknowledged it was there.

Chair Woods said re-establishment was what they were looking for.

Mr. Katz asked if there was any time problem if they postponed it now.

Mr. Rasch said the Board had 65 days to act, starting when the application was received. October 22 started that clock.

Ms. Brennan advised that the applicant to consent to stopping the clock.

Mr. Lloyd said he could not be back until January 14. He agreed to leave the clock stopped.

Action of the Board

Mr. Katz moved to postpone Case #H-13-095 in order for the applicant to come back with a design of the replacement of the buildings that are there that would meet the essential elements that would be re-established as the Board discussed. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion.

Chair Woods said it would be good to identify those features that were essential in the motion.

Mr. Katz added to his motion the specific essential elements of reading as three separate buildings, the façades three feet from the street, narrow sidewalk, no portal, the parapet, no encroachment into the San Francisco Plaza, setback on the second floor.

Ms. Mather asked that the nature of the openings on the buildings being modest. Some of them had Territorial style, flat against the structure.

Mr. Katz hoped they would be spared large swinging glass doors.

Ms. Walker add to have a single level streetscape.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-13-064A. 127 Quintana Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, agent for Terri Ives, owner, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Situated near the end of the street, 127 Quintana is a one-story, roughly L-plan residence made of what is presumed to have been several once-independent structures. Built before 1950, and displaying a recent Spanish-Pueblo Revival remodeling, it is contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of the house's historic status designation.

Historical Overview

Before the late-19th century, San Francisco Street terminated at the west at what were then the tracks of the Denver Rio Grande Railroad. Beyond were a few adobe homes scattered among cornfields. By 1912, San Francisco Street had developed west to a point where it terminated at Arroyo de las Mascaras. Concentrated near the end of the street were a cluster of large L-plan adobe homes, associated with the Ortiz, Apodaca, Armijo and Montoya families.

Starting in the 1920s, north-south streets began to branch off San Francisco Street, including Quintana, which was developed on land once owned by Antonio J. Ortiz. An early 1930s city directory identifies several families living along the lane, including the eponymous Quintanas, as well as the Ortiz and Chávez families. By the late 1930s, there were ten families on the street, each owning their home.

The 1940 city directory includes the first listing for 127 Quintana Street, indicating it was owned Jose Gallegos, 35, a plasterer, and occupied by wife Josefita, 37, along with their six children, ranging from 14 to an infant named Junior. The Gallegos's lived in the house until the mid-1950s.

After their departure, the house went into rental use, with multiple tenants listed with different surnames. The listing of multiple tenants may indicate that the original house was subdivided or an additional living unit was constructed at some point in the 1950s.

A 1972 aerial suggests there were at least two distinct living units and a separate garage on the property. Artificially organizing these units, they would include Building #1, making up the foot of the "L" at the north; Building #2, located at the center; and Building #3, the garage, situated at the south end of the footprint. In the early 1980s, city directories began listing two addresses (127 and 127 ½) for the lot. The 1985 historic survey of the property notes that two buildings were joined together without providing a date for this

alteration.

By the early 1990s, when staff lived at the address, there were three units—including the conversion of the garage—under one roof. The windows were a mix of divided-light double-hung wood and steel casements at the time.

The former owner, before sale to the current applicant in 1997, documented in a letter changes made to the property, including interior restructuring and replacement of windows and doors.

And finally, in 2012-13, the current applicant, without HDRB review or a building permit, replaced most of the remaining windows, significantly changed openings, and removed and reconstructed the portal, among other alterations.

Evaluation of Historical Status

Before the most recent change, the property seems to have been of questionable historic integrity. Prior to 1963, the lot may have included several independent units that were joined together in the 1970s or '80s. This alteration changed the integrity of each unit in terms of massing, by joining each under a shared roof. With the subsequent removal of windows and modification of openings and the portal, the individual units, as well the combined building lost all integrity. The structure, while made of parts more than 50 years old, lacks historic integrity and, therefore does not contribute to the 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 downgrading the structure to noncontributing status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends downgrading the house to noncontributing status to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, finding it does not meet the definition of a Contributing Structure.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Walker said the zoning review sheet was in our packet and asked if they still needed that even though it was just done in November.

Mr. Murphey explained it was needed for the second case and it just got into the first case.

Chair Woods asked if he was saying this applicant prior to the work still did not have a contributing structure.

