City of Santa Fe

Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
DATE 4/2/14 TIME 9:40
SERVED BY Camille Vigil
RECEIVED BY

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, April 8, 2014 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, April 8, 2014 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

AMENDED

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 25, 2014

E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-14-013	109 Calle la Pena	Case #H-14-015	793 Camino del Poinente
Case #H-12-077	1148 Camino San Acacio	Case #H-14-016	116 Calle la Pena
Case #H-14-014	426 Abeyta Street		

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-13-091. 1001 E. Alamaeda Street. Downtwon & Eastisde Historic District. Design Solutions, agent for Riverside Santa Fe LLC, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a two-car garage on a contributing property by reducing the size and constructing a 61 sq. ft. addition. (David Rasch).

2. Case #H-13-084. 145 East Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gabriel Brown, agent for Triple R Builders, L.P., owner, proposes to construct a 1,465 sq. ft. addition to a height of 21'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'1" on a non-contributing commercial structure. An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).

3. Case #H-11-035. 505A Cerrillos Road. Historic Transition Historic District. Gabriel Browne , agent for McMojo LLC, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing commercial building by altering non-historic openings and constructing a roof deck on the front elevation. An exception is requested to alter the character of the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(C)(1)(a)). (David Rasch).

4. Case #H-14-017. 208 & 208 ½ Polaco. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. John Delamater/Delamater Family Trust Partnership, agent/owner, request an historic status review of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-14-018. 661 C Garcia Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Miguel da Silva, agent for Lynne and Joe Horning, owners, proposes to convert a garage to a studio on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

6. Case #H-14-019. 707 Agua Fria Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Richard McManus, agent for McManus Family Living Trust, owners, requests designation of primary elevations on a contributing residence and requests to demolish a contributing garage. An exception is requested to remove historic materials and degrade the historic status (Section 14- 5.2(D)(1)(a)+(D)(5)). (David Rasch).

7. Case #H-14-012. 223-225 Johnson Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis agent for Conroad Association owner, proposes to meet a previous HDRB condition by reducing the scale on the overhang above the rear door on a significant commercial building. (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.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
April 8, 2014

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes March 25, 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. Case #H-13-091. 1001 E. Alameda	Approved as recommended	3-4
2. Case #H-13-084. 145 East Alameda	Approved with conditions	4-13
3. Case #H-11-035. 426 Abeyta Street	Postponed to April 22	14-18
4. Case #H-14-017. 208/208½ Polaco	Downgraded to non-contributing	18-20
5. Case #H-14-018. 661C Garcia Street	Approved with conditions	20-24
6. Case #H-14-019 707 Agua Fria Street	Approved demolition	24-27
7. Case #H-14-012 223-225 Johnson Street	Approved with conditions	28
G. Communications	Comments	28
H. Matters from the Board	Discussion	29
I. Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:00 p.m.	29

MINUTES OF THE

CITY OF SANTA FÉ

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD

April 8, 2014

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
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
Mr. Bonifacio Armijo
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Mr. Edmund Boniface [excused]
Ms. Karen Walker [excused]

OTHERS PRESENT:
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
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 said 116 Calle la Peña should be removed from the Findings of Fact and he added Matters from the Floor to the agenda.

Mr. Katz moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 25, 2014

Ms. Rios requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 5, fifth paragraph, should say "what" instead of "that."

On page 9, fourth paragraph, should read, "Vice Chair Rios said the gate shown on page 29 was acceptable to her because it was see through."

On page 20, 7th paragraph, should say, "Vice Chair Rios- asked Mr. Rasch to describe the streetscape."

Ms. Mather requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 9, 3/4 down the page, it should say, "Ms. Mather assumed that at the master bedroom they were rebuilding the whole wall."

On page 19, just before Action of the Board, it should say, "Ms. Walker's second sentence about Gus Kaiser, "He took dead trees along the acequia and had Ben Ortega carve them."

Ms. Rios moved to approve the Minutes of March 25, 2014 as amended. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-14-013 109 Calle de Peña

Case #H-12-077 1148 Camino San Acacio

Case #H-14-014 426 Abeyta Street

Case #H-14-015 793 Camino del Poiñente

Ms. Rios moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as presented. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

There were no matters 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.

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case #H-13-091. 1001 E. Alameda Street**. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Design Solutions, agent for Riverside Santa Fe LLC, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to construct a two-car garage on a contributing property by reducing the size and constructing a 61 sq. ft. addition. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

1001 East Alameda Street is a single family home that was constructed before 1900 and now is presented in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On October 8, 2013, the Board approved the construction of a 560 square foot free-standing two-car garage to a height of approximately 12.75'.

Now, the applicant proposes to amend the approval with the following three items.

1. The overall floor plan will be a few feet wider and a few feet less deep. In addition, the width of wall mass at the corners of the vehicle doors on the west elevation will be increased and the south elevation wall will be slightly out of 90 degrees from the east and west elevations.

2. The pedestrian door on the north elevation will be relocated from the east end of the façade to the west end of the façade. An 11 square foot overhang will be installed above the door that will be supported by three projecting vigas.

3. The remainder of the north elevation massing will be stepped down to a height of approximately 11.25'.

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

Chair Woods asked if the applicant had permission to go to the property line.

Mr. Rasch believed they did.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Ms. Dolores Vigil, P.O. Box 1835, Santa Fé, who said she was present to answer questions.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Armijo asked what purpose the 61 sq. ft. addition would provide.

Ms. Vigil said it was for storage and that was shown on the north end of the site plan.

Mr. Armijo reasoned that it was more of a one car garage.

Ms. Vigil said it was drawn as a two-car garage.

Ms. Mather asked if Ms. Vigil planned no change to the doors originally proposed. Ms. Vigil agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if there would be anything on the roof. Ms. Vigil said no.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-13-091per staff recommendations. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Case #H-13-084. 145 East Alameda Street**. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Gabriel Browne, agent for Triple R Builders, L.P., owner, proposes to construct a 1,465 sq. ft. addition to a height of 21'6" where the maximum allowable height is 14'1" on a non-contributing commercial structure. An

exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)). (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

145 East Alameda Street is a commercial building that was constructed in a vernacular manner in 1983. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. On September 24, 2013, the Board postponed action on a proposal to construct a roofed structure on the existing roof deck that doesn't have a pitched roof and is set back from the first story.

Now, the applicant has redesigned the project. The area of roof coverage has been reduced from approximately 5,600 square feet to 1,465 square feet with setbacks from both street frontages. The portal will be constructed with traditional wood details. A height exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height of 14' 1" up to 19' 6" for the portal roof and up to 21' 6" for the fire separation parapet at the lotline. The required exception responses are as follows.

Mr. Rasch pointed out the story poles on the northwest corner of the proposed structure that the Board members saw on their site visit to this property.

EXCEPTION TO EXCEED MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HEIGHT

(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

Under Chapter 14-7.4(3)(a) the city zoning code lists the following "Design Objectives for the Alameda Street Sub-district of the BCD":

(I) allow more intensive development because of the lack of historical or well-defined townscape characteristics;

(ii) strengthen continuity of block forms;

(iii) strengthen the built edge of the street sections and extend features of the Plaza streetscape to this district;

(iv) improve the sense of enclosure to pedestrian spaces;

(vi) emphasize the river park by allowing relatively dense buildings north of the Alameda in contrast to the park;

Each of these objectives identifies the desirable character of this part of the city as one of density and taller structures.

The streetscape along East Alameda and along Shelby is a rich mix of single story and two story to three story buildings. The overall impression along both streets is of a two story average. In his case the historic calculation of 14' 1" by code excluded the very tall phone building across the street and the many two story state buildings that really define the streetscape along both streets. Leaving those buildings out of the calculation, while required by code, skews the calculation from the common sense understanding of

the streetscape average.

The actual streetscape is more tall and dense than the height calculation indicates. Granting our height exception will reinforce the positive and unique aspects of the streetscape and move this parcel closer to the stated objectives for this townscape sub-district as stated in the zoning code.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The HDRB does not use the BCD standards which appear to be in conflict with the intent of the Historic Districts Overlay Zoning Code. The more restrictive standards shall prevail. The Historic Districts height ordinance purposely defines the applicable streetscape for valid reasons.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare

This exception is required to allow the owner of this property to use it in ways allowed by the city zoning code. The shade and weather protection afforded by the portal structure is essential to those allowed uses. There are no design alternatives which would fulfill that objective and which would not require a height exception.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. Again, the Historic Code is often more restrictive than the zoning code, that is why it is an Overlay Zoning Code. There are other design options that would not require a height exception while allowing some use of the roof deck, they include not providing shade with a permanent structure or using temporary umbrellas that are not permanently affixed to the deck structure.

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

The specific character of this neighborhood as identified in the BCD zoning code language will be reinforced. This portion of the zoning code seems specifically written to identify the unique character of each of the areas of the BCD and to identify how to strengthen that character. This design proposal and height exception strengthen that character, thus strengthening the unique heterogeneous character of the city as a whole.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The applicant has not described the "full range of design options" that are available and why this option is the one chosen. Other designs include the potential for bright or off-colored umbrellas, additional massing created by an enclosed second story, etc.

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

Most of the existing streetscape is already two story or taller. Those properties are owned or used by the state, or by the telephone company, and as such don't wouldn't need or qualify for a height exception.

The open two story courtyard is a unique urban element in this streetscape and presents unique challenges that require this exception. Other properties in the streetscape are not presented with these challenges.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

This property was previously used for storage and outdoor display, but the city and owner would be well served to be allowed to use the space for a wider variety of uses allowed by the BCD zoning including public gathering, and other uses. In order to accommodate those other allowed uses, at least part of the space needs to be protected from the elements. The challenges of making a space accommodating for those additional uses are special conditions and circumstances which are outside of the control of the applicant.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement generally, although staff does not agree that the space must be roofed to accommodate other uses.

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

It is not possible to provide the comfort and accommodation being sought here without the height exception.

Allowing this height exception will allow the owner of this property to use this property for the uses legally allowed by the zoning code, while also promoting the economic, cultural and general welfare of the city by ensuring a harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and development of the city. Allowing this exception will create an attractive outdoor space for tourists and residents alike which reinforces the historic of Santa Fe and promotes property values.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the height exception criteria have not been met, but otherwise this application complies with Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather noticed that perhaps one reason why Mr. Rasch didn't find the responses for the height exception pertinent was that they seemed to be answering some other code.

Chair Woods thought it was good to bring that up. She asked Ms. Brennan to respond why reference to the BCD code was not appropriate and what it meant to have an overlay code.

Ms. Brennan said the code provided that where there was a conflict between an overlay district and underlying zoning, the conflict was resolved in favor of the most restrictive provision and otherwise they tried to read the overlay and underlying together if allowed.

Ms. Mather asked, assuming that the Board would find the design acceptable, how they would deal with that conflict.

Mr. Rasch suggested the Board could flesh out the testimony from the applicant to help find that they met the height exception.

Ms. Mather asked, since this was a commercial building, if it had enclosed spaces or if they were just opened to the elements.

Mr. Rasch thought the applicant could address it better but he believed this was an annex of an existing restaurant. So they also had indoor space.

Ms. Rios asked if this was basically a portal they were seeing on the second story and it was going as much as 5' 5" over the maximum in both places.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The portal itself was over by 5' but at the north end, since this building attached to adjacent building, a fire separation was required. There were two options. One was to have a fire rated 30" parapet as chosen here or a fire rated roof and with this portal, it was much easier to do a parapet and not a roof.

Ms. Rios asked how much higher this was compared with the adjacent building.

Mr. Rasch didn't know but affirmed it was taller.

Ms. Mather pointed out regarding the height calculation that there were numerous commercial buildings nearby that were two-story buildings.

Mr. Rasch said the applicant had argued that in the application. But the height ordinance as written had government buildings removed and any that were over 16' or had nonhistoric second stories were omitted from the calculation.

Chair Woods said that was to prevent height creep.

Mr. Armijo asked if the parapet was on top of it.

Mr. Rasch said it was on top of the building to the north.

Mr. Armijo asked if the board had that elevation. Mr. Rasch said no.

Mr. Armijo asked how tall the parapet was.

Mr. Rasch said it was 21' 6" from ground to top of parapet.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Gabriel Browne, 1012 Marquez Place, Suite 210-B, who said this project came to the Board several months ago and the owners felt it didn't represent what they needed and was unsightly. This was a much more modest proposal. There were two new aspects - to add entry doors between the two buildings with a small portal. That was part of the application.

The larger issue was the second floor portal. If the ordinance didn't remove some buildings from the height calculation this proposal would fit. There were many three-story buildings in the area. The BCD zoning said specifically that creating the subzone strongly supported the two-story aspect. He said they recognized that the historic ordinance didn't allow it but that the Board could make an exception.

The original application had the portal over the whole area. The elevation had the adjacent restaurant shown and an addition onto the building for fire separation so this would just add to it and it would not be seen at the street elevation. It was set back seven feet from the street property line. The parapet was extended in the previous application.

Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Mather asked if the applicant would agree that the exception wouldn't damage the streetscape and better response should be to harmonize with the other two-story buildings in the area.

Mr. Browne agreed.

Ms. Mather said it had around corner a long windowless wall and asked if they didn't intend to break up that mass.

Mr. Browne agreed that wasn't in keeping with the character of the site but they hadn't brought it here tonight.

Ms. Mather asked if they also would not change the current railings.

Mr. Browne agreed. That was part of another conversation.

Ms. Mather asked if the ramada was completely covered. Mr. Browne agreed.

Ms. Mather noted on page 20, 21 the portal extended to the west beyond the opening down into the courtyard. One possible concern was the visibility of the portal from the street. On the south the applicant solved it but having it less visible on the west would be better. She asked Mr. Browne if he would object to stepping back a couple of feet at that end.

Mr. Browne said they had discussed how much they could step it back. There was an interior stair and another one. And they needed to cover that it would not rain on the stairs.

Ms. Rios asked how far back the porch was from the railing.

Mr. Browne said it was 7.5'. The porch and railing would be stained dark Brown.

Mr. Armijo referred to page 26, sheet A-2-1 and asked what the parapet thickness was there.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the note there pointed to that taller parapet.

Mr. Browne agreed and showed where it was stepping back.

Mr. Armijo said the edge thickness of the parapet there was his concern. It looked like six inches.

Mr. Browne said it returned to Shelby and they would set it back seven feet. They could ask the adjoining owners if they could turn it one way or the other.

Chair Woods suggested he could also just thicken the wall there to 12".

Mr. Armijo agreed.

Chair Woods thought with plaster it would be 14".

Mr. Armijo said that would answer his concern.

Mr. Browne agreed they could create a pilaster.

Mr. Armijo went to page 25, the north elevation, and asked if that was where the parapet was happening.

Mr. Browne said that thicker parapet turned parallel to Shelby so they could get rid of that column and thicken it there. He agreed that was a good recommendation.

Mr. Armijo noted they had a walk through and asked why they would need a parapet there.

Mr. Browne said the fire requirement required five feet to pull off and they would end up not accomplishing what was needed.

Chair Woods asked if they were adding any railings.

Mr. Browne said no.

Chair Woods asked if the portal was wood and not steel. Mr. Browne agreed.

Chair Woods noted on page 22 it seemed they could lessen the height slightly by the thickness of the beam and the corbel pattern out there.

Mr. Browne explained they were taking the water off the portal to the back and to the ground and they were uncomfortable with cascading it down or some kind of gutter down that column. So the corbelled end was a fascia to hide the roof slope where they would catch the water at the back.

Chair Woods asked the height of the beam.

Mr. Browne said it was 7' 6" from the second floor. The beam was 20".

Chair Woods felt that was huge and they didn't need a 20" beam. 12" would work and every little bit of reduction would help.

Mr. Browne said he would make it 12".

Chair Woods did not understand the door design.

Mr. Browne said the new doors would go at the U shape with a little portal over it.

Chair Woods asked about door finish and color.

Mr. Browne said it would be dark Brown.

Chair Woods said the Board needed a detail or maybe the Board could say take it to staff.

Mr. Browne said the doors would be aluminum clad.

Chair Woods asked if he meant like a patio door. Mr. Browne agreed.

Mr. Armijo asked about gutter and down spouts.

Mr. Browne said they would have interior drains - a commercial roof drain. Every other set of columns would have a pipe down to store water below.

Ms. Rios asked if the portal was to offer shade for customers. Mr. Browne agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if these areas with the walls below were completely enclosed spaces at the lower level.

Mr. Browne said they were open with grill work into the courtyard.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Chair Woods summarized the concerns of the Board.

Ms. Mather moved in Case #H-13-084 to approve, accepting the responses to the exception criteria, with the following conditions.

1. **Door finish and details would go to staff for review and approval;**
2. **Reduce the portal height by using a 12" cross beam;**
3. **Creation of a pilaster at the end of the parapet and that design would go to staff for review and approval.**

Mr. Armijo seconded the motion.

Chair Woods asked that the second condition say "the portal height per structural engineer specifications..." Ms. Mather agreed it was friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #H-11-035. 505A Cerrillos Road.** Historic Transition Historic District. Gabriel Browne, agent for McMojo LLC, owners, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a contributing commercial building by altering non-historic openings and constructing a roof deck on the front elevation. An exception was requested to alter the character of the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(C)(1)(a)). (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch /gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

505A Cerrillos Road, formerly 519 Cerrillos Road, and previously known as the Santa Fe Theater and later as car dealerships, is an 8,685 square foot commercial structure that was constructed by 1948 in the Moderne style. Reversible or non-character-defining alterations have preserved the historic integrity of the building and it is listed as contributing to the Historic Transition Historic District and the west elevation is designated as primary.

From 2007 to 2011, the Board conditionally approved remodeling of the building while preserving the distinctive primary west elevation.

Now, the applicant requests to amend the approval to remodel the structure with the following two

items, that will create a roof deck on the second floor west elevation.

1. Two existing windows will be removed and converted to doors in the existing opening dimensions. They appear to have single lites rather than divided lites like the existing conditions.

2. A safety railing is required for occupation of the roof deck. The railing will be black steel that mimics the unique front façade design. A small area of brick detailing will be extended vertically beyond the roof deck. An exception is required to alter the character of the primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(C)(1)(a)) and the required exception responses are as follows.

EXCEPTION TO ALTER PRIMARY ELEVATION CHARACTER

(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

We feel that this design builds on the unique character of this specific façade. (By using and building on the pagination of the glass and columnar posts below from the Historic Dealership photos that have been presented).

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The historic character of the primary façade will be altered with features that mimic the historic details and change the character of the streamlined design.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

The Street below retains the same walkway and sidewalk path. By using the roof space above as horizontal space for gathering - we feel the pedestrian nature of the space will be greatly enhanced. (The use of this space by the local tenant will be of great value).

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The applicant has not described a potential hardship or injury.

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

The specific design we are intending is unique to the character of this building and does remain in Historic Context. As we have presented to the public before for these building proposals – we will endeavor to present a clear and specific design not only in 2 Dimensional Drawings but also in 3D Computer Walkthrough.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The mimicry of unique detail creates a false sense of historical development. The applicant has not described design options available that would visually recede, rather than compete with the historic design, such as a stuccoed or brick wall.

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

This building is unique to Santa Fe – both in type and character. We are planning to enhance and building on these – **site-specific** characteristics.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. Enhancing the historic character of the building does not maintain its integrity.

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

The nature of this existing space and design lends towards both its intended design and use.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The applicant has not described special conditions or circumstances.

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

The overall building height and character of the façade will be maintained.

Staff response: Staff does not agree with this statement. The character of the streamlined façade will be altered by this proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the applicant has not met the exception to alter a primary elevation and recommends that the roof deck be redesigned in a more simplified manner that does not compete with the character defining details.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather had trouble reading the material. The extension of the balcony seemed to go up to the light fixtures.

Mr. Rasch said the applicant could clarify that.

Ms. Mather asked on page 23, the west elevation, if 3 was the revised and 4 were the proposed.

Mr. Rasch agreed that #4 was the proposal.

Ms. Mather referred to page 24, the south elevation, and asked what #2 was.

Mr. Rasch said that was the current approval.

Ms. Mather asked about the "funny little posts shown there.

Mr. Rasch said except for the far left side, that was the proposed for tonight. He didn't know how much had been built. The Land Use Director did some minor tweaking after the Board approved the top.

Ms. Rios asked if it was Contributing.

Mr. Rasch agreed and the west façade was primary.

Ms. Rios asked if he felt this proposal would keep it from being contributing. Mr. Rasch agreed.

Chair Woods asked if that meant the applicant would have to ask for it to lose its Contributing status.

Mr. Rasch said no.

Chair Woods said to the applicant that the Ordinance specifically said the Board couldn't approve a proposal it would cause the structure to lose its historic status. She offered that perhaps they could work together to get a design that would work. The proposal would make changes to the primary façade.

Mr. Rasch agreed and shared the wording of the ordinance and here, the primary façade was the west façade. So preserving the west façade would be enough to keep its status.

Chair Woods read from 14-5.2 d, 3 a concerning remodeling that "no increase in height was permitted." And this proposal adds to the height on the primary elevation and changes historic materials. That made it an uphill struggle.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Gabriel Browne (previously sworn) said his partner and the owners were also present. He agreed they were in an uphill battle. This elevation was already destroyed in the late 1980's and it was all stuccoed over with steel windows installed. If they had come back then and asked to restore the original façade he thought the Board would have seen that they were restoring something to enhance its original status.

They now had a tenant who want to use the front space and needed more height. None of the glass or steel in that elevation was original. They would just raise the rail to 42" to make it capable to be occupied and new doors.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Katz asked if there was a way to use the posts on the first story to extend without the lollipops on top but just a band across so it was not so busy. Mr. Browne agreed that was possible.

Chair Woods suggested if they needed that space, they had architecturally defined railings all over and that was blocking the wavy façade on top. If the applicant could take the railings they proposed but set them back slightly from the façade and keep them simple, they would get the deck and the Board could see the original façade. They had worked a lot with this building and done a good job. The Board stretched the limit to keep the contributing status and couldn't do that any further but the Board still wanted to get what was needed for the tenant while keeping the contributing status.

Chair Woods asked Mr. Rasch if that would work.

Mr. Rasch agreed. The most minimal railing and most visually penetrating would be best.

Ms. Mather agreed with both Mr. Katz and Chair Woods. The lollipop detail was a visual distraction. The doors should have a light pattern that mimicked the existing windows. And the steel front would block off what the Board hoped to keep visually.

Ms. Rios asked what those lollipops were.

Mr. Browne said they were light fixtures.

Chair Woods said he would have to put different light fixtures there and that could be brought to staff.

Mr. Armijo asked if converting the windows to doors would change the status.

Chair Woods said if they kept the window width ad used the same light pattern, it could be maintained.

Ms. Rios agreed. The ordinance allows that.

Mr. Rasch agreed. To take out a nonhistoric window and keep the same header height and width didn't require an exception.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Chair Woods said the motion would need to be very specific and might not be exactly what the applicant wanted. Or the Board could ask the applicant to bring something back with a postponement.

Mr. Katz said he would be a whole lot more comfortable in doing that. He asked if the Board could get it back by the next meeting.

Mr. Rasch said they could if the Board postponed to a date specific. He said he would need drawings by Monday.

Mr. Browne agreed to that.

Mr. Katz moved to postpone Case #H-11-035 to April 22nd. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Case #H-14-017. 208 & 208½ Polaco.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. John Delamater/Delamater Family Trust Partnership, agent/owner, request an historic status review of a contributing residential structure. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

208 and 208½ Polaco Street is a duplex that was constructed in a vernacular manner by 1948. The building is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant proposes an historic status review and provides information regarding dates and types of alterations. Of particular importance are the additions of two portals with materials that are not harmonious to the building and replacement of all doors and most windows. One historic wood casement and several historic steel casement windows are retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff defers to the Board regarding the amount of non-historic alterations and its impact upon the historic status of the building. The loss of historic windows and doors is not significant and the portal additions are reversible treatments.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Rios asked if on the door replacement, the openings had not changed and also with the windows.

Mr. Rasch said the doors were the same but windows might be different. The footprint would remain except for the portals.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Ms. Lynn Eirleger, 200 Old Pecos Trail.

Chair Woods asked if she wanted to represent this property which was for sale. Ms. Eirleger agreed.

Questions to the Applicant

There were no questions of the applicant.

Public Comment

Present and sworn was Mr. John Delamater who said he was the owner and wanted to say why they wanted to do this. He bought it 35 years ago and tried over the years to keep it up. The whole

neighborhood has gotten so much nicer and this house didn't improve the neighborhood. It was in his best interests to make it noncontributing but it would improve the whole neighborhood if something nicer were built there.

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

Action of the Board.

Ms. Rios pointed out that deterioration didn't mean it should be noncontributing and as contributing he could still renovate it.

Ms. Rios moved in Case #H-14-017 to have the building remain as contributing with the east façade as primary. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-14-017 to revise the status to non-contributing because of the number of changes made to it. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Rios who opposed.

5. **Case #H-14-018. 661 C Garcia Street**. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Miguel da Silva, agent for Lynne and Joe Horning, owners, proposes to convert a garage to a studio on a non-contributing property. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

661-C Garcia Street is a 3,000 square foot single-family residential structure and free-standing 490 square foot garage that were constructed in the late 20th century in the Territorial Revival style. The buildings are listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. The garage would be converted into a studio by removing the vehicle door and replacing it with three 3-lite clerestory windows, one of which will be operable as an awning with the other two fixed, and a single-lite awning window at the north side of the west façade. The remaining wall infill will be finished with Core-ten metal siding.

2. A 3' foot deep eyebrow will be installed on corbel brackets that will wrap around the west elevation to the south elevation. The eyebrow will be finished with Core-ten metal.

3. Also on the south elevation, a 9-lite pedestrian door with lower panel and a 9-lite awning window will be installed with Territorial surrounds.

4. Three small square awning windows will be installed on the north elevation.

5. Additional site alterations include two low dry-stacked retaining walls that will more clearly limit the driveway and parking areas and a flagstone path that will lead from the back of the studio to the residence.

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

Chair Woods asked where the Core-ten steel would be used.

Mr. Rasch said it would be on the remaining infill on garage and the eyebrow. He pointed it out on the elevation.

Chair Woods asked if that much percent of a façade was allowed to be metal.

Mr. Rasch said that the building was not publicly visible. It was far back from Garcia Street. He read from Recent Santa Fé Style in which he said the percentage was for a publicly visible façade. So the Board could approve the Core-ten metal.

Ms. Mather thought there was a public right of way in front.

Mr. Rasch said that was a private drive way. The public could drive up the drive without trespassing.

Ms. Mather said it was only not visible because of wall and gate. She asked what it looked like.

Mr. Rasch said it was a dark brown rusted steel.

Ms. Mather asked about the pattern of the windows and why it had the unusual pattern there.

Mr. Rasch didn't know why

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Miguel da Silva, 931 Shoofly, had nothing to add.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Katz said it was puzzling why the applicant wanted that steel.

Mr. da Silva said it was not stucco at the moment. They intended to keep the trim around the garage door which had a natural stucco stop. The Core-ten was pretty natural in a way.

Mr. Katz asked what was the reason was for the unusual light pattern.

Mr. da Silva said three of the windows would mimic the garage door and the others would gather too much solar gain.

Mr. Armijo was not familiar with Core-ten and asked if he brought a sample or pamphlet.

Mr. da Silva said it was uncoated metal that would rust and they would use flat sheets.

Mr. Armijo said many times people would keep the garage doors and insulate it inside.

Mr. da Silva said he would be open to wood instead of metal but the door was plastic. It was meant to look like carriage doors.

Mr. Rasch showed them pictures of it.

Mr. da Silva explained it had four sections and the detail was stamped into the plastic.

Chair Woods said when the gate was open this door was very visible from Garcia Street. And if the gate were ever replaced the Board would ask it be fenestrated. The applicant left the trim as it was but the unsymmetrical windows and then this overhang were a concern.

Mr. da Silva asked if it was the lack of symmetry that concerned her.

Chair Woods agreed but also the Core-ten metal. The eyebrow comes 3/4 around the corner.

Mr. da Silva asked why it needed the symmetry.

Chair Woods said it was because he left the trim in the door.

Mr. da Silva said it was not visible from Garcia Street whether the gate was open or closed.

Chair Woods said when they went by today it was visible.

Mr. Katz said it was visible from the driveway only.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Ms. Mather moved to postpone Case #H-14-018 so the applicant could come back with a different design not incorporating the Core-ten siding and providing either symmetry or non-symmetry but not both. Mr. Armijo seconded the motion.

Ms. Rios asked if she was postponing to a date certain.

Mr. Rasch said there were already 10 cases on the next agenda.

Ms. Mather withdrew her motion.

Mr. da Silva said if the Board wanted to discuss not having Core-ten or not extending the overhang he was open to that.

Chair Woods suggested centering the overhang over the garage and have symmetrical windows and remove the Core-ten.

Mr. da Silva offered to use old barn door material and added that he could extend the awning all the way. The interior didn't lend itself to having glass all the way and maybe he could make it look like four panel openings.

Chair Woods said he could frame something but not necessarily have it be glass.

Mr. Armijo understood but noted that the interior was just a hallway leading back to the bath.

Mr. da Silva said if it was a deal breaker he didn't have a problem putting more glass on the west side of the door.

Mr. Armijo asked if the window he would be adding would just face the kitchen cabinets.

Mr. Da Silva asked if he meant putting the window all the way across.

Mr. Armijo agreed - continuous window. That was what Chair Woods was suggesting.

Chair Woods said centering the eyebrow and abandoning the Core-ten were her big concerns.

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-14-018 to approve the application with the conditions that the proposed surface material on the west elevation be replaced with barn wood rather than Core-ten, that the windows go all the way across symmetrically and that the eyebrow be symmetrical over the current door opening. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. **Case #H-14-019. 707 Agua Fria Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Richard McManus, agent for McManus Family Living Trust, owners, requests designation of primary elevations on a contributing residence and requests to demolish a contributing garage. An exception is requested to remove historic materials and degrade the historic status (Section 14- 5.2(D)(1)(a)+(D)(5)). (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

707 Agua Fria Street is a single-family residence and free-standing garage that was constructed by 1912 in a Mediterranean Revival style. Both structures are listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

The applicant requests that the Board assign primary elevations to the contributing residence and proposes to demolish the garage with an exception to remove historic materials (Section 14-5.2(D)(5)) and degrade the historic status (Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a)).

EXCEPTION TO DEMOLISH A CONTRIBUTING HISTORIC STRUCTURE

(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

• Garage is constructed of cement blocks which is nonconforming

• Demolition of said garage would enhance streetscape by allowing a view of more of the historic windows of the residence.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement, concrete block construction shall be stuccoed.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare

• Garage is not useable in its current size and state of disrepair. (see photos)

• Existing footprint allows for only one parking space; removal of the garage prevents that hardship to the applicant.

• Garage is located very close to Dunlap Street which impedes the neighbor's view when they enter or exit their driveway.

• Many of the cement blocks are missing adequate mortar.

• There is evidence of fire damage within the structure's ceiling which is a safety concern.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

• Removal of a nonconforming cement block structure enhances the streetscape of the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

• Removal of the structure will solve issue of the space being used as a place to dump trash and/or for habitation.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

• Removal of the structure will alleviate the encroachment which exists on the neighbor's property.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

• The property was purchased by the owners in December 2013 and the garage pre-dates their ownership.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

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

• If demolition is approved, owners plan to carefully remove and preserve the matching metal roof tiles from the garage prior to demolition. These will be used for possible future repairs on the roof of the house.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the board grant the exception request to demolish the contributing garage or otherwise recommends that the east and south elevations of the residence and the east elevation of the garage be designated as primary elevations.

Mr. Rasch explained the design in front and back elevations.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather said it seemed a number of windows were no longer historic. Certainly the west was most character defining and perhaps the most original.

Mr. Rasch said that was the east elevation. The inventory said the south and east original windows were replaced with picture windows and the north and west replacements were single light aluminum casements and picture windows and small windows on the dormers. So there was replacement of windows. He wasn't sure about dimension changes.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard McManus, 707 Agua Fria, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Questions to the Applicant

Ms. Rios asked when the picture windows were added.

Mr. McManus said he didn't. There was one owner since 1948 and it was grandfathered in as he hit the fifty year mark.

Ms. Rios asked if he agreed with staff recommendations.

Mr. McManus said he did.

Mr. Armijo said, based on looking at it, it was made out of block so he was not sure how contributing it was . It was more of a chicken coop. All he saw were the tiles.

Mr. McManus said they intended to keep the tiles.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Ms. Rios moved in Case #H-14-019 that the south and east façades be designated primary, that the applicant met the exception criteria and that the request for demolition was approved. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

7. **Case #H-14-012. 223-225 Johnson Street**. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis agent for Conroad Association owner, proposes to meet a previous HDRB condition by reducing the scale on the overhang above the rear door on a significant commercial building. (David Rasch).

Mr. Rasch gave the staff report as follows:

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

225 Johnson Street is a commercial building that was constructed with brick in the Territorial style by 1902. Located adjacent and to the rear of 225, 223 Johnson Street is a similar building that was constructed before 1908. Non-historic additions were placed at the rear of both buildings and the addition on 225 connects the two buildings together. Both buildings are listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

On February 25, 2014, during the HDRB field trip, the Board saw that an oversized door overhang was installed without approval. At the public hearing to remodel the property that evening, the Board's action included the need to remove the overhang or bring it to the Board for approval.

Now, the applicant proposes to retain a redesigned overhang that has similar character but in a smaller depth and height. The overhang will be the same width as existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Questions to Staff

Ms. Mather asked if they were going to paint it.

Mr. Rasch didn't know.

Applicant's Presentation

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis, 200 West Marcy, who said they did intend to paint it.

Questions to the Applicant

Mr. Armijo asked what was changed.

Mr. Purvis said the window overhang would be 16" instead of 60" but the width was the same.

Chair Woods asked if he was still using the big framing members.

Mr. Purvis said no. He showed them the new framing members. All the big pieces were gone except the little piece where it hits the wall.

Public Comment

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Action of the Board.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-14-012 per staff recommendations and that the color of the wood elements would match the rest of building. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

G. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said he didn't get any award nominations by April 4th. He still needed to find a location, date, time and poster and he had cosponsors working.

Chair Woods said she didn't get the categories.

Mr. Rasch agreed to send them to her.

Chair Woods said if they listed new construction and remodels it might help.

Mr. Rasch said a co-sponsor was working with one of the potential award winners and might find space within that building. And would be a great poster.

H. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Mather said she would just be getting back from Mexico the night before the next meeting.

Chair Woods said Ms. Walker couldn't be here next time.

Ms. Mather said she would be here then.

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.