**CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Sommer, Karnes & Associates, LLP, agent for G. E. Senlic, LLC, owner, requests to demolish a parking kiosk and stairwell and to construct a new four-story commercial hotel structure with two-level underground parking. Exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable building height, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(ii); to construct a pitched roof where fewer than 50% of the structures in the applicable streetscape have pitched roofs, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d); and to deviate from the district design standards, per Section 14-5.2(E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case number:</th>
<th>2020-001734-HDRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>HDRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LOCATION (S):** 200 Block of West San Francisco Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OW – G.E. Senlic LLC</th>
<th>P.O. Box 1627</th>
<th>Santa Fe, NM 87504</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP – Sommer, Karnes &amp; Associates LLP</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2476</td>
<td>Santa Fe, NM 87504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DATA:**

**HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Don Gaspar Area □ Downtown and Eastside ☑ Historic Review □ Transition □ Westside-Guadalupe □

**HISTORIC BUILDING STATUS**

Non-Statused □ Non-Contributing □ Contributing □ Significant □ Landmark □ N/A ☑

**PRIMARY ELEVATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North □</th>
<th>South □</th>
<th>West □</th>
<th>East □</th>
<th>N/A □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PUBLICLY VISIBLE FACADE-EAST**

Yes □ No ☑

**PUBLICLY VISIBLE FACADE-NORTH**

Yes □ No □

**PUBLICLY VISIBLE FACADE-SOUTH**

Yes □ No □

**PUBLICLY VISIBLE FACADE-WEST**

Yes □ No □

**HISTORIC DISTRICT INVENTORY NUMBER**

N/A

**YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION**

N/A

**PROJECT TYPE**

Status □ Primary Elevations □ Remodel □ Demolition □ New ☑ Other

USE, EXISTING

Residential □ Non-Residential ☑ Vacant □

USE, PROPOSED

Residential □ Non-Residential ☑

**HISTORIC BUILDING NAME**

________________________________________
City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: March 10, 2020
TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members
FROM: Lisa Gavioli Roach, Historic Preservation Division Manager

Case #2020-001734-HDRB
Address: 200 Block West San Francisco Street
(225 West San Francisco Street)
Historic Status: N/A (vacant)
Historic District: Downtown and Eastside

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

___ District Standards & yard wall
 & fence standards.

___ Historic Inventory Form

___ Zoning Review Sheet

___ Other: 1) Case #H-08-046 Findings of Fact
and Conclusions of Law; 2) Planning
Commission Staff Report, February 20, 2020

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

___ Proposal Letter

___ Site Plan/Floor Plan

___ Elevations

___ Photographs

___ Other:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the exception criteria for all three exceptions have been met and recommends approval of the application as it otherwise complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all H Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District.
BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

225 West San Francisco Street (also referred to as the 200 Block Hotel and 211 West San Francisco Street) comprises the parcel that is currently in use as a parking lot at the corner of West San Francisco and Sandoval Streets. A two-story commercial building previously existed on the site until the 1970s, when it was demolished during the expansion of Sandoval Street.

Adjacent to the parcel to the east are two significant structures. 211 West San Francisco Street, known as the Lensic Performing Arts Center, was constructed in 1930 in the Moorish Revival style. Infill on the west side and a rear addition constructed to 65-ft high have been determined to have not impacted the significant status of the structure. 219-223 West San Francisco Street, originally known as the Santa Fe Vogue College and known today as the Lensic Commercial Building, was constructed in the Spanish Baroque Revival style, also in 1930. Minor non-historic alterations have taken place at this structure but have also not affected the structure’s significant status.

The applicant requests approval to construct a four-story, 70-room hotel structure with two underground levels of parking. A previous iteration of the project with a similar footprint, style, and height, was brought before the Historic Districts Review Board in May and June of 2008 and was approved with conditions, having found that the proposal met the criteria for all three exceptions needed. The development plan for the current proposal was reviewed by the Planning Commission on February 20, 2020, and was recommended for approval to the Governing Body, who will review the project on March 26, 2020.

The four-story hotel building is proposed at a height of 49-ft with intermediate step-backs of 36.5-ft at the third story and 26.5-ft at the second story, providing balