



CITY CLERK'S OFFICE  
**Agenda** DATE 3/18/14 TIME 4:38  
 SERVED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 RECEIVED BY CDorbal

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP**

**TUESDAY, March 25, 2014 at 12:00 NOON**

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

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING**

**TUESDAY, March 25, 2014 at 5:30 P.M.**

**CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**A M E N D E D**

- A. **CALL TO ORDER**
- B. **ROLL CALL**
- C. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- D. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 11, 2014**
- E. **FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Case #H-12-082	716 Gomez Street	Case #H-08-096	1150 Canyon Road
Case #H-13-036	60 E. San Francisco	Case #H-12-068	825 El Caminito

**F. ACTION ITEMS**

1. Case #H-14-013. 109 Calle la Pena. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Strell Design, agent for Gary L. Kaplan, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure, including a height increase from 17'8" to 21' on a sloping site where the maximum allowable height is 17'4". (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-12-077. 1148 Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Greg & Kay Crouch, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 244 sq. ft. addition, altering an opening dimension to meet egress/ingress standards, and enclosing a portal. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-14-014. 426 Abeyta Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio PC, agent, for Daniel Nossiter & Nancy Bookbinder, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 54 sq. ft. addition on the front east elevation, increasing height from 11'6" to 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", and replacing windows and doors. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-14-015. 793 Camino del Poniente. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Catherine Clemens, owner, proposes to remodel an attached non-historic guest house on a contributing residential structure by changing opening dimensions on the north elevation and replacing all windows, and replacing both solid wood vehicular gates with solid wood gates of a different design. (David Rasch).
5. Case #H-14-016. 116 Calle la Pena. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Dan & Ashley Perry, owners, proposes to remove a street-frontage coyote fence and replace it with a stuccoed yardwall at 4'6" high with taller accents, pedestrian gates, and a patio with a banco and fireplace at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3.5.14 TIME 4:45SERVED BY Carmelle VignRECEIVED BY Carmelle Vign

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, March 25, 2014 at 12:00 NOON

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

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, March 25, 2014 at 5:30 P.M.

## CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 11, 2014
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-12-082      716 Gomez Street  
 Case #H-13-036      60 E. San Francisco  
 Case #H-08-096      1150 Canyon Road

Case #H-12-068      825 El Caminito  
 Case #H-11-105      237 & 239 DeVargas Street  
 Case #H-14-013      109 Calle la Pena

## F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-12-077. 1148 Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Greg & Kay Crouch, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 244 sq. ft. addition, altering an opening dimension to meet egress/ingress standards, and enclosing a portal. (David Rasch).
2. Case #H-14-014. 426 Abeyta Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio PC, agent, for Daniel Nossiter & Nancy Bookbinder, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 54 sq. ft. addition on the front east elevation, increasing height from 11'6" to 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", and replacing windows and doors. (David Rasch).
3. Case #H-14-015. 793 Camino del Poniente. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Catherine Clemens, owner, proposes to remodel an attached non-historic guest house on a contributing residential structure by changing opening dimensions on the north elevation and replacing all windows, and replacing both solid wood vehicular gates with solid wood gates of a different design. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-14-016. 116 Calle la Pena. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Dan & Ashley Perry, owners, proposes to remove a street-frontage coyote fence and replace it with a stuccoed yardwall at 4'6" high with taller accents, pedestrian gates, and a patio with a banco and fireplace at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

## G. COMMUNICATIONS

## H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

## I. 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.

**G. COMMUNICATIONS**

**H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**I. 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.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
March 25, 2014

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ACTION TAKEN</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE(S)</u></b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes March 11, 2014	Approved as amended	2-3
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as presented	3
Matters from the Floor	None	3
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-14-013.</u> 109 Calle la Peña	Approved with conditions	3-12
2. <u>Case #H-12-077.</u> 1148 Camino San Acacio	Approved with conditions	12-14
3. <u>Case #H-14-014.</u> 426 Abeyta Street	Approved with conditions	14-16
4. <u>Case #H-14-015.</u> 793 Camino del Poñiente	Part approved/part postponed	16-19
5. <u>Case #H-14-016.</u> 116 Calle la Peña	Postponed	19-21
G. Communications	Comments	22
H. Matters from the Board	None	22-23
I. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:37 p.m.	23

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

**March 25, 2014**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Vice Chair Cecilia Rios 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. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair [excused]  
Mr. Bonifacio Armijo [excused]

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. Zach Shandler, Assistant 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 said there was one error in the Findings of Fact where the case should be Case #H-11-082, and not Case #H-12-082 for the first one.

Vice-Chair Rios wanted Matters from the Floor to be added to the agenda.

Ms. Walker said Mr. O'Reilly told Chair Woods two weeks ago that it was up to the Board to include it on the agenda.

Mr. Rasch agreed to confirm that.

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

#### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 25, 2014**

Mr. Boniface requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 9, second to last paragraph, should have a space between "south" and "east."

On page 13, fourth paragraph, last sentence should read, "So he would argue."

On page 24, paragraph nine, it should say, "Mr. Boniface said it would look like it was glued on the wall."

Ms. Walker requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page six, near the bottom, it should say, "Ms. Walker asked if they could hear both the downgrade and their case at a future meeting based on the downgrade at the same hearing."

On page 14, fourth from the bottom, it should say, "Mr. Rasch said that the façade dimension is at least eight feet width set off by four feet."

Vice-Chair Rios requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 17, second paragraph it should read, "Ms. Rios was confused as to what it will look like in its finished state since it would be on two different planes. Ms. Rios commented that she was surprised with the City Attorney stating that if the City Council makes the recommendation to the H Board on a case that is sent back to the H Board that the Board must follow the Council's recommendations on the building's design."

On page 35, first paragraph, it should read, "Ms. Rios stated the building is presenting contributing. In fact the new wall negatively impacted it but the historic building footprint still remains. She asked Mr. Rasch

if he felt the building remained contributing and he said "yes."

**Mr. Boniface moved to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by a 3-0 voice vote with Mr. Katz and Ms. Mather abstaining.**

#### **E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**Case #H-11-082     716 Gomez Street**

**Case #H-08-096     1150 Canyon Road**

**Case #H-13-036     60 E. San Francisco**

**Case #H-12-068     825 El Caminito**

**Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no matters from the floor.

Vice-Chair Rios 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.

#### **F. ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Case #H-14-013. 109 Calle la Peña.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Strell Design, agent for Gary L. Kaplan, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure, including a height increase from 17'8" to 21' on a sloping site where the maximum allowable height is 17'4". (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

109 Calle la Peña is a single-family residence that was constructed in 1949 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. An addition with a second story was constructed on the west side of the residence at an

unknown date between 1958 and 1966. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The residence will be significantly altered in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival Style with an increase in the footprint with approximately 952 square feet of additions. The existing structure is 17' 8" high and the maximum allowable height for this property is 17' 4". The applicant proposes to increase the height of the structure to approximately 21' and shows that there is a grade change of 3' over the proposed footprint of the structure which allows the Board to grant 4 additional feet of height without an exception.
2. The front entrance will have wall and a carport that will screen most of the residence from public view. The metal fence and gate will be a square mesh design at 6' to 6' 6" high. A Board of Adjustment height variance has not been granted to exceed the underlying zoning maximum height of 6' and an exception has not been requested.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff defers to the Board regarding the proposed design of the residence in terms of harmony with the streetscape.

#### **Questions to Staff**

Ms. Mather noted that the report didn't include any detail the applicant provided in his letter about the windows, the finish, the walls, or about the structure itself. Typically the staff provided all of that so it was read into the record and here that was not done.

Mr. Rasch apologized, guessing he was short on time and quickly went through it but as long as the applicant's letter was in the packet it was in the record. It was not in the verbal record but it was in the case file.

Ms. Mather noted the letter indicated a STO finish would be used.

Mr. Rasch agreed. On non-contributing buildings cementitious stucco was not required but was required if the building was contributing or significant. This board determined some time ago they would not prefer STO on adobe but in this case it was noncontributing and you could ask the applicant about it being adobe or not.

Ms. Walker thought she read that the applicant was going to regrade the land to correct the drainage problem and that the grading would change the slope.

Mr. Rasch said that was possibly correct.



Ms. Walker said since they did not get a height variance from the Board of Adjustment and didn't ask for an exception she wondered how the Board could go forward with this application.

Mr. Rasch clarified that as an accent on top of the wall, the Board could consider approving it.

Vice-Chair Rios asked what the height of the existing fence was.

Mr. Rasch asked if she meant the existing stuccoed wall at the front of the property. He was not sure of the height of it but it was between 5 and 6 feet.

Vice-Chair Rios asked Mr. Rasch to explain that "simplified Spanish Pueblo" was.

Mr. Rasch said he was doing research for a speech to the Friends of Architecture on this topic. He had noticed from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century onward that many people proposed simplified. The classic typically had distinctive decorative details with viga posts on corbels, viga posts on portals, carved corbels, exposed headers and projecting vigas. Also reveal to some extent. And on Territorial style window surrounds and coping on the parapet. Those seven vocabulary items were typical on classic Santa Fe Style

We have seen over the last forty years many projects coming in with none of those. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century Spanish had more influence and by mid-century, the only influence beside adobe and decorative elements were corbels. Because of sustainability issues, the green code didn't support projecting wooden vigas which would rot or exposed headers because of thermal transfers. So many people eliminated those elements. He would favor seeing them in more permanent materials such as steel projecting vigas. In his opinion, that would harmonize more with Santa Fe Style more than a simplified Pueblo building that had no projecting vigas.

Vice-Chair Rios asked Mr. Boniface if in his experience STO finish did not breathe.

Mr. Boniface agreed. It was elastomeric finish and because it was elastomeric, it couldn't breathe but at base of building. CID now required a weep screed to be installed. You might have seen bubbles on some with moisture stuck behind them. At the bottom this ugly little element has perforations in it so allow moisture to weep out. In his experience, cement stucco breathes. It cracks a little more but so did STO. The weep screed was a code issue.

Vice-Chair Rios asked about public visibility.

Mr. Rasch said the weep screed eliminates the classic Santa Fe look of having the building come out of the earth and to go back into the earth but he saw people doing STO past ground level.

For public visibility there was only an apricot tree and the second floor was visible where the applicant put in headers.

Vice-Chair Rios asked if the applicant wanted to go as high as 21'. Mr. Rasch agreed.

#### Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Ralph Strell, 121 Morningside, who said on the question of grading that it was primarily to avoid flooding that was occurring at the front of the house for a long time causing much deterioration and the reason part of the house would have to be removed. The two parts of Calle La Peña drained onto the site and a culvert under the concrete block wall brings more runoff from the street. They hired a hydrologist who did an extensive study and advised him to raise the front of the house and it created floor level problems within the house because of existing floor levels. They would be required to leave the adobe part built by a previous owner in order to have adequate heights, it would require raising the front of the house to avoid flooding and also to preserve the large apricot trees in front.

They proposed to create a swale and direct drainage around the house and allow for drainage to drain into gardens in front, side and back where there would be a drainage pond.

#### Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Walker thought that was logical but since lowest point on the lot was the northwest corner. She asked if he was building that up.

Mr. Strell said he was not and there was a small pond there and not raising that up. They were raising the front door to avoid flooding. The difference in height front to the back was 3.7 feet. They would create a swale around to the north and also on the south. So we have created a garden to catch the rest.

Ms. Walker pointed out that STO wasn't particularly harmonious.

Mr. Strell said he didn't have any objection to using cementitious stucco.

Vice-Chair Rios asked if the corners were rounded or square.

Mr. Strell said they would be rounded and he included some radius corners in the packet and they would have no sharp edges.

Vice-Chair Rios asked if anything on the roof would be publicly visible. Mr. Strell said no.

Vice-Chair Rios asked what portion of the house would be visible.

Mr. Strell said there were privacy walls, the back side of the shed to hide tools and an open portal to the front, a small gate to the garden, one of apricot trees. They would have plantings and permeable paving in the front. The privacy was wall between the front court and the auto court which has the garage. The public wouldn't see the garage and the fence was open.

Vice-Chair Rios asked Mr. Rasch if the Board could go forward with the proposed vehicle gate height.

Mr. Rasch said the gate could only go to six feet high but an accent could go up six more inches.

Vice-Chair Rios asked Mr. Strell to describe the vehicle gate.

Mr. Strell said it would have a rustic patina metal gate like much of the colors in the neighborhood. They chose metal instead of wood for durability without compromising the historic finish.

Vice-Chair Rios asked if the windows would be inset.

Mr. Strell agreed and that depended on the thickness of the walls particularly where they had the courtyard. Those would be 12-15" deep to correspond with the existing adobe walls and they wanted as much shadow line on the walls as possible.

Ms. Walker asked if the gate was six foot plus a decorative thing or six and a half feet high.

Mr. Strell said it was six and a half feet to correspond to the adjacent wall and the tool building in the front. The fence in front could be six feet and not six and a half if the Board wished.

Mr. Katz referred to page 15 which showed the east elevation as proposed and had the new stucco wall back of the storage unit and running along there for privacy. He asked if that wall had no openings at all. Mr. Strell agreed.

Mr. Katz asked if the covered walkway also had a wall with no fenestration. Mr. Strell agreed.

Mr. Katz explained that the Board preferred fenestration with openings so you could see there was a house there. He asked if Mr. Strell would consider that.

Mr. Strell said he would entertain it and could talk with staff about it.

Mr. Katz thought the ceiling of the new bedroom seemed unusually high and asked why.

Mr. Strell said one of the main concerns was different massing and stepping. They were required to lower the level at the east and have this part at a higher roof line. It also gave some profile over the front fence to the building. You might see the parapet over the fence there so he stepped it back.

Mr. Katz said it looked like it stepped down and then back up.

Mr. Strell said a portion on the west was lower as required by zoning and then went up facing the courtyard.

Mr. Katz said it was half way up on the bedroom.

Mr. Strell agreed and also a sitting room facing public space. He explained that the grading would require that they also raise the head area in the loft for access in order to have a normal ceiling height.

Mr. Rasch pointed out on the floor plan the wall that had no fenestration. On the other side was storage but there was another place where fenestration could be put.

Mr. Katz thought it would be preferable to have the fenestration where the storage was and switch those two areas. And then one could just see into the courtyard instead of into the house. He didn't know if that would work.

Mr. Boniface asked to show the apricot trees locations on the site plan. Mr. Rasch pointed them out.

Mr. Boniface recalled the tree behind the portal wall as low and spread out. It didn't seem like the portal wall would work.

Mr. Strell said if they took one very low limb off they could still have access to the front.

Mr. Boniface said regarding floor levels and heights said it appeared they were raising the floor level 5 inches.

Mr. Strell agreed. There were 3-4 levels now so they were trying for a consistent level throughout.

Mr. Boniface noted they currently had an 8' ceiling on page 18 - north elevation, and a 7' ceiling above and it looked like both were being raised to 9'.

Mr. Strell said there were vigas below that 8'.

Mr. Boniface asked what radius he chose for the corners.

Mr. Strell believed it was 1.5".

Mr. Rasch said it was in the notes on page 17, third line.

Mr. Boniface thought that looked pretty small.

Mr. Strell understood their concerns. They walked the neighborhood to make sure they didn't have a severe corner. It was a minimum of 1.5" and he could submit that in writing.

Mr. Boniface said they could include that in the motion and they would want it in plan as well as a radius at the top of the parapet. He explained that he would ask for a 3" radius. He said he preferred contemporary architecture but the Board was trying to preserve these lines and massing.

Mr. Boniface said on the drawings it showed their attempt to convey the massing (page 15 at the bottom). It was a good start on massing but also brought this gate into issue. He liked specifics and in addition to the photograph of other gates wanted to see more dimensions on the gate. It showed crossed straps but a lot of detail was implied. This was a major part of the preservation of the building. Regardless of the height issue he hadn't seen enough in the details here to vote for it. He liked the concept but was hesitant on the gate because it was so massive.

Mr. Strell said this property had been a century of violations with cars driving into the gate and into the wall numerous times. People failed to see the turns there. They had lots of conversation about it. The reason it was here was because he was concerned with that kind of violation. He agreed he hadn't shown the details but it was exactly as the gate on the property to the south. If there was a way he could submit the details to Mr. Rasch He'd be happy to do that. The fence was certainly up for discussion and would make sure it was in keeping.

Mr. Strell said if the Board would prefer something else for it, he was amenable to going further in the discussion.

Vice-Chair Rios said the gate on page 29 was acceptable and it was see through.

Ms. Mather - wanted to go over the changes and asked if he would tear out the courtyard wall completely and rebuild it.

Mr. Strell said the back of the additional building and beyond that had no additional wall. It would all be landscaped. The curved part wouldn't be there and that would be all landscaped and graded.

Ms. Mather asked if that sunken aspect of the courtyard wouldn't be there.

Mr. Strell said there would be a grade change there for aesthetics and drainage.

Ms. Mather assumed that at that master bedroom she assumed they were rebuilding that whole wall there. She asked what material he would use.

Mr. Strell said it would be dimension compatible with adobe so the public would see the thick wall that would be either frame, adobe or block to carry the mass with the same depth.

Ms. Mather asked if the Board needed to specify that material in this case for the bedroom and the whole area where storage and garage were disappearing.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that it was not historic, so whatever materials achieved the visual effect was okay.

Ms. Mather asked if the storage was roofed, if it would no longer be a wall.

Mr. Rasch agreed. And they had seen zoning sometimes accepting a higher height because of that. It was a structure.

Ms. Mather said for the changes to the front area, the gate was coming down and the wall was coming down and they would have an open gate and wall around that semicircular area and all gates would be open gate design.

Mr. Strell said the original wall coming off the south was retained. There was currently a double wooden vehicle gate and a door that died into the wall on the east property line. The portion that was masonry was being retained at the front as much as possible to still allow parking there.

Ms. Mather reasoned that just one portion of stuccoed wall remained.

Mr. Strell said there was a gate allowing one into the property and a solid gate on the east boundary to the garage and then the gate to prevent people from pulling in and parking there. So the open gate would replace the solid wood gate.

Ms. Mather asked if he agreed to cementitious and the color was Suede. Mr. Strell agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if he was using Pella or equivalent windows.

Mr. Strell said they had not yet chosen window colors.

Ms. Mather asked if the posts for portal to be wood posts.

Mr. Strell said they were hoping for metal posts and beam with a patina finish.

Ms. Mather asked about exterior lights.

Mr. Strell said they were all recessed lights in the ceiling and up lights on the walk way.

Ms. Mather asked if the application was for a car port or a garage.

Mr. Strell said it was a garage with a door and was not visible.

Mr. Rasch said it was shown on page 20.

Mr. Katz was puzzled by his statement that people drive into this property from the street and go right into the property but there were wooden gates there and he was proposing more gates. He asked why the applicant was replacing the wooden gate with a metal gate.

Mr. Strell said those gates had been replaced many times.

Mr. Katz asked how a metal gate would be any better.

Mr. Strell said with design the driver would see the interior wall and the landscaping.

Mr. Katz didn't think it would be any different.

The other thing that didn't make sense was the portion of metal fence and what the purpose was for the metal fence there.

Mr. Strell said the point was to allow access to the landscaped area and traffic to take things from the outside of the property to the landscaped area so if you were gardening there you could open the gate on the south side.

Mr. Katz went to page 14 and the diagram on page 17 and asked if the metal fence was between the gates.

Mr. Strell said the open gate allowed driving to the back and the solid gate went to the garage. It would provide security.

Mr. Katz asked where the gate was.

Mr. Strell showed him. Just to the right of the entry there was an open gate for access to the driveway and beyond that was a security gate.

Mr. Katz understood that was the stationary fence and asked why that was not a wall. He asked if the fencing matched the gates.

Mr. Strell agreed. It would cut off the planting under the apricot tree. It would provide extra drainage and as a planter, bisected that area.

Mr. Boniface thought he understood that photograph. He asked what the window on the right was.

Mr. Strell said that was the garage door beyond the fence.

Mr. Boniface liked the fence there since it opened up the property. There were many yard walls on the street but he liked this more because it really did open up that whole corner and those were really great apricot trees. Bringing that back to the street scape was good.

Ms. Mather assumed there was a planter before the fencing and asked about the landscaping there.

Mr. Strell said he hadn't done that landscaping in detail yet but was open to suggestions.

Ms. Mather asked if it would have a step.

Mr. Strell said they were utilizing what was there.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-14-013 with the following conditions:**

- 1. To approve the 21' finished height on this structure;**
- 2. That the building will have cementitious stucco in Suede color;**
- 3. That the other colors come back to staff for approval including the metal elements and windows;**
- 4. That any exterior lighting besides recessed lighting be submitted to staff for review and approval;**
- 5. That the radius be 3" for corners and parapet;**
- 6. That the materials for planter or hardscaping be submitted to staff for approval;**
- 7. That the gate will approximate the gate design of the neighbor at far south end and may include cross section detail;**
- 8. That the wall step up;**
- 9. That the gates not exceed six feet on the fenestrated wall;**
- 10. That the applicant will save the two apricot trees;**
- 11. That the Board accepts the metal posts and beam on the portal;**
- 12. That there will be no rooftop appurtenances.**

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

- 2. Case #H-12-077. 1148 Camino San Acacio. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Greg & Kay Crouch, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 244 sq. ft. addition, altering an opening dimension to meet egress/ingress standards, and enclosing a portal. (David Rasch).**

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

1148 Camino San Acacio is a single-family residential building that was constructed in a simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1964. There have been significant alterations during non-historic dates, including the pitched roof. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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



1. A 244 square foot addition will be constructed on the northeast corner of the building to match existing adjacent height. The addition will feature a 4-lite awning window on the north elevation and two paired 4-lite awning windows on the east elevation. Stucco and trim will match existing character.
2. The rear portal will be infilled for heated living space. The room will feature 4 6-lite casement windows on the south elevation and an 8-lite French door and an 8-lite fixed sidelite on the west elevation.
3. An existing 4-lite window on the west elevation will be replaced with a 6-lite casement window that meets the egress/ingress dimensions.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

#### **Questions to Staff**

Ms. Mather noted that in #1 they would match existing and asked if that was true for #2 also. Mr. Rasch agreed.

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Andrew Lyons, P.O. 858, Santa Fe, who had nothing more to add to the staff report.

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

Ms. Walker asked if in #3 the replacement would be the same color.

Mr. Lyons agreed. It was odd because they had two colors of cladding. One was blue in some cases and off-white in others. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Mr. Lyons said they would try to match colors with adjacent windows. He didn't know how it happened. The windows in front would match what was in front and windows in back would match the back cladding color.

Ms. Walker asked if the portal matched existing.

Mr. Lyons agreed. It was Desert Rose.

Mr. Katz noted the parking area was graphically shown and asked if it would be possible to include

something there to block the tires from going further forward and avoid crashing into the wall.

Mr. Lyons agreed and would take that up with the owners.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Mr. Boniface moved to approve Case #H-12-077 at 748 Camino Acacio with the condition that a planter or object be installed in front of the retaining wall at the parking area at least three feet deep constructed of same material as the rest of the house or possibly a rock wall there, and accepting the proposed matching of window colors on each façade. Ms. Walker seconded the motion with a request for further details on the condition.**

**Mr. Boniface said the buffer would be at least 18" above the current driving surface.**

Mr. Lyons asked what he should do if that would force the back end of the car out into the street.

**Mr. Boniface said if it couldn't be done, he should return to staff to work it out. Ms. Walker agreed. Unanimous.**

3. **Case #H-14-014. 426 Abeyta Street.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture Studio PC, agent, for Daniel Nossiter & Nancy Bookbinder, owners, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residential structure by constructing a 54 sq. ft. addition on the front east elevation, increasing height from 11'6" to 12' where the maximum allowable height is 14'4", and replacing windows and doors. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

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

426 Abeyta Street is a single-family residential building that was constructed in 1938 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. Substantial alterations were made in the 1970s, including the addition of a bay window on the front, east elevation. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The front, east elevation bay window will be replaced with a squared-off addition that will increase the footprint by 54 square feet. The addition will be 12' tall, or 6" higher than the adjacent parapet height, where the maximum allowable height is 14' 4", and it will feature paired 12-lite casement windows on the north and east elevations, a 10-lite French door with a 10-lite fixed sidelite on the

south elevation, and a 4'x3' skylight that will not be visible above the parapet.

A stuccoed spur wall on the south elevation will screen the door, steps, and handrail.

2. The north wing of the residence will be increased in height to 12'. This will improve the room-block massing of the structure.
3. All doors and windows will be replaced with divided-lite units with some alteration to opening dimensions and location. All lites will meet the 30" standard.

### **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**

Vice-Chair Rios asked about the discrepancy on the inventory sheet.

Mr. Rasch said the 1983 inventory was on page 6 where they recommended contributing. The more recent one in 1991 was for non-contributing and found it was built in 1938.

Vice-Chair Rios pointed that one was checked as contributing.

Mr. Rasch said his copy said non-contributing but listen on the state register was checked but that was not for this house but for the district.

Ms. Walker noted this was already at the maximum lot coverage and they were adding 54 more square footage. She asked whether this addition was approved by Zoning.

Mr. Rasch didn't understand why they signed off on it.

### **Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 1524 Paseo de Peralta. Mr. Daniel Nossiter was also sworn in.

Mr. Martínez said the windows had all been replaced and they now planned to replace them with wood windows that would be painted turquoise. They were matching the color of stucco to match cementitious stucco. They were increasing the height in front to make sure the skylight was not visible. The master bedroom was raised because the ceiling had to be replaced so they planned to raise it above the rest and ceiling raised so the overall height would be six inches higher.

### Questions to the Applicant

Vice-Chair Rios asked what color the windows were now.

Mr. Martínez said they were off-white and the proposed color was called Taos Blue. He offered to bring a color sample for staff to review. It was a medium blue turquoise.

Ms. Mather asked if the windows were true divided lights.

Mr. Martínez said they had spacers in the middle.

Ms. Mather said she walked this neighborhood and it had a fortress wall. She asked if they had considered lowering the wall.

Mr. Martínez said they had not.

Ms. Mather said it was a charming house and just a modicum more of view would help.

Vice-Chair Rios asked if the French Doors on the south would have divided lights.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if they would have any roof top appurtenances.

Mr. Martínez said they would have non visible skylights.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

### Action of the Board

**Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-14-014 per staff recommendations with conditions that the window color be approved by staff, no visible rooftop appurtenances, the stucco color would match existing stucco, accepting the height increase, that there would be simulated divided lites on the French doors and windows. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 4. Case #H-14-015. 793 Camino del Poñente. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Catherine Clemens, owner, proposes to remodel an attached non-historic guest house on a contributing residential structure by changing opening dimensions on the north elevation and replacing all windows, and replacing both solid wood vehicular gates with solid wood gates of a different design. (David Rasch).**

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

793 Camino del Poñente is a single-family residential building that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1938. A free-standing garage was replaced with an attached garage at an unknown date. The adjacent guest house was constructed after 1969 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. All windows will be replaced with 30" compliant windows. On the north elevation a door will be converted to a 4-over-4 window and the large fixed-lite widow with fixed sidelites will be removed and replaced with two paired 8-lite windows.
2. The two large wooden vehicle gates with woodwork that resembles an "ojo de perdiz" pattern will be removed and replaced with similarly-sized wooden vehicle gates in a vertical pattern with metal clavos. Flanking pilasters will be slightly lowered in height to be more harmonious to the yardwall.

**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**

Ms. Mather asked what similar sized meant. Mr. Rasch suggested she ask the applicant.

**Applicant's Presentation**

Present and Will McDonald, 488 Arroyo Tenorio, who explained that the two windows on the curved wall next to the fireplace were not going to be replaced.

Regarding the height of the gate and pilasters, there was discussion about the gate and whether we want to lower them or not.

Mr. Rasch said on page 12, the height of the east gate from grade to top was 5' 6" and the height of the existing west gate was 6' 1".

Mr. McDonald said the street was inclined down to the west.

Ms. Rios asked how many windows they were replacing.

Mr. McDonald said they were replacing three windows and putting a window where there was a door now and the big north window would become two windows.

Ms. Mather was confused. She asked if the windows were all on the guest house.

Mr. Rasch agreed this was only for the guest house.

Ms. Mather asked if the windows were wood.

Mr. McDonald said they were metal clad wood windows with simulated divided lights and would be white.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch if the applicant was able to discover when those gates were installed and if the project had a permit to install them.

Mr. McDonald said they were put it up in the 1980's and he couldn't determine if a permit was pulled.

Ms. Mather asked if he could have some fenestration on the gates to break up the mass - some interest to open it up. It becomes an impenetrable corridor, modest though it might be.

Mr. McDonald noted that any visual access there was only to a parking area and visual access at that point would be a security issue.

Ms. Mather suggested maybe the one gate on the east side could maintain solidity and the west one would be more open with visual access to the house and landscaping.

Ms. Walker added that it was a contributing house.

Mr. McDonald thought there would be more visual interest to create some opening on the wall toward the west corner.

Mr. Rasch showed the site plan.

Mr. McDonald suggested somewhere along the south or west side they could create an opening that would be more interesting but farther away from the house so less of a privacy issue. He agreed to talk with his client about that rather than an opening in the gate.

Ms. Mather said the quid pro quo would be either the gate of a sight line somewhere along the wall. There was a planter at the corner.

Mr. McDonald said it was not at the southwest corner. They were talking more about pedestrians rather than travelers along Abeyta Street. So somewhere near the southwest corner would be a place to consider it.

Vice-Chair Rios asked what size opening he would envision.

Mr. McDonald thought maybe two feet by 18".

Mr. Boniface was hesitant to make him open up walls when he didn't know what was there. He suggested that the applicant consider on the elevation where he had clavos was where he would have wood thought an opening of about six inches of wood and then six inches of clavos and then six inches of wood.

Mr. McDonald asked if it would be to the height of the gate. Mr. Boniface agreed.

Mr. McDonald said that was a possibility and it would maintain a simple design with a steel structure. He didn't know what would be revealed behind it but they could consider that and understand that was the sort of thing the Board wanted.

Mr. McDonald said he could come back.

Vice-Chair Rios said they could approve the rest.

Mr. McDonald said they were simple issues and his clients would be able to move ahead with renovation. He had talked with Mr. Rasch about when they were looking at the structure of the gates and discussed lowering the pilasters on the west gate because they seemed to stick up a lot. But it would reveal the structure. Mr. Rasch said it would need a height calculation so they would have to discuss it in the future anyway. He said they could find that maximum height and come back with a proposal.

Vice-Chair Rios said that sounded good.

Ms. Walker commented that August Kaiser was the artist who lived there. He took dead trees from the Tesuque Acequia and carved them.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

#### Action of the Board

**Ms. Mather moved to approve part 1 of Case #H-14-015 - the request for installing wood metal clad windows on the guest house with simulated divided lites and that part 2 regarding the gates be postponed and come back to the Board. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Mr. Katz suggested the applicant consider stepping up the wall to the pilaster.

5. **Case #H-14-016. 116 Calle la Peña.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Plan A Architecture, LLC, agent for Dan & Ashley Perry, owners, proposes to remove a street-frontage coyote fence and replace it with a stuccoed yardwall at 4'6" high with taller accents, pedestrian gates, and a patio with a banco and fireplace at a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

116 Calle la Peña was a single-family residential building that was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in 1944. Significant non-historic alterations have been performed on the structure. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property by replacing a coyote fence at the front lotline with a stuccoed yardwall with two pedestrian gates and other site work.

The yardwall will vary in height from 4' 6" to 8' over the gates. Additional variation in massing will be achieved with a buttress, steps or undulations in height, a window with paired wooden shutters below and exposed wooden header, and a low stone planter around the parking area. The bileaf wooden gates do not present fenestration and pendant light fixtures are proposed above the gates. A tapered cylindrical fireplace and chimney will be incorporated into the yardwall. Other site work includes flagstone terraces and a path with a banco and a water feature.

**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**

Vice-Chair Rios asked if Mr. Rasch could you describe the streetscape.

Mr. Rasch said it appeared there were many tall stuccoed walls and many gates and this property stands out with its coyote fence which was very characteristic of old style coyote.

**Applicant's Presentation**

Present and sworn was Mr. Greg Reid, 500 Montezuma, who said the fence was in the street and not on the property. The owners want to have some privacy in back with small gatherings outside. The fence was extremely transparent and they proposed to take a section off the street and incorporate it into the wall. On the new site plan he showed how they would incorporate the transparent fencing and most of the walls at a low height. It would step up in certain areas where it made sense.



### Questions to the Applicant

Vice-Chair Rios asked if it was stepped up from 4' 6" to 8'.

Mr. Reid said over the gate the wall was 8'.

Ms. Mather asked about the chimney on this outdoor fireplace. In the drawing it looked very prominent.

Mr. Reid said part of the problem was the computer. He had a hand drawing that was more accurate. The height was 9' and the base was 4'.

Ms. Mather felt that was a lot of chimney there.

Ms. Walker understood it was back from the street but she suggested a redesign of the fireplace.

She said the bileaf gate had no fenestration and asked if the gate was under the arch.

Mr. Reid said they called out Peñasco style and this was the door into the garage with folk art type cutouts.

Ms. Walker said it was pretty.

Ms. Walker asked if any of that wonderful property was visible.

Mr. Reid said most of the house was visible.

Mr. Boniface said the exterior on the elevations looked like it had some stone.

Mr. Reid said it was an edge to stop the gravel in transition to the planting area on the outside of the wall like a six inch high stone curb.

Mr. Boniface thought it almost looked like a hearth on the back side of fire place.

Mr. Reid said it was just a raised area to unify where the three elements hit and like a place to sit.

Mr. Boniface asked about the gooseneck shade there.

Mr. Reid said they wanted something deal with the shadow on the door. They were looking for a down light on each side of the gate in bronze.

Mr. Boniface asked if the gate itself was about six feet eight inches high. Mr. Reid agreed.

Mr. Boniface said the print out looked like the top of that wall was 9' at the gate as shown on Sheet A-3

bottom drawing where there was a dimension.

Mr. Reid said it was 9' to incorporate that light over it. The chimney was actually 10' but they both could be lowered.

Mr. Boniface said 6' 8" was a typical standard door size so Mr. Reid could probably lower all of it down to 7' 8" just the way it was presented. It was so massive. And then there was the difference there with the wall to the left of the gate and on page 12 it was almost a steep wall there. So he was hesitant to rule on it.

Mr. Rasch said the line drawing was what was submitted for permit.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Boniface about proportions of the fireplace and chimney.

Mr. Boniface thought they seemed massive also. It would look like a rocket ship. It was huge.

Ms. Walker thought they needed a redesign of the fireplace.

Mr. Rasch noted there was another like it to the south.

Mr. Katz said in showing the coyote fence, he asked if they could leave it there and put a wall behind it.

Mr. Reid thought it would be hard to keep that land in between without weeds. They were trying to work better to relocate part of it and keep the three big trees meanwhile.

Vice-Chair Rios asked what the length of the proposed wall was.

Mr. Reid said he didn't know the entire length of the proposed wall.

Ms. Mather commented that the overall project with gentle low wall worked quite well but the chimney and fireplace was not in scale with the rest.

Ms. Mather moved to postpone the application for Case #H-14-016 to the following meeting so the applicant had an opportunity to take into consideration the comments of the Board.

**Mr. Boniface seconded the motion and asked Mr. Reid to consider incorporating the coyote fence more into the project, maybe along the driveway with pilasters to the garage. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **G. COMMUNICATIONS**

Mr. Rasch said they needed to do a status review for DeFour Bridge and Delgado Street Bridge.

Mr. Rasch asked the Board to think about awards in May. He didn't have a poster or a date. There was

a lot to do. He had to find a location also. He would be talking with OSFA and HSFF about dates.

Ms. Walker asked him to check with the National Park Services.

Mr. Rasch said the state awards would be on May 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> at the St. Francis Auditorium.

Mr. Rasch asked Board members to review minutes to see about nominations.


#### **H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

There were no matters from the Board.


#### **I. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.)