Mr. Murphey agreed. Sometime in the 1980's it became one contiguous foot print and lost a lot of integrity at that time due to massing changes.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Albert Moore, 1000 Cordova Place, Unit 72 who said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Action of the Board

Ms. Walker moved to approve the staff recommendations for Case #H-13-064A, downgrading the structure at 127 Quintana Street to non-contributing. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-13-064B. 127 Quintana Street** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Albert C. Moore, agent for Terri Ives, owner, proposes a remodeling project, to include reconstruction of a portal, replacement of windows and doors, and other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Situated near the end of the street, 127 Quintana is a one-story, roughly L-plan residence made of what is presumed to have been several once-independent structures. Built before 1950, and displaying a recent Spanish-Pueblo Revival remodeling, it is contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a retroactive review of a remodeling project.

Portal

At the time of the 1985 survey, and up until 2012, the portal consisted of a shallow structure covering a portion of the south and west elevations of the courtyard. Based on apparent deteriorated conditions, the applicant tore it down and replaced it with a new structure, extending it 20' to the south. (The new structure extends across an area where a separate portal was located on Building #2).

Constructed of wood, the roof changed from flat to a modest pitch roof made of standing seam metal. In terms of design and materials, the new portal conforms to district standards.

Windows/Doors/Openings

The applicant replaced most of the historic and non-historic windows as part of the remodeling. These included double-hung, divided-light wood windows as well as steel and aluminum-frame units. These were replaced with aluminum-clad, exterior white finish, true-divided light windows, often of the same operation and within the same opening.

Other openings, for example one on the northeast corner, were changed in dimension to hold larger units; some were converted into door openings. For example, along the west elevation, a small window was significantly enlarged to hold a new sliding patio door.

Doors were also replaced with aluminum white-clad units, and in one instance on the west elevation, widened to include sidelights.

The fenestration of the former garage at the south of the building was not modified as part of the project.

Miscellaneous

The entire house was re-stuccoed in a cementitious application that approximates El Rey's "Buckskin." Other work was accomplished in 2012-13, including alteration of interior space to improve the flow of the once separate units. Much of the work is not publicly visible.

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 Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Section 14-5.2 (I).

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked if there were specific individual changes that he found egregious.

Mr. Murphey said that was subjective but there were changes like the window to sliding patio door.

Ms. Mather said her question was if there were things done that the Board probably would not have approved had they come first to the Board.

Mr. Murphey said no.

Chair Woods doubted they would have approved some of the light patterns. She asked if this applicant had been before the Board before.

Mr. Murphey said at least once and that probably was in 2000.

Chair Woods surmised that she was aware of the process.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Moore (previously sworn) said he was brought in from an appeal by a friend of the owner to assist. In speaking with Mr. Murphey, he said the documentation should be in their hands. All he had done was to try to make sense of a very complex thing done without any professional assistance. From what he understood after interviewing her and her friend, the project started out as a stucco job only and escalated to all kinds of places here. There were a number of critical structural conditions with water penetration that led to severe deterioration of the portal and no professional advice but only the owner responding to contractors frantically.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Woods understood this started out without a permit.

Mr. Moore agreed.

Chair Woods pointed out that any re stucco had to come here to the Board too. She understood that obviously Mr. Moore was a third person so he had to bear the frustration of the Board. This project was completely inappropriate and the Board had the right to make her take out the patio door and put in a French door.

Mr. Moore said she understood that.

Chair Woods said she also knew better.

Mr. Moore agreed and for a professional to watch this stuff happen. He had faced these kinds of things elsewhere. After 40 years of practice it seemed silly that this would happen with all the information out there. She realized what she did and knew she was in deep trouble. He made it clear that for any change, she should seek professional help. He would struggle with this himself.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato repeated that this lack of getting a permit when they know the process shows great disrespect for the Board and especially without getting a permit. It would encourage more of it if the Board just said okay. She would suggest the Board require the patio door to be put back into a window. It might cost a few hundred dollars. Maybe that would convince her the Board was serious.

Ms. Walker said Ms. Beninato was right.

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

Action of the Board

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-13-064B to approve most of the application but require that the two sliding patio doors on the south and west elevations be removed and replaced with French doors with divided lights. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Boniface asked if he would clarify the number of lights in the French doors.

Mr. Katz agreed they should have the standard number of lights.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 5. 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).

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Boniface moved to table this case to the end of the agenda. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 6. Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes to remodel a non-statused garage by replacing the vehicular entry door, creating a new window opening, and changing the operation of a vehicular gate. (John Murphey).

The applicant was not present for this case.

Mr. Boniface moved to table this case to the end of the agenda. Ms. Mather seconded the

motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-13-100. 603 Garcia Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Tom Easterson-Bond, agent for Joe Nero, owner, proposes to construct additions totaling 912.5 sq. ft. to match existing height, and replace all doors and windows, construct a 6' high fence and wall with pedestrian gate, and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

603 Garcia Street is a single-family residential structure that was constructed in a vernacular manner at approximately 1930. The building had moderate alterations including the addition of two rooms at the rear and it appears that a brick coping on the parapets has been stuccoed over. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. Approximately 545 square feet of additions are proposed on the street-facing west elevation. The addition will match existing adjacent height with the two portals slightly lower.
2. All windows and doors will be removed and replaced. Windows will have divided lites in a historic 3-over-1 design. Opening locations and dimensions will be altered with doors added at bedrooms. Trim color will be "Turquoise".
3. The flat roof and canales will be replaced with the installation of downspouts. The existing rear addition pitched roof will be replaced in metal, but no description of type or color was submitted.
4. The building will be stuccoed with El Rey cementitious "Adobe".
5. Existing coyote fencing along the north lotline on Johnson Lane and west frontage on Garcia Street will be removed. A coyote fence with uneven latilla tops will be constructed at 4' high on the Johnson Lane side with stuccoed pilasters at irregular intervals. A coyote fence with uneven latilla tops will be constructed at 4' high behind the parking area on Garcia Street with a section that has a stuccoed wall flanking a pedestrian gate between stuccoed pilasters.

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. Easterson-Bond, 23A Arroyo Griego, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Woods asked about the pitched roof at back.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said it pointed away to the back and was not visible. He would gladly take recommendation from Board and could match the stucco if the Board wanted.

Chair Woods asked if he could change it back to a flat roof.

Mr. Easterson-Bond said they were matching what was there but if the Board wanted it flat, they were fine with doing that.

Chair Woods asked why he put downspouts right in front of the posts.

Mr. Easterson-Bond explained those were on the south side and very close to the coyote fence and in heavy rains they would go into the neighbor's property. The owners wanted to be good neighbors. The structure was within the proper set back but out of respect for neighbor wanted to prevent damage.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-13-100 with the condition that the pitched roof be converted to flat roof with parapet to match the rest of the building. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

8. **Case #H-13-101A. 862 Don Cubero Avenue.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent, for Maiel Nanasi, owner, requests an historic status review and assignment of primary elevation(s) for a non-contributing garage. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Situated at the end of a long concrete driveway, the rectangular plan, two-car garage is associated with the main house at 862 Don Cubero Avenue. Built before 1948, and displaying a Spanish-Pueblo Revival architectural treatment, it is noncontributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of the garage's historic status designation.

Historical Overview

The garage is associated with the main house, a Spanish-Pueblo Revival dwelling built in the early 1930s under the ownership of Harold Oakley Lamoreux, a Nebraska-born carpenter and contractor who owned the Lamoreux Carpenter Shop on Agua Fria Street. Lamoreux lived in the house with his wife, Elda, and his daughter, Geraldine. Based on its design and materials, the garage was most likely built during Lamoreux's ownership, which lasted through the mid-1940s.

The structure is constructed of hollow block tile with a wood interior wall dividing the stalls. The most character-defining features of the garage are the hinged wood doors. The bottom half are made of vertical pieces of wood; the top half holds a grouping of six-light wood-frame windows. The doors open by means of three steel strap hinges. An almost cornice-like drip edge crowns the opening. The north and west elevations are fenestrated with six-light wood hopper windows. With its parapets slightly curved at the corners, the structure is finished with cementitious stucco.

Evaluation of Historical Status

The garage represents the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style applied to an ancillary structure. In place by 1948, it is more than 50 years old, retains a high degree of integrity, and reveals "architectural design qualities" that contribute to the district and. Staff recommends designating the garage contributing, as it meets the definition of a Contributing Structure.

The vehicular entry at the east elevation presents the function and the highest architectural quality of the garage. Staff recommends designating this elevation (# 2) the primary façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends designating the garage contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District, finding it meets the definition of a Contributing Structure, and designating the east elevation (#2) the primary façade.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to staff.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Thomas Lechner, 24 Vista Grande who had no comment.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. Miguel Romero, 861 Don Cubero, who said he had lived there all of his life. The garage was historic. He was opposed to making it a guest house. He didn't have anything else to say.

Present and sworn was Ms. Karen Peterson, 866 Don Cubero who believed it was non-contributing but she had an aerial photograph from 1958. It showed her house that was built by the same owner in 1920. They were made of pen tile. This garage had always been there and had the old doors on it. She thought it should be Contributing. She thought every house on that street was historic. She provided a copy of the aerial photograph [attached as Exhibit].

Ms. Beninato said the garage was beautiful and worth preserving with contributing status.

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

Action of the Board

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-101A to designate the structure as Contributing with the east elevation as primary. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

9. **Case #H-13-101B. 862 Don Cubero Avenue.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Thomas E. Lechner, agent for Maiel Nanasi, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing garage into a guesthouse by replacing a window and creating a door opening. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Situated at the end of a long concrete driveway, the rectangular plan, two-car garage was associated with the main house at 862 Don Cubero Avenue. Built before 1948, and displaying a Spanish-Pueblo Revival

architectural treatment, it is noncontributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of a project to convert the garage into a guesthouse.

Vehicular Doors

The existing vehicular doors will remain but will be modified for the garage's reuse. The top portion will be cut horizontally so that the windows can swing open. The glazing, which may or not be original, will be removed and replaced with thermal glass. The lower portion will be weatherproofed and insulated on the interior, with the doors fixed so they are no longer operable. Otherwise, the doors will remain the same in design, material, and appearance. As such, the project does not require an exception to alter a primary façade.

Doors/Windows

The original wood hopper units on the north and west elevations will be replaced with aluminum-clad, simulated divided light windows with a white finish. One window on the west elevation will turn into a door with a 3'-0" unsupported wood overhang. Its opening width will be of the same as the former window. A new wood landing will sit at the foot of the door. Areas of window alteration will be re-stuccoed to match the existing color.

Miscellaneous

Four low skylights will be placed on the roof. These will not be visible from a public way.

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 Don Gaspar Area Historic District, Section 14-5.2 (H).

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked if the front elevation was the only one publicly visible.

Mr. Rasch said the west elevation also had some visibility.

Mr. Katz referred to the picture on page of the west façade. He asked if that wouldn't change.

Mr. Murphey said it would change because the window portion would swing out but from street one

wouldn't see any change.

Mr. Katz thought the public would still see those windows.

Mr. Lechner said those windows would be visible in the inside of the space. There was a partition between the two garage doors and the windows were operable to allow circulation.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Lechner made no presentation.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions to the Applicant.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. Henry Adams, 862 Don Cubero and current tenant, who said most of what he wanted to say was that the term "guest house" was used. This was not to be a guest house but a rental unit. The landlord told him they intended to rent it to someone else.

Chair Woods that was not appropriate for us but there were places to go in the city.

Ms. Brennan said there were requirements for guest houses and other requirements for rental units. Those questions should be addressed to the Land Use Department.

Mr. Murphey said in his communications with the applicant the term used was guest house.

Ms. Beninato said the owner was in Wisconsin but the way it was being designed it should be approved because it was keeping the appearance as a garage. Her concern was about off-street parking for it.

Mr. Miguel Romero said he too was very concerned with off-street parking.

Chair Woods explained that parking was not under the Board's purview. They would need to discuss those concerns with the City.

Mr. Romero asked about the owners who were living there.

Chair Woods advised him to talk with Mr. Oreille at the Land Use Department at the City.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ian Mack, 862 Don Cubero and wife of the man who just spoke, who said regarding the features that the owners were going to split the yard in half and build a fence. But she saw in the plans no indication of that.

Chair Woods said that would have to come back to the Board for approval to build a fence and the Board would let Mr. Lechner know that.

Ms. Mack thanked her.

Mr. Murphey clarified that it might not need to come back to the Board but would have to come back to the Historic Preservation Department to get approval.

Mr. Lechner said that was new information he wasn't aware of.

Chair Woods noted this had been labeled as a guest house on the agenda but evidently was not being used as a guest house. She said it had to be appropriately labeled at the City.

Ms. Brennan clarified that there were different standards for a second rental unit so that would have to be cleared up with Land Use.

Chair Woods asked if the Board should postpone it.

Ms. Brennan said the Board could vote on it.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-13-101B as submitted. Ms. Mather seconded the motion. .

Chair Woods asked about exterior lighting and rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Boniface amended his motion to add the conditions that there would be no rooftop appurtenances and that any exterior lighting be submitted to staff for review and approval. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

10. Case #H-13-102A. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, requests an historic status review to downgrade a contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Located at the rear of the Hacienda del Sol Condominiums, Unit #4 is a roughly 911 sq. ft., two-story, L-

plan structure. Constructed at an unknown date, and thought to have been originally a garage, the building was converted into a loft-like dwelling in the c.1980s. Its style is indeterminate. The residence is designated contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of the structure's historic status designation.

Historical Overview

Little is known about the origin of the building. During a 1984 survey, the surveyor noted it had originally been a garage that was reconstructed into a dwelling, concluding that it was "virtually a completely new building." As observed today, the modifications included creating several non-district compliant glass-block openings.

Evaluation of Historical Status

The dwelling represents a c. 1980's conversion of an ancillary structure into a dwelling. Its style is indeterminate and several of its treatments do not comply with district standards. While the original structure may have been older than 50 years, the current building has not retained historic integrity, nor does it have historic associations/and or historic design qualities that contribute to the district.

Staff recommends downgrading the structure to noncontributing status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends downgrading the residence to noncontributing status to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, finding it does not meet the definition of a Contributing Structure.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked if the Board had any idea how it got that way.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Krupnik, 120A Valencia Road, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Questions to the 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. Mather moved in Case #H-13-102A, to downgrade the structure to Non-Contributing. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 11. Case#H-13-102B. 447 Cerrillos Road, #4.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Michael Krupnick, agent for Becky Vollstedt, proposes to create additions of approximately 847 sq. ft. increase parapet heights to approximately 18'7", below the highest point of the structure, replace windows and doors, re-stucco and make other alterations to this contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Located at the rear of the Hacienda del Sol Condominiums, Unit #4 is a roughly 911 sq. ft., two-story, L-plan structure. Constructed at an unknown date, and thought to have been originally a garage, the building was converted into a loft-like dwelling in the c.1980s. Its style is indeterminate. The residence is designated contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests review of a project to totally remodel the building within its existing footprint.

Roof/Parapets

The existing roof, deck and chimney of the east portion of the dwelling will be removed and replaced. The wall height of this space will be lowered by approximately 1'-0" with the roof continuing to function as a deck. The larger west portion will be increased to provide additional ceiling height. The increase will reach a maximum height of 18'-7", approximately 18" lower than existing highest point of the house at 20'-1 ½." This modification will remove the angled overhang and replace it with a flat roof.

Openings

The project will replace all existing windows and delete and/or modify other openings. This will include removing the c. 1980's vertical and horizontal glass block units. The windows along the south elevation will be completely eliminated. The new windows will be of standard proportion and consist of aluminum-clad, simulated divided-light double-hung units with a "Hot Chocolate" finish. A solid wood door will replace the

Mexican-style entry on the north elevation, the dwelling's primary entrance. An aluminum-clad, single-light door will be placed on the deck of the east elevation.

Miscellaneous

The entire house will be re-stuccoed with a traditional cementitious application of El Rey's "Madeira" color, a Board-approved coloration.

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

Mr. Krupnik (previously sworn) said all they were adding was to put the HVAC unit not on the roof but on the deck and he had a drawing of that change [attached as an exhibit].

Chair Woods asked if it would be visible from a public way.

Mr. Krupnick said it would not. It was not the most elegant but was the only solution. It was behind a six foot wall with doors to open onto the roof deck.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Boniface asked what was on the east elevation above.

Mr. Krupnick said it was a six foot wall above the deck.

Chair Woods asked that it not be a skinny wall.

Mr. Krupnick agreed. It would be at least 12" wide.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-13-102B as submitted with the new information provided by the applicant. Ms. Mather seconded the motion.

Chair Woods suggested adding to the motion that the wall be 12" and the unit not visible to the public and a condition to take any exterior light fixtures to staff. Mr. Boniface accepted the conditions as friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 12. Case #H-13-103. 125 West Coronado Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Aaron Cordova, agent for Candice Johnson, proposes to construct additions totaling approximately 737 sq. ft. to match existing height, replace all doors and windows, increase yardwalls from 2' to 4' high and perform other site work on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

125 West Coronado Street is a single-family residential structure and free-standing garage that were constructed in a vernacular manner by 1947. The building has moderate alterations with an addition at the rear and all windows replaced with 2-over-2 aluminum units. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. An approximately 737 square foot addition will be constructed on the rear of the building that will remove and/or alter the existing rear addition and free-standing garage. The addition will match the existing height of the residence.
2. All exterior doors and windows will be removed and replaced with new units whose design and color were not identified, but wood is identified for doors. Window and door locations and opening dimensions will be changed. The new garage will have doors on both the south and north elevations.
3. The front porch beam will be stained in a "Redwood" color.
4. The exterior walls of the structure will be insulated and restuccoed with El Rey cementitious "Soapstone".
5. An HVAC unit will be mounted on the ground on the east elevation and a fence or wall screen will be constructed on the south, street-facing side.
6. Existing flagstone and concrete finishes have been removed and they will be replaced with concrete. Additional site improvements include alteration of the front yardwall with an increase in height to 4'. A pedestrian gate is indicated, but the design, material, and color is not indicated.

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 (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked about the door and window replacements.

Mr. Rasch said they were single light casements or one over one double hung or single hung.

Ms. Mather asked if those were allowed.

Mr. Rasch agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if Soapstone color was okay. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Ernest Cordova, 125 W. Coronado, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Woods asked him about what was going on because it was very hard to read the drawings the way they were shaded. She asked that he go through each elevation and tell what the windows and doors would be on each elevation.

Mr. Cordova said they windows would all be single or double-hung. He didn't know why the lines were in there and it had nothing to do with window design.

Chair Woods asked if he could read those notes on the left at the bottom.

Mr. Cordova explained that- fire rated gypsum board for garage and R-21 insulation would be used.

Chair Woods asked if it would not be stuccoed.

Mr. Cordova said it would be stuccoed. There was a walkway in back so putting the door in the garage for access to back yard required the fire rated board. The color of the door would be the same as the beam in front. Redwood. He had a color chart of it.

Chair Woods asked if it was a zero lot line for the garage.

Mr. Cordova agreed and had a signed affidavit from his neighbor on the back side.

Mr. Boniface asked if he didn't have to have a ten feet set back.

Mr. Rasch said that was a good point.

Mr. Cordova didn't know.

Chair Woods thought that would be caught at Permit.

Mr. Cordova said it had to be a fire rated door.

Mr. Boniface agreed.

Mr. Cordova said on the front he just envisioned a slightly larger wrought iron gate.

Ms. Mather asked what the color of the window was.

Mr. Cordova said it would be a color close to the finish of the wood.

Mr. Cordova showed them the color chart and the brown color he chose.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato commented that the type of window were kind of vague. They should have divided windows. Things could change and it could turn out to be something different so she asked that the applicant state it specifically.

Chair Woods asked if they were one over one.

Mr. Cordova said they had to change the size and it took a while to get with the City. He said he would use casements in the original size.

Chair Woods understood they would be in medium brown. Mr. Cordova agreed.

Chair Woods said he would also have a pedestrian gate.

Mr. Cordova agreed.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-13-103 with conditions that casement windows be used with brown color, trim would be medium brown and an iron pedestrian gate, that the doors be medium brown and if denied by zoning on the setback that the garage door changes be brought to staff for their approval on what they would look like, that there would be no exposed mechanical equipment on the roof and lighting would be taken to staff for approval. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The Board removed Case #H-13-099A from the table for consideration.

5. **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-stated garage. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Located near the west property line, the rectangular plan, one-car garage is associated with the main house at 511 East Palace Avenue. Built before 1960, and displaying a Spanish-Pueblo Revival architectural treatment, it is non-stated to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of the garage's historic status designation.

Historical Overview

The garage is associated with the main house, an approximately 1,864 sq. ft., Spanish-Pueblo Revival dwelling originally owned by Jose C. and Vita Gallegos. Mr. Gallegos, during his ownership of the property, was the president of the New Mexico Motor Sales, Inc., an automobile dealership on Don Gaspar Avenue.

Built before 1960, the garage is made of concrete block or hollow-tile construction. It is entered through the south, through a 1960s or '70s wood-panel overhead door manufactured by the Overhead Door Company. There is a plank door and double six-light wood sliding windows on the east elevation, most likely of original construction. The other elevations are not fenestrated. The garage displays the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with the rounded parapets, wood door and windows, a wood canale, and stepped stuccoed wing walls.

Evaluation of Historical Status

The garage represents the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style applied to an ancillary structure. In place by 1960,

it is more than 50 years old, retains a high degree of integrity, and reveals "architectural design qualities" that contribute to the district and. Staff recommends designating it contributing, as it meets the definition of a Contributing Structure.

The vehicular entry at the south elevation and the pedestrian entry at the east elevation present the function and architectural quality of the garage. Staff recommends designating the east (#2) and south (#3), except the current non-historic garage door, elevations the primary façades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends designating the garage contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, finding it meets the definition of a Contributing Structure, and designating the east (#2) and the south (#3) elevations, the primary façades.

Questions to Staff

There were no questions to staff.

Applicant's Presentation

There was no presentation from the applicant.

Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Mather commented that in looking at the proposed north elevation she had some problems figuring it out.

Mr. Murphey explained it was just on status.

Mr. Lloyd thought only an owner or the Board could ask for a status review.

Mr. Murphey said Staff made them ask for it.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato didn't know the door was historic. She thought the building was historic and deserved contributing status and it was right on the street and very visible.

Action of the Board

Mr. Boniface moved in Case #H-12-099A to approve designation as Contributing with the east and south elevations (2 and 3) as primary façades. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-13-099B. 511 East Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates, agent for David Lamb, owner, proposes to remodel a non-statused garage by replacing the vehicular entry door, creating a new window opening, and changing the operation of a vehicular gate. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

Located near the west property line, the rectangular plan, one-car garage is associated with the main house at 511 East Palace Avenue. Built before 1960, and displaying a Spanish-Pueblo Revival architectural treatment, it is non-statused to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Project

The applicant requests a review of a remodeling project.

Garage

The non-historic paneled overhead door is proposed to be replaced with a wood plank door. The new door would be fenestrated with four diamond-shaped lights replicating similar openings found on the vehicular entry gate immediately to the east.

On the north elevation is proposed a large window to provide additional light. The window will be a true-divided light aluminum-clad casement with a bronze finish. The window will be sheltered by a decorative corbelled overhang, projecting 2'-0" from the wall.

A section of the east and west stucco-on-block yard walls on this elevation will be removed and filled with twisted wrought-iron railing.

Vehicular Entry Gate

The existing wood entry gate east of the garage will be modified from a swinging to a sliding function. The exterior face will not be altered as part of the conversion.

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 if the diamond shape was based on anything historic.

Mr. Murphey said he couldn't speak to it other than to say it was an existing motif today on the vehicular gate.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Lloyd said he had nothing to add.

Questions to the Applicant

Chair Woods didn't see anything on the building that was conforming to this Contributing building. The elements of the overhang were not in harmony with the rest of the house.

Mr. Lloyd asked in what part of the ordinance he was not following.

Chair Woods said they spent a lot of time on this. There was nothing that mimics the elements on this structure. It was a completely new element he was adding to a contributing building.

Mr. Rasch read from Chapter 14-5.2- C 1 a that changes that create a false sense such as conjecture.

Mr. Lloyd said there were elements like that all over town.

Chair Woods said it was not on this particular building.

Mr. Lloyd asked if that was on the primary or any façade.

Mr. Rasch said it was any façade.

Mr. Murphey asked what the function was.

Mr. Lloyd said it protected that window on the north side in winter.

Mr. Boniface asked where the diamonds came from.

Mr. Lloyd said the diamond was on the existing gate.

Public Comment

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) thought the door for the garage was an improvement but not necessarily a historic pattern. She didn't really have any trouble with the overhang on the north that was not visible. It would be a protection. She pointed out that the Board had allowed features on other buildings

that didn't mimic existing.

Mr. Murphey said that elevation was visible on Armijo.

Ms. Beninato said then it was different. Because it introduced a new element.

Mr. Lloyd said it was visible only six months of the year.

Ms. Mather wondered if the overhang would be appropriate if it didn't have all the corbels.

Mr. Rasch said those 18" or more needed support.

Mr. Lloyd said he was happy to reduce it to one foot.

Mr. Katz moved to approve Case #H-13-099B with the exception of the overhang which would be one foot without corbels. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Approved by:



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer