



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 12/29/11 TIME 3:50

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, January 10, 2012 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2nd FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, January 10, 2012 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES December 13, 2011
- E. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case # H-10-033 801 Griffin Street
Case # H-11-122 740 Acequia Madre
Case # H-11-125 828 Camino Atalaya
Case # H-11-115B 9 & 9½ Montoya Circle
Case # H-11-123A 127 West Water Street
Case # H-11-123B 112 West San Francisco Street
Case # H-11-131 806 Old Santa Fe Trail

Case # H-11-132 246 Rodriguez Street
Case # H-11-135 412 East Palace Avenue
Case # H-11-137 403 Canyon Road
Case # H-11-111B 940 East Palace Avenue
Case # H-11-133B 1228 Cerro Gordo Road
Case # H-11-138 544 Canyon Road

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

1. Case # H-11-151. 250 East Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residence, owner, propose to construct a 2,880 two-story addition in front of the existing three-story façade and remodel 1,245 square feet of one-story structure on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
2. Case # H-11-12B. 215 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Brokedown Palace, LLC, owner, proposes to construct an 826 square foot second-story addition to the maximum allowable height of 20', partially enclose the front portal, replace windows and doors, reconfigure arched openings, and perform other minor alterations on a Non-contributing commercial property. (David Rasch).
3. Case # H-10-17B. 62 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associate Architects, agent for Jennifer Lind, owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a Contributing commercial property by installing roof-top mechanical equipment and signage. Three exceptions are requested to install roof-top mechanical equipment that is publicly visible (Section 14-5.2(D)(3)(b)), to install signage above 15' on a façade (Section 14-8.10(H)(26)(a)(i)(d)), and to install more than three signs on the property (Section 14-8.10(H)(3)(a)). (David Rasch).

4. Case # H-11-142. 608 Miller Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Gwynne & Joe Brooks, owners, proposes to change various windows and doors and re-stucco a Contributing residential property. (John Murphey).
5. Case # H-11-139. 711 Don Cubero Alley. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Lynn Kingsbury, agent/owner, proposes to install two publicly visible skylights, remove a chain link fence, construct a stuccoed yard wall to 5' 5" high where the maximum allowable height is 6', and install a pedestrian gate to a height of 6' 8" on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
6. Case # H-11-140. 535 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architecture, agent for Stephen Crozier, owner, proposes to change various windows and doors, construct approximately 10' high portals, construct interior screening walls, install solar thermal and photovoltaic panels and make other changes to a Non-contributing residential property. (John Murphey).
7. Case # H-11-141. 115 East Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jeff Seres, agent for Greer Enterprises, owner, proposes to remodel a storefront by removing a ground floor window and portion of a wall to create a new recessed entry and make changes to an ADA ramp on a Non-contributing commercial property. (John Murphey).
8. Case # H-11-143. 207 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Annette Vigil, agent for Andres & Lorren Viamonte, owners, proposes to reconstruct a former second-story portal at less than the adjacent parapet height and replace a square post with a viga post on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch).
9. Case # H-11-144. 622 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Judd Kleinman, owner, proposes to remodel an existing yard walls by constructing pilasters, install metal pedestrian gates, and increase the height of the walls with additional stuccoed mass and iron fencing to the maximum allowable height of 4' 10" on a Contributing residential property. (David Rasch).

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

J. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. If you wish to attend the January 10, 2012 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, January 10, 2012.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
January 10, 2012

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes December 12, 2011	Approved as amended	2-3
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	3-6
Communications	Discussion	6
Business from the Floor	Discussion	6-7
Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-11-051</u> 250 East Alameda Street	Postponed to February 14	7
2. <u>Case #H-1'-112B</u> 215 East Palace Avenue	Approved with conditions	8-12
3. <u>Case #H-10-117B</u> 62 Lincoln Avenue	Partially approved	12-21
4. <u>Case #H-1'-142</u> 608 Miller Street	Approved as recommended	21-23
5. <u>Case #H-1'-139</u> 711 Don Cubero Alley	Approved as recommended	23-24
6. <u>Case #H-1'-140</u> 535 Camino del Monte Sol	Approved with conditions	24-29
7. <u>Case #H-1'-141</u> 115 East Water Street	Approved as recommended	29-30
8. <u>Case #H-1'-143</u> 207 Sena Street	Postponed to January 27	30
9. <u>Case #H-1'-144</u> 622 Gomez Road	Postponed to February 14	30-31
Matters from the Board	Discussion	31-33
Adjournment	Adjourned at 7:52 p.m.	33

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FÉ
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

January 10, 2012

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, 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. Rad Acón
Dr. John Kántner
Mr. Frank Katz
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Fasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Mr. John Murphey, Historic Planner
Ms. Kelley Brennan, 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 announced that the first case on the agenda, #H-11-051, was postponed by the applicant

and would be heard on January 24, 2012. The last case on the agenda, #H-11-144 was also postponed by the applicant and would be heard on February 14, 2012.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 13, 2011

Ms. Rios asked for the following changes to the minutes:

On page 23, line 4 of the verbatim minutes, it might require checking the recording but it should say, "... the movement moving of one building..." [Stenographer's note: In review of the recording, the word spoken was "movement," not "moving."]

On page 44, 3rd line from the bottom should be, "Ms. Rios asked if ~~none~~ any of materials were ~~not~~ historic."

On page 60, tenth paragraph, should read, "Ms. Rios asked for the width of the columns on the porch and the kind of materials they proposed to use."

Ms. Walker asked for the following changes to the minutes:

On page 6, 3rd paragraph from the bottom, she asked Mr. Zamora if he told the Council that this was only an advisory opinion and they were free to do what they chose.

On the top of that page, second paragraph, it said, "I've seen you do quite meticulously." She asked what Mr. Zamora was referring to there.

Ms. Mather thought it referred to checking the records.

Ms. Walker referred to page 25, one third of the way down where Mr. Herrera said "Sorry, but for you guys to just be intimidated are ridiculous and..." She said she responded, "Ray, what makes you think we were intimidated?" [Stenographer's note: In reviewing the recording, the minutes at that point were accurate as submitted.]

Dr. Kantner requested the following change to the minutes:

On page 30, in his first statement there should have quotes for "Each structure to be recognized has a physical record of its time and place and use." The statement in the minutes had no quotation marks.

Ms. Mather requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 7, fifth paragraph, "families" should be "familiar."

On page 16 at the bottom of the page, where it said, "So I want to stress that = those points." She was not sure what was going on there. [Stenographer's note: The words used were correct but a dash should have been there instead of an equals sign.]

On page 63, center of page when Mr. Acton was speaking – it should say "using old ~~hard~~ barn material."

Mr. Katz was puzzled on page 63 by the motion that Mr. Acton made. He moved to approve the case per staff recommendation but the staff recommendation wasn't to approve so he was not certain what was meant there.

Mr. Rasch clarified that staff recommended denial of using wood siding on a publicly visible elevation but otherwise recommended approval of the rest.

Mr. Acton said he then said "accepting the responses to the exception regarding the wood"

Ms. Walker moved to approve the minutes of December 13, 2011 as amended. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-10-033	801 Griffin Street	Case #H-11-132	246 Rodriguez Street
Case #H-11-122	740 Acequia Madre	Case #H-11-135	412 East Palace Avenue
Case #H-11-125	828 Camino Atalaya	Case #H-11-137	403 Canyon Road
Case #H-11-115B	9 & 9½ Montoya Circle	Case #H-11-111B	940 East Palace Avenue
Case #H-11-123A	127 West Water Street	Case #H-11-133B	1228 Cerro Gordo Road
Case #H-11-123B	112 West San Francisco Street	Case #H-11-138	544 Canyon Road
Case #H-11-131	806 Old Santa Fé Trail		

Mr. Katz said in Case #H-10-033 he thought there should be an additional finding of fact between 14 and 15 and he didn't have language but it should say something like, "Jan Biella, the State Historical Preservation Officer, stated in her letter to whomever it was that on whatever date it was, that moving the building - whatever it was that she said. As I recollect, she stated that she thought it was problematic and one of the standards for a significant building or landmark is what the State or Feds have done. It's not controlling but it is a factor. It is certainly a factor that we would consider."

And then in 15, he thought they needed the factual language a little beefed up there. He quoted from it, "Moving the Casitas in components and reconstructing them in a new location with some historic material and some new material does not preserve the historic integrity of the casitas. It jeopardizes their listing on the State Register of Cultural Properties and therefore will cause them to lose their landmark status them as landmarks within the meaning of SFCC §§14-5.2(C) and (D)." He proposed adding that language but he

didn't have the letter so he couldn't say what was said in the letter.

Mr. Rasch agreed to review the letter and talk with Mr. Katz on the following day to get that corrected.

Chair Woods said she knew she needed to sign it the next day but she wouldn't sign it unless she knew that it said what the Board said.

Mr. Katz agreed to email the language to her and Mr. Rasch.

Ms. Mather said in the Conclusions of Law for Case #H-11-123B, #2 should read, "Any proposed doors or windows of 127 Water on the west and east elevations go to Board for review." She said that was from page 50 of the minutes.

Mr. Katz said in the Conclusions of Law for Case #H-11-133B it now said, "The Board concludes that the project had met the one exception criteria." He said the word "one" should be deleted because he didn't just meet one of the criteria but all of them.

Mr. Katz said in Case 11-138, which was the 544 Canyon Road case, he believed on finding #6 regarding character defining elements that they were found on the north and the south elevations.

Mr. Katz asked if for case 11-115B they had a revision on that.

Mr. Murphey said there was a revision.

Mr. Katz asked if the Board was allowed to see the revision. He said until the Board saw the language on it they could not approve that one.

Mr. Murphey said he changed the language this morning.

Mr. Katz said he would love to see it. Significant changes were required; it wasn't just a few words.

Mr. Murphey apologized. He said he thought that only the citations were to be changed.

Mr. Katz said that was not the case. This was a demolition request and the code had all kinds of criteria for demolitions that must be met so the Board had to make findings that those criteria were met. Those were not in the findings so that one should not be approved here.

Ms. Mather had a general suggestion but Chair Woods asked that they first approve these and thought Ms. Brennan had some words of wisdom as well.

Chair Woods asked, based on what had been said, if they had a motion to approve these except for Case 115B.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the findings of fact and conclusions of law as amended as discussed with the exception of Case #H-11-115B. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Ms. Mather suggested that since the Board was trying to be much more careful with the Findings of Fact that perhaps when they reviewed them for errors, they could consider them one at a time instead of flipping back and forth through them.

Other Board members agreed with that suggestion.

Chair Woods agreed and asked when members found a need for a correction to email the staff immediately.

Ms. Brennan explained that the new appeals ordinance provided that on day 31 after the hearing that the appeal period was triggered if days were triggered if the Board or other land use board had not approved findings. So because of the Board's schedule, if the findings were not adopted at the next meeting, the appeal process would run before they were approved. So she suggested that they come up with a method where if people, when they saw the findings and had a comment, that they email them to staff so that staff could make the corrections and recirculate them to members and that way could vote on them at the next meeting and avoid that contingency. They had one right now where the findings were not adopted within the two week period.

Chair Woods complimented everyone for really looking at them now that the members could not speak in front of Council to make sure these things were accurate.

Mr. Boaz asked for clarification whether the findings of fact and conclusions of law had to be approved within two weeks after the meeting.

Ms. Brennan said it did not. However, for the purposes of appeal, it was best if they were approved at the next meeting immediately following the decision of the Board.

The Findings should also reflect what happened in the meeting. It is not an opportunity to correct what was not done in the meeting - to make findings the Board did not actually discuss and didn't inform the Board's decision and were not in the record. She also encouraged the Board to not just focus on the Findings but also on the minutes and to give the reasons why "you vote as you do and the things that informed your decision - that were important to you as you make your decision. Because when those are in the record, they can be incorporated in the Findings." They should not be included in the Findings if, in fact, they are not in the record."

Chair Woods asked about what Mr. Katz was talking about with the issue of demolition. She didn't think with demolition that they needed to cite the entire code to which they were referring.

Mr. Katz said he never remembered anything. He did not have a clear recall how they phrased the

approval of the demolition of those houses on Montoya Circle.

Ms. Brennan assumed that if they were presented as a demolition case that the code sections were cited and the oversight was in the findings. In other words, in a demolition case, there were certain findings the Board had to make and staff typically set those out. She didn't think the Board had to recite the whole code. The code was there and what was important were the reasons why the Board believed it met the criteria or didn't meet the criteria for whatever decision the Board was making. That was what needed to be made clear in the proceedings.

Mr. Rasch said with demolition, one of the 3 standards you use to determine if the demolition was approvable was whether the structure was 75 years old and had been referred to the Archaeological Review Committee. But if the Board didn't discuss that, it couldn't be one of the findings.

Ms. Walker had a question on 403 Canyon on conclusions of law in the last sentence what "postpone" meant.

Chair Woods reminded her that they had already approved them.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch said regarding appeal matters that tomorrow night the Governing Body would hear the status review of the Kay Wagner house that determined the residence and the casita were Significant.

There was also an appeal on the 806 Old Santa Fé Trail property signage which would be heard sometime in February. He anticipated the appeal on St. Kate's would likely also be heard by the Governing Body in February.

Ms. Brennan clarified that the Council packet was posted on the web site on the City Clerk's page. The appellant's name was Jernigan and members could navigate to it.

Ms. Walker cautioned that it was a long document to print out.

Ms. Brennan agreed; it was about 75 pages long.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Present and sworn was Ms. Stefanie Benito, 604½ Galisteo, who had two matters. One was that her residence on Galisteo, a Contributing adobe home, was flooded on August 21st because the drain in front of the driveway got covered with leaves and the water from 45 houses on Santa Fé Avenue came down her driveway and into an opening on her property. The water pushed off a cover and pushed its way through the earthen foundation and she had a foot of water in her house. She had been trying to negotiate with the

City to do something different at the street there because this was the second time in ten years that the water had come off the street and onto her property. The first time - a historic drain probably to Acequia Madre - the drain took the water the first time and she had asked the City to do something. There needed to be something done there with a larger opening that would accept leaves. Something was done at another place on the street. She was asking the Board to help her. It was a contributing building. It was earthen foundation - not even rubble.

Secondly, the City now had two Air stream trailers selling food and she believed they were structures. Neither of them met the code. Slurp, across from the State parking structure was one. And now another was at 502 Old Santa Fé Trail across from Kaunes. She believed they must be brought to the Board for approval. If they were permanently attached to the ground it was a structure. They had a significant electric cable so she believed they were structures. Slurp was obviously not itinerant because it had been there over a year now.

Present and sworn was Mr. John Dressman on behalf of the Downtown Merchants Association. There was something in one of the two bond issues for \$100,000 to do something with the electric box on the plaza. He hoped staff had learned to bring it here for approval of whatever they planned to do with it. He asked that the Board reject mitigation of it. There might be other things to spend that money on and he hoped the Board would have some influence to bring it here.

Chair Woods received a letter from Deborah Potter [attached as Exhibit 1] that said,

"Honorable members of our H-Board: I thank you for the service you do for all of us. Your time and effort keeps our beloved city beautiful and 'different.' without your work, it might be neither."

"In the last few years, I've noticed many business signs in the historic zone that are more than three colors or do not include a color that is also on the business's building. "As you know, our sign ordinance requires three colors only and one color to match part of the building. Although most signs seem to be of adequate size, there seems to be a proliferation of red-yellow-black or metallic-white-turquoise-black signs on adobe and white colored buildings, downtown and on Canyon Road. Please ask that the sign approvals division uphold this requirement. It's a good section of the law and it needs to be respected."

"Sincerely, Deborah Potter"

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. **Case # 1-11-051** 250 East Alameda Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Duty & Germanas Architects, agent for El Castillo Retirement Residence, owner, propose to construct a 2,880 two-story addition in front of the existing three-story façade and remodel 1,245 square feet of one-story structure on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

The case was postponed under Approval of Agenda.

2. **Case #H-11-112B** 215 East Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Architectural Alliance, Inc., agent for Brokedown Palace, LLC, owner, proposes to construct an 826 square foot second-story addition to the maximum allowable height of 20', partially enclose the front portal, replace windows and doors, reconfigure arched openings and perform other minor alterations on a Non-contributing commercial property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

215 East Palace Avenue is a commercial property that was constructed before 1951 in a vernacular manner and altered in a non-conforming manner before 1964. It is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

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

1. An 826 square foot addition will be constructed as a second-story to the maximum allowable height of 20'; although the submitted drawings scale out to 20' 6" and a height exception has not been requested. The addition will be set back to approximately the center of the footprint and it will feature a flat overhanging roof with exposed rafters
2. Existing parapets will be raised 24" to accommodate two roof decks.
3. Approximately half of the front portal will be infilled and installed with non-divided storefront windows that are 4' back from the front.
4. All windows on the east and north elevations and one window on the west elevation and all doors on the north and west elevations will be removed and replaced with 30" compliant windows, where necessary.
5. The arched portal openings will be squared-off in a more compliant style.
6. Mechanical equipment, solar panels, and skylights will be installed on the roof.
7. The front steps will be reconfigured with the addition of an ADA compliant ramp and planters will be constructed at the portal pilaster bases.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ms. Walker referred to his third point in the staff report and asked what it was four feet from.

Mr. Rasch said it was four feet from the portal.

Ms. Walker asked if the applicant did say the mechanical equipment would not be visible.

Mr. Rasch said no; he just noticed them on the plans and the Board could clarify that tonight.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, who said the building status was reviewed 3 months ago and it was determined to be non contributing. The building was also in great need of upgrades. It was partially uninsulated; the roof was compromised and the heating system was outdated. They proposed to address those issues in a renovation that would include PV solar panels, a second story studio space and new fenestration on the south, north and east façades. As a clarification on the staff report, the height of the building would not exceed 20' so they didn't have to ask for an exception. He thought Mr. Rasch measured it on the west elevation and felt it was six inches off.

They would raise the parapets for the new roof deck, insulation and a new roof. The canales were at the line of the parapet now.

The front steps didn't require ADA ramp so there would be no rails required for it.

The air conditioning units were existing units on the building and with a 2' higher parapet they wouldn't be visible.

He brought larger plans for the Board to read more easily [attached as Exhibit 2]. He also went through them using full-sized plans on an easel.

They didn't propose to change the footprint of structure. There were various additions to it with one in the 50's; one in the 60's in back; and one in the 70's a portal that wrapped around. That was enclosed in the 80's. What they proposed was to add a second story set way back in an area where they had to replace the roof so they were lowering the ceiling for the artist studio. All skylights were behind parapets and not visible. Mechanical units were shown to be replaced in their existing locations. From the floor plan it was obvious there were no major changes on interior. The biggest change was enclosing portion of portal at the southeast corner. It was originally enclosed and he had a picture of that. There was just one bay to be enclosed. He shared the photo from the historic worksheet to show the storefront that existed there. It was ugly [attached as exhibit 3].

They were replacing the store front and the west elevation would remain as is. They were replacing windows on the east and north façades and adding a small stair and second floor studio at 22x28'. Elevations showed the storefront we were adding - squaring off the arches and bringing in more Santa Fé style.

The back addition had a flat roof and exposed rafters that would be left and used as an enclosed

workroom. They would use that flat roof detail on the second floor to stay within the 20'.

Some walls had no insulation and they proposed 2' solid insulation. He wanted to change stucco color from Sandalwood to Suede. They placed samples on the wall for the owner to choose and he preferred Suede. Mr. Enfield passed around a color chart to show the difference.

They also would add a smaller window on the north and a new door on the east at existing openings. They were shown as new. They also showed a wood stove in the east gallery and no visible chimney would show - just a vent pipe.

All of this work would enhance the downtown area and help restore this building.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone who wished to appeal a decision of the Historic Design Review Board had 15 days from the date of the approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of law for that case to appeal it to the Governing Body.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and previously sworn, Ms. Stefanie Beninato had a general objection -part of the problem as happened with the Hilton was that the Board usually took staff recommendations pretty much wholesale. All the staff were doing was reviewing a proposal but they didn't hear from both sides. At the state level, staff heard from the public first.

Secondly, the ordinance put the onus on the Board to look at the elements to see if the proposals met code and at times, staff were making legal decisions and at times architectural decisions. Staff could say they meet submittal requirements and staff could identify the parts that meet code. It would make the whole process better and she applauded the Board for taking more time with Findings of Fact. She would push Council to require verbatim minutes because things get lost with summary minutes. That was an objection to all cases tonight.

Ms. Walker asked if the mechanical equipment, skylights and solar panels were not visible from street.

Mr. Enfield said none of those would be visible from the street.

Ms. Walker pointed out that in the zoning review worksheet it said no parking information was provided and 3 spaces were required. He asked if that was true.

Mr. Enfield explained that Zoning signed off on this on December 29th. They had said because of the extra square footage that his client would be required to seek three spaces and lease them for a minimum of five years. But he didn't think that was accurate because they did not take into account that it was once completely enclosed but that would be dealt with at time of building permit. His client would seek to lease three parking spaces downtown.

Ms. Mather asked if there was any lighting on this building.

Mr. Enfield said there was lighting under the portal. They planned to have lights between the portal beams so they wouldn't be visible. One was required at the back door. There was a security light there now. His client would be willing to submit light fixtures.

Ms. Mather asked about lights on the second floor.

Mr. Enfield agreed one was required at the exterior door and he would make a note on that.

Mr. Acton said he had a four foot setback on the Palace side. Any lighting in the soffit must be submitted to staff as well.

Mr. Enfield said they didn't talk about lighting in the soffit area and would rather highlight the interior of the building at the storefront area.

Ms. Rios asked if he thought the greatest impact of the second story was on Cienega Street.

Mr. Enfield said one would see a small portion between the two buildings. That could be seen on C-1 that view corridor and on C-2 you could see the very small portion that would be visible. Most of it was behind the buildings.

Chair Woods said there was a sheer two-story wall on one façade. She asked if that was 20'. Mr. Enfield agreed and the other three were set back.

Chair Woods was also concerned about the various fenestrations. There were a lot of different things going on in the building. For the second story on east and south she asked him to talk about those windows.

Mr. Enfield asked if she meant the long horizontal windows. Chair Woods agreed.

Mr. Enfield explained that because it was an art studio, they wanted a minimum amount of windows on the south side and figured that visibility from Palace would be minimal. From Palace, you wouldn't know that was a long linear window. It would suggest a bigger window that could not be seen from the ground. You could tell it was not from Drury Hotel. They wanted to minimize the light on the east and south because he wanted to open up the north side with glazing that would allow a lot of light in but not affect his art work.

Chair Woods said this was right in the middle of the historic east side and those windows were not historic style. If they were broken up in a series of small clerestory windows it could be considered more historic but not a single long window.

Her other concern was the storefront windows. They were fairly contemporary looking - not symmetrical and this was right on Palace Avenue. On existing east there were nice divided light windows but they were

not on the west elevation. So many things were not consistent.

Chair Woods reviewed the concerns expressed in the Board's discussion - no lighting fixtures, suede stucco, no visible rooftop including stove vent, height not to exceed 20', and her concerns about fenestration.

Ms. Rios asked him to respond to Chair Woods's suggestions.

Mr. Enfield said it was already a fenestration nightmare and without the expense of replacing windows on the west and paying homage to the old adobe that actually was there on the east side, the one they chose to fenestrate in a more traditional manner were in the old adobe portion. They would maintain the existing windows on the west side. For the high windows on the gallery they wanted to have a clerestory feel. They did the same thing at the New Mexican. Their visibility was low so didn't look like long linear clerestory windows. But he would entertain breaking up the horizontality of them for the window that faced south and the window that faced east. Chair Woods was right it would make it look less contemporary.

Dr. Kantner asked if it would be possible to match the pattern of the other window there.

Mr. Enfield said those windows were only 12 inches high so he divided them as if they were divided to meet the thirty inch rule. But he felt having three windows and then a space would work.

Chair Woods suggested two windows and a space, two windows and a space, and two windows.

Mr. Enfield agreed to do that.

Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-11-112B with the following conditions:

- 1. That any exterior lighting be reviewed by staff;**
- 2. That the stucco color be suede;**
- 3. That no rooftop appurtenances be visible;**
- 4. That the second story will not exceed 20';**
- 5. That the fenestration on the south and east elevations have the long horizontal windows broken up by two windows spacing. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 3. Case #H-10-117B 62 Lincoln Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd & Associates Architects, agent for Jennifer Lind, owner, proposes to amend a previous approval to remodel a Contributing commercial property by installing roof-top mechanical equipment and signage. Three exceptions were requested to install roof-top mechanical equipment that was publicly visible (Section 14-5.2(D)(3)(b)), to install signage above 125' on a façade (Section 14-8.10(H)(26)(a)(i)(d)) and to install more than three signs on the property (Section 14-8.10(H)(3)(a)). (David Rasch)**

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

62 Lincoln Avenue, previously known as El Oñate Theater (the Cassell Building) and now known as the First National Bank, was originally constructed in 1920 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style with a remodel in 1954. The building's historic status in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District was determined during the previous case this evening. If it listed as contributing, then the east and north elevations may be considered as primary.

On January 11, 2011, the Board conditionally approved remodeling that included removing the mechanical unit from the Plaza-side, east elevation of the building. The Board action stated that there shall be no publicly-visible rooftop equipment or that any equipment shall be screened.

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

1. A large mechanical unit was installed on the rooftop without permission and it is publicly-visible from both Palace Avenue and San Francisco Street. The unit is located on a lower roof, but it is taller than the adjacent highest parapet. The applicant requests an exception to have publicly-visible rooftop equipment (Section 14-5.2(D)(3)(b)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.

14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts

In any review of proposed additions or alterations to structures that have been declared significant or contributing in any Historic District or a landmark in any part of the City, the following standards shall be met:

(3) Remodeling to Increase Height; Rooftop Appurtenances

- (b) For significant and landmark structures, publicly visible roof top appurtenances, including but not limited to solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment, shall not be added nor shall the parapet be raised to conceal the rooftop appurtenances. For contributing buildings solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment if publicly visible shall not be added.**

2. New signage is proposed for the east elevation on the portal parapet. The signage will be above 15' from grade and an exception is requested to place a sign on the façade in excessive height (Section 14-8.10(H)(26)(a)(i)(D)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report.

14-8.10(H) Special Sign Regulations in the H Districts

(26) Wall Signs

(a) Area Limitations

- (i) A wall sign is subject to the following limitations:**

- D. No sign shall be permitted 15 feet or more above street grade measured in front of the façade where the sign is to appear.**

3. New signage is proposed for yardwalls at the parking lot. The signage is intended to be directional, i.e. entrance and exit. But, they also propose the Bank name on them, so that they are also business signs. Only three business signs are allowed and with this application a total of four or five business signs are proposed. An exception is requested for excessive signs (Section 14-8.10(H)(3)(a)) and the required criteria responses are at the end of this report. Also, since business signs are allowed only on yardwalls when they are deemed necessary (Section 14-8.10(H)(4)(a)), it does not seem necessary for the business name to be placed on these directional signs.

14-8.10(H) Special Sign Regulations in the H Districts

(3) Number of Signs

The total number of signs allowed is as follows:

- (a) **For up to two business establishments on one premises, no more than three signs per business, the total area of which for any one business shall meet the size limitations for specific types of signs as set forth in this section, or 85 square feet, whichever is less, exclusive of free standing signs.**

(4) Prohibited Locations

- (a) **No permanent signs shall be placed on a balcony, gallery, shed, roof, door or window or placed so as to disfigure or conceal any architectural features or details of any building, or painted on walls. No sign shall be displayed from any fence or wall or open lot unless it is deemed necessary to the conduct of a business by the Division, in which event a waiver of regulations can be allowed.**

EXCEPTION FOR PUBLICLY-VISIBLE ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT:

- (i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

The proposed painting will minimize the visual impact of the equipment within the massing of the existing building, and in the context of the backsides of all the buildings on the block will not damage the character of the district.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, the unit will be still publicly visible and a violation of the Land Use Code.

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

There is no interior location available inside the existing building for this equipment, which replaces the equipment removed from the Plaza side of the building, and it's location on this back roof was required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, there has been no submittal showing space allotment before or after the proposal and the City was not informed before the work was performed that created the so called hardship.

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

This proposal is not applicable to the goal of strengthening 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.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response, since the commercial structure cannot be used for residing in the district.

- (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.

As a remodel project this situation is a result of constraints imposed by the existing building and is thus 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.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, as the applicant has not stated how this building differs from others in the streetscape.

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

As a remodel project this situation is a result of constraints imposed by the existing building and is thus due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, as the applicant has not stated how this building differs from others in the streetscape.

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

We believe this will provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in §14-5.2(A)(1).

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, since a space allocation has not been provided and the substantial remodel may have provided an interior location for this unit or perhaps a ground mounting.

EXCEPTION FOR SIGNAGE ABOVE 15' ON A FAÇADE:

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

The proposed signage is typical for the frontages on the Plaza and replaces existing signage and will not damage the character of the district.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

There is no wall area available on the existing building within 15 feet above the sidewalk so that the proposed signage location was required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

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

This proposal is not applicable to the goal of strengthening 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.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

EXCEPTION FOR EXCESS SIGNAGE, MORE THAN THREE:

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

The additional signage with the business name is needed to identify the entrance to the private parking lot, and as it replaces existing signage it will not damage the character of the district.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, since the directional needs do not require a business sign to achieve their purpose and a full-time attendant ensures the private parking use.

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

Policing the use of this downtown parking lot is a significant issue for the bank and signage identifying the specific business operating the lot is required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff is not in agreement with this response, since illegal parking will not be stopped simply by posting a sign.

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

This proposal is not applicable to the goal of strengthening 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.

Staff response: Staff is in agreement with this response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the exception request to install publicly-visible rooftop equipment, approval of the exception request to install signage above 15' on the east façade, and denial of the request to exceed the allowable number of signs for this business and place business signs on yardwalls.

Mr. Rasch said on the board members' desk was an amendment to build a screen wall to screen the rooftop equipment. The applicant could address that.

Chair Woods said the amendment placed on their desks was not for a new screen wall but for a parapet wall. Mr. Rasch agreed the amendment would extend the existing parapet.

Ms. Rios asked if the windows shown with the rooftop equipment were supposed to be divided.

Mr. Rasch agreed that the Board had approved four-lite windows and he believed the applicant had a solution for permanently affixing Muntin on the interior and exterior.

Present and sworn was Mr. Alan Baer.

He agreed there were a number of issues and addressed the window muntins first. They would be applied - these were fire windows - literally not windows but translucent walls for the fire code so they would apply the Muntin to the inside and outside to get the divided look.

The mechanical equipment there did grow during construction with a higher plenum than expected because it was used as a mixing chamber. They had originally proposed a paint solution or a screen wall painted or stuccoed. But the bank directed him today to propose a full parapet wall to screen the equipment and that was the amendment in front of the Board of three pages [attached as Exhibit 4].

He said they intended to keep that parapet wall below the high parapet and there might be some of the equipment visible over that parapet and they would be willing to build the wall and have it reviewed prior to finishing it with story poles. They intended to take it over to where the wall stepped up and in fact step down there. That was shown on the drawings on the desk.

Regarding the signage on the front - the reason they requested an exception was that they had no wall lower than 15' to put the sign on. They were actually returning to a sign that preceded the sign there now. The original sign materials and colors would be the same here. The letters were aluminum and the logo aluminum. The other signage would be two colors - aluminum plaque and charcoal brown letters. The directional signs into parking lot were to make it clear that this was for patrons of the bank and not a downtown parking lot. That was the reason - it was not advertising the bank but trying to mitigate the policing of that lot. It was obviously a very desirable location to park but was minimal for the bank and monitored constantly. He stood for questions.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz asked if for the signs on the parking lot if it would be okay to say bank parking only. Mr. Baer agreed.

Mr. Katz felt the screening wall didn't look sufficient because it appeared to be higher than the high wall.

Mr. Baer said they looked from the Delgado House and it was just about exactly the same as the high wall. It would be in front and he had not done an angle study on it for cutoff of view. They were asking for an exception that could be part of tonight's case.

Mr. Katz wondered if it would be wise to delay that part for the story poles.

Mr. Baer said they were pressed for time on it and trying to finish construction by the end of the month.

Chair Woods asked if it would be a height exception.

Mr. Rasch said if it did exceed the height of the high wall, it would require a height exception. This hearing was posted for a sign exception but not for a height exception.

Mr. Katz pointed out that they were not asking to go higher than that other parapet wall so it would not require an exception.

Mr. Rasch pointed out that if the equipment was still visible they would need an exception for publicly visible equipment.

Mr. Acton asked if matching the existing high parapet was okay.

Mr. Rasch agreed it would be as far as the height ordinance was consider. It would be the Board's call if they felt the change would alter the status of the building. But he reminded the Board and the west and south elevations were not primary.

Ms. Brennan confirmed that if the height matched or was lower, an exception would not be required.

Chair Woods said Mr. Baer believed it would work at the same height.

Mr. Acton asked if they had exhausted all options on the plenum. Mr. Baer agreed.

Chair Woods asked about the windows shown on page 2.

Mr. Baer said the red drawing that was being passed around had the muntin pattern which would mimic the rest of the windows.

Chair Woods didn't understand the red drawing.

Mr. Baer explained that one window got too close to the adjacent addition so it was half of what the other windows were. There were six windows across the south elevation. 5 full and one was a half window.

Mr. Acton asked if they could take parapet to existing height but just to the south until it got past the unit and then dropped it to match the other parapet height.

Mr. Acton said that was acceptable.

Chair Woods asked how he would do that.

Mr. Baer pointed out the configuration of what he drew. It would look more like an elevator shaft and he concurred with Mr. Acton's recommendation.

Ms. Mather thought they would still have a problem with the duct work.

Mr. Baer said if they painted the duct work to match the stucco color no one would ever see it or they could have the parapet one foot higher for that.

Ms. Mather asked about the color of the muntins.

Mr. Baer said they would be Smoky Slate and they would paint the trim to match existing.

Ms. Rios asked for clarification when the board heard signage.

Mr. Rasch clarified that the Board hear signage only if it didn't meet code.

Chair Woods summarized the discussion: the muntins and raising of the parapet to hide the rooftop appurtenance. The highest they could go without an exception was the height of the parapet behind and Mr. Acton suggested stepping it down to cover the ducting and if the motion approved the sign, it needed to cite the code.

Dr. Kantner asked what would happen if after raising the parapet to the current height of the building it still made the unit visible.

Chair Woods said that could be put in the motion.

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-10-117B to accept the staff recommendation to deny the exception to install publicly visible rooftop equipment, to approve the exceptions for the request to install signage above 15' on the east façade and to deny the request to exceed the number of allowable signs advertising the business on the side walls and allowing them to have a sign that said bank parking. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Acton moved to approve Case #H-10-117B per staff recommendations that the exception for the sign above 15' was accepted, that the exception for the additional signs stating First National Bank in the parking area was denied and that the proposal submitted and discussed here was accepted with the following conditions:

- 1. That the parapet was brought up to the height of the existing parapet and brought over horizontally to the east to the extent that it satisfactorily screened the rooftop appurtenance;**
- 2. That the section of the parapet in front of the ductwork be raised to sufficiently hide the duct work;**
- 3. That the window muntin pattern on the translucent wall sections be accepted.**

Ms. Mather seconded the motion.

Ms. Walker thought that to bring up the parapet height enough to screen the appurtenance might exceed the existing height in which case the applicant would have to ask for a height exception.

Mr. Acton accepted that and added another condition:

4. That the mechanical box be painted the same color as the stucco.

Mr. Katz explained the reason he made his motion was that he didn't want to see the equipment and if they could not build a parapet wall that would hide it without an exception, he didn't want it. So he suggested denial of an exception to see the rooftop equipment and that would allow them to do the parapet to existing height.

Ms. Mather asked for a friendly amendment that the color of window muntin match the existing colors of the rest of the building. Mr. Acton accepted that as friendly.

Chair Woods requested a friendly amendment that the muntin pattern be as shown in the revised submittal.

Ms. Rios said in reference to what Mr. Katz was saying, this motion indicates that the wall would be same height as the higher portion and they would paint the equipment same color of building. She asked if any portion of it showed, whether the motion said the applicant would have to come back.

Mr. Acton indicated he didn't require the applicant to come back.

Mr. Katz asked what the motion did with the request for an exception to let the rooftop equipment show. He asked if the motion would deny or grant that exception.

Mr. Acton said he technically was accepting it but would accept a friendly amendment.

Mr. Katz proposed adding a friendly amendment to deny the request for an exception to allow the equipment to be visible.

Mr. Acton agreed with it but would allow a screening device. That was a recourse.

Chair Woods clarified that if the rooftop equipment was still visible that the applicant come back for solutions. Mr. Acton accepted that as friendly.

Chair Woods also requested that the exception for signs at parking be accepted. Mr. Acton said the request for an exception was denied as submitted but accepted if the signs said "bank parking" with no bank name or logo.

The motion as amended passed by unanimous voice vote.

[Stenographer's Note: No code citations were given in the motion for the denials of exception requests.]

4. **Case #H-11-142** 608 Miller Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Wynne & Joe Brooks, owners, proposes to change various windows and doors and re-stucco a Contributing residential property. (John Murphey)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Constructed in several phases, starting in c.1929, 608 Miller Street is a one-story adobe Spanish-Pueblo Revival style residence with additions and a separate guesthouse. It is contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

In 2000, the then-owners came before the Board with a major renovation project. They were approved to change windows and doors on all elevations of the main house. This included swapping steel casement and awning units for wood casements and changing windows into doors. In addition, they were permitted to attach the carport to the residence, construct a new entry and portal along the north elevation, and make other changes. The Board approved a separate application in 2000 to modify the guesthouse with an addition to the west, installation of new windows and doors, the construction of a parapet over the portal, and other alterations.

The current applicant proposes to remodel the residence with the following items:

Main House:

Replace 12 windows with insulated, true divided light wood units fabricated to match light pattern and operation of existing windows.

Change a fixed six-light window with an awning component (#6) at the southeast corner of the master bedroom to a door; remove and fill in its companion (#5) on the other side of the corner.

Replace non-historic main entry door with a solid wood door with sidelights.

Guesthouse:

Replace three non-historic windows with true divided light wood casements; openings will remain the same.

Insulate the main house, carport and guesthouse with 2-inch rigid insulation and stucco with cementitious El Rey "Navajo White." The house is currently stuccoed in an off-white.

Staff made a site visit to the property with the applicant on December 2, 2011 and recommended the east (street-facing) elevation as the primary façade. Staff observed at the time—combined with a later review of photographs from the 2000 project—that most of the windows and doors proposed for replacement are non-historic. Despite their appearance, the wood casements on the primary façade are replacements of steel casement and awning windows. The origin of the two fixed six-light windows is unknown, but they most likely post-date 1962.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Ms. Mather referred to the summary of the main house, second sentence and asked what the numbers referring to there.

Mr. Murphey said it referred to the window schedule and those numbers were the corner windows seen during the site visit today.

Ms. Mather asked if on the east elevation shown on page 13 the darkish square was an opening being infilled. Mr. Murphey agreed.

Ms. Mather asked if he recommended the east elevation as primary. Mr. Murphey agreed.

Ms. Rios asked if this proposal would affect its contributing status.

Mr. Murphey believed it wouldn't affect the status.

Present and sworn was Mr. Christopher Purvis who said he had a picture of the proposed door to be replaced at #1. He shared copies of the picture [attached as Exhibit 5].

Mr. Purvis concurred with staff recommendations.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Walker asked what was there now [door #1].

Mr. Purvis said it was a pair of French doors with no side lights.

Mr. Acton asked if he had really concealed the labels on the elevations. He asked Mr. Purvis to take pity on the Board.

Mr. Purvis apologized to them.

Ms. Walker moved in Case #H-11-142 to designate the east façade as primary and to approve the application per staff recommendations. Mr. Acton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

5. **Case #H-11-139** 711 Don Cubero Alley. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Lynn Kingsbury, agent/owner, proposes to install two publicly visible skylights, remove a chain link fence, construct a stuccoed yard wall to 5' 5" high where the maximum allowable height was 6' and install a pedestrian gate to a height of 6' 8" on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

711 Don Cubero Alley is a single-family residence that was constructed in a vernacular manner at an unknown date. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. Two skylights on tall curbs were added to the roof without permission or a building permit. The skylights are publicly-visible from the alley.
2. An existing chain link fence along the alley was removed without permission or a demolition permit.
3. A stuccoed yardwall will be constructed in the rear yard to the maximum allowable height of 5' 5".
4. A 6' 8" high pedestrian gate will be installed in the new yardwall. The wooden gate has diagonal panels below and wooden slats in an upper window. Finish stain or paint color was not stated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Ms. Mather asked Mr. Rasch to show the Board where on the lot plan this yard wall was located.

Mr. Rasch showed where the new yard wall went.

Present and sworn was Ms. Lynn Kingsbury, 711 Don Cubero Alley, who said she was not aware that if the project was not visible in front it still had to come to the H Board. The contractor didn't either and put the skylights in. He did get a permit for all the other work. When they demolished some of interior they found beams there. In place of the chain link fence she wanted a stucco wall.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if she was going to stain the pedestrian gate.

Ms. Kingsbury said it was stained and a photo of it was submitted. It was mahogany color.

Dr. Kantner asked if the publicly visible skylights in the alley required an exception. Mr. Rasch didn't think so.

Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-11-139 per staff recommendations. Ms. Walker seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Acton questioned requiring a demolition permit a chain link fence.

6. **Case #H-11-140** 535 Camino del Monte Sol. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan Architecture, agent for Stephen Crozier, owner, proposes to change various windows and doors, construct approximately 10' high portals, construct interior screening walls, install solar thermal and photovoltaic panels and make other changes to a Non-contributing residential property. (John Murphey)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Constructed around 1970, 535 Camino del Monte Sol is a sprawling, mainly one-story adobe residence associated with its architect, William Thomas Lumpkins (1909-2000), who lived there with his wife Roberta for seven years, between 1970 and 1978.

Designed around a courtyard—a central aspect of the architect's residential work—it consists of a multi-massed plan designed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The plan includes a two-story circular tower at the northeast corner and a separate guest suite, formerly a garage, at the southwest.

The house experienced a major renovation in 1998, converting the garage into living quarters, replacing the Pueblo-inspired portals and expanding the kitchen. A project in 2001 replaced a majority of windows and doors; another project after 2001 replaced the courtyard portals with Japanese-influenced tile roofed porches. And at some point, the original vigas and canales were shorn off. The only surviving element of Lumpkins' original design is the circular tower.

The applicant proposes a major remodel of the residence. The aim of the renovation is to simplify and modernize the home's lines by removing non-historic elements—the portals, oversized canales, Japanese-style porches. Openings will be greatly simplified and mid-century (revival) elements will be introduced,

including unpainted steel fascia and horizontal and vertical screening.

The specific proposed work includes:

Main House

North: Eliminate non-historic shed-roof portal and replace with simplified flat-roof structure measuring approximately 10' in height. Install steel screens across portion of portal. The fascia, as with all replacement portals, is of unpainted steel.

Remove wood casement windows and replace with clear anodized aluminum finish units of various operations.

Expand ground floor window opening and install larger fixed window in volume adjacent to tower; frame window with wood planking. Change detail of second story window of same volume.

East: Eliminate non-historic shed-roof portal and replace with simplified flat-roof structure measuring app. 10' in height.

Remove wood casement windows and replace with clear anodized aluminum finish units of various operation; some windows to include wood plank treatment below the sill.

Remove second story balcony railing; replace with off-center design.

South: Eliminate non-historic shed-roof portal and replace with simplified flat-roofed structure measuring app. 10' in height.

Remove wood casement windows and replace with clear anodized aluminum finish units of various operation; some windows to include a wood plank treatment below the sill.

West: Remove double set of carved wood entry doors.

Remove wood casement windows and replace with clear anodized aluminum finish units of various operations. In some instances, doors will be replaced with windows.

Construct privacy walls north and south of main entry. (A third privacy wall is incorporated in the portal on the north elevation). The walls will attach to the house and measure 7' to 10' in height. Horizontal untreated steel beams will cover 50% percent of the openings between the house and the walls. The walls will be board-formed concrete finished with a clear sealer.

Courtyard: Eliminate Japanese-style porches.

Roof: Install solar thermal and photovoltaic panels.

Exterior: Clad entire envelope with Sto Corp "Sahara"; window and door trim to be painted "medium grey."

Guest Suite: Remove shed-roof portal on east elevation; replace with simplified structure. Construct a flat-roofed portal measuring app. 10' in height across south elevation; install vertical and horizontal screens.

Carport: Revise freestanding structure with construction of two enclosed storage rooms; work to include unfinished board-formed concrete walls.

Greenhouse: Remove and revise c.1981 structure.

Walkway: Revise pedestrian entry path, by removing steps and landing; work will include constructing an app. 18" high retaining wall.

Staff made a visit to the property with the applicant on November 18, 2011. The house, as described in the application letter, is down a hill with no visibility from Camino del Monte Sol or any other public way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

He added that the stucco color was changed to Sahara.

There was a very oblique view through vegetation so there was some visibility.

Ms. Rios asked if the ordinance allowed openings without muntins whose panes were bigger than 30".

Mr. Murphey said it did.

Mr. Rasch explained that in the old Santa Fé style section that was not permitted. In the recent Santa Fé style section no windows were allowed to be closer than 3' from a corner.

Dr. Kantner said recent Santa Fé style was supposed to be like old Santa Fé style so he thought it would continue that restriction.

Mr. Rasch quoted from the code that "doors and windows that are publicly visible shall be one of the old Santa Fé styles."

Mr. Katz asked what publicly visible meant. Specifically, he asked to what extent vegetation that might not survive was considered.

Mr. Rasch read the section on publicly visible. He said the Board had practiced in the past that structures could screen but not vegetation.

Chair Woods asked if in this case if the trees died it would be seen.

Mr. Rasch agreed but how much was not clear.

Chair Woods thought sight lines could be used to determine it.

Mr. Rasch showed pictures of the property from Camino del Monte Sol.

Mr. Acton noted it was somewhat blocked by the carport roof.

Present and sworn was Mr. Trey Jordan who said his clients bought this house because they thought they were buying what could be a sculpture. The underlying assumptions were to take the parts done by Bill Lumpkins and set them off with this material and profile. They wanted to keep the soft lines of the house and they loved the gumdrop windows very much. That was how he proceeded on this.

He said regarding the concern on visibility that from Monte Sol it was just at the south of the property. He didn't remember that part but with the gate open, part of it would be visible and they would be willing to use that softer profile at that point.

The existing coyote fence would not change if trees changed. His clients always wanted to do something contemporary and felt this would have little or no impact on streetscape

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. Katz was puzzled by the top two elevations. He asked what happened to all those windows.

Mr. Jordan said they would be hidden by the new courtyard walls.

Mr. Katz said it looked like the new wall was lower.

Mr. Jordan clarified that they wanted to eliminate the change in height.

Mr. Katz said his concern was visibility from Camino del Monte Sol and it appeared they wouldn't see anything that the code required.

Mr. Jordan didn't realize that the second floor would be visible. The small existing windows on that upper level facing west they would be happy to divide but would still replace them and would insure those windows responded to code as one of old Santa Fé styles.

Ms. Mather said the new walls on the west elevation were very rectilinear and lacked the softness he said he liked. She asked if that was on purpose.

Mr. Jordan agreed. Everyone knew this had been altered in many ways. They wanted to layer on a new chapter and not have the new walls look like the old. His clients were fans of Photo voltaic systems and solar system so it was intentional to make it look like it had not been done at the same time.

Ms. Mather thought the gate looked cantilevered.

Mr. Jordan said there was no gate there.

Chair Woods was concerned about the legality of publicly visible parts with the use of materials not allowed in the ordinance. She asked if they could do whatever they wanted where it was not publicly visible.

Ms. Brennan said the ordinance governed what was publicly visible.

Ms. Mather countered that in recent Santa Fé style the code said the materials would be those of old Santa Fé style.

Mr. Rasch read the preamble to the Eastside code section and then read the section on recent Santa Fé style.

Chair Woods said Ms. Brennan said it didn't matter if it wasn't visible publicly.

Ms. Brennan said in the code, height and cantilevering didn't refer to publicly visible but all the rest specifically said public visibility. After the preamble it listed the standards were for publicly visible façades.

Ms. Mather agreed but the preamble didn't refer to publicly visible provisions.

Ms. Brennan agreed it didn't specifically mention it.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Walker if as a realtor that houses not publicly visible were not subject to the historic ordinance.

Ms. Walker said she could not say that to a buyer because she didn't agree with that interpretation. She didn't think you could do whatever you wanted just because the public had difficulty seeing the house. That was what she would tell her clients.

Ms. Rios said the Recent Santa Fé Style part said it must retain old style materials so windows had to be divided.

Mr. Rasch agreed for publicly visible windows.

Ms. Brennan said it included similarity of materials also.

Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-11-140 to approve the application with the condition that the second

story windows on west elevation remain divided lites and could be replaced. Mr. Acton seconded the motion.

Mr. Acton felt the only consolation was that the building had such strong and historic massing that it could take this hit and still be a wonderful expression of Santa Fé style.

The motion passed by majority voice vote with all in favor except Ms. Walker and Ms. Rios who were opposed.

7. **Case #H-11-141** 115 East Water Street. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Jeff Seres, agent for Greer Enterprises, owner, proposes to remodel a storefront by removing a ground floor window and portion of a wall to create a new recessed entry and make changes to an ADA ramp on a Non-contributing commercial property. (John Murphey)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Constructed in c.1994, 115 E Water Street is a two-story, arcaded storefront associated with Plaza Galleria, a retail operation spanning between Water and San Francisco streets. The storefront is noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the storefront by removing a ground floor window and portion of a wall to create a recessed entry. The proposed entry is a steel-and-glass door with sidelights. It will match the adjacent windows in terms of color and similar division of lights. As part of the project, the ADA ramp will be modified with the removal and replacement of steel handrail. The replacement handrail will be painted to match existing stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

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

Present and sworn was Mr. Jeff Seres who had nothing to add to staff report.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods asked what the colors of the windows were.

Mr. Seres said they would match existing window colors.

Ms. Walker moved to approve Case #H-11-141 per staff recommendations. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

8. **Case #H-11-143** 207 Sena Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Annette Vigil, agent for Andres & Lorren Vianonte, owners, proposes to reconstruct a former second-story portal at less than the adjacent parapet height and replace a square post with a viga post on a Non-contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

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

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

207 Sena Street is a two-story single-family residence that is part of a duplex which was constructed in approximately 1982 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

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

1. A porta will be reconstructed at the east elevation second-story deck. The portal roof will be located below existing canales and it will be stained to match existing woodwork.
2. The square post at the southeast corner entry portal on the ground floor will be removed and replaced with a viga post that is stained to match existing woodwork.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District.

Present and sworn was Ms. Annette Vigil who had nothing to add except that the clients wanted a change in the portal cover to Spanish tile. They were concerned about losing head height to get a slope on it.

Chair Woods said she would need to bring a sample of the tile and asked if she wanted to postpone it.

Mr. Katz moved to postpone Case #H-11-143 to the next meeting. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Woods explained to Ms. Vigil that the drawing would really change. Ms. Vigil agreed.

9. **Case #H-1' -144** 622 Gomez Road. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Dominic Sisneros, agent for Judd Kleinnan, owner, proposes to remodel an existing yard wall by constructing pilasters, install metal pedestrian gates and increase the height of the walls with additional stuccoed mass and iron fencing to the maximum allowable height of 4' 10" on a Contributing residential property. (David Rasch)

This case was postponed to February 14 under Approval of the Agenda.

I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Rios said in reference to comments made about the two trailers during Business from the Floor that she wondered if the Board would address any of them.

Mr. Rasch said Land Use had determined the trailers were not structures.

Chair Woods recalled that when Sonny Otero came before the Board it was determined that electrical hook up made it so.

Ms. Brennan disagreed. An electrical hook up was just a plug. Trailers were not allowed in this district but that was another matter. Itinerant food vendors were allowed. It had come up often like signs on a truck. In interpreting the codes they tried to balance the interests. They could unplug it and take it away.

Chair Woods was confused. She remembered the concern. It was a trailer permanently parked there. She didn't bring her copy of the code but remembered Karl Sommer saying there was a light in it and Sonny Otero couldn't put in the modular bathrooms because of that.

Dr. Kantner said if it attached to some permanently on the ground it was a structure.

Mr. Rasch said it was permanently affixed to a pole in the ground.

Ms. Brennan thought it would be fruitful for her to come back to the next meeting to address it. She was handling an appeal regarding Sonny Otero's trailer. There were several points of discussion and that was one of the least of the issues.

Chair Woods asked what made it permanent or not permanent.

Ms. Walker said the task force addressed that in the rewrite.

Ms. Brennan said in the current code it was sketchy and murky.

Mr. Katz pointed out that the people using these trailers could move their trailer three feet every week and then move it back. He was not sure that was a fruitful method of attack. It had to cover something other than structures.

Ms. Mather added that an Airstream couldn't be parked at her house because it violated the code but this was not.

Ms. Brennan said it was not simply a trailer but an itinerant food vendor.

Ms. Mather concluded that a roach coach could crop up all over the east side to sell food.

Mr. Acton said the permit wasn't time dependent. It could just sit there.

Chair Woods was discouraged. The H-Board couldn't answer questions in Council anymore and now trailers were allowed all over the east side. She said she had never been this discouraged.

Ms. Brennan said these things raised constitutional issues. A person's home was his or her castle and public regulation could only go so far on what could or could not be regulated by government. It was a constitutional concern how much that could intrude.

Mr. Acton agreed with that "but obviously that building took a hit."

Chair Woods disagreed. She had lived next to one and moved away. We would have to tell people.

Ms. Walker said they would have to ask her.

Mr. Acton asked Chair Woods if in her case it would have behooved her to approach that person about it.

Chair Woods said she never got to see it and it was already built. She didn't know it because there was no sign posted and staff could approve it.

Mr. Acton said this one was published in the paper and neighbors could have shown up.

Chair Woods countered that no sign is posted when staff approves it.

Mr. Rasch said, "Actually no. Four of five districts are very clear but not Eastside and Downtown. You are the authority over all exterior alterations."

The Board had more discussion on Mr. Jordan's building.

Mr. Acton said he was not finding Airstream trailers as a growing urban blight. They were interesting artifacts of the tourist history of Santa Fé and these were old restored Airstream units.

Ms. Mather agreed they liked Airstreams but many of them were not Airstreams and could show up.

Mr. Rasch said Chapter 14 revisions had been approved but not the H code and the revisions did

address temporary structure and makes it more restrictive.

Mr. Katz asked about having larger drawings.

Mr. Rasch said if they were of that size he would put them in the packet.

Chair Woods thought it would make sense to bring full sized drawings on the site visit.

Ms. Rios asked about labels.

Mr. Rasch agreed they needed to tighten that up.

J. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 pm.

Approved by:

Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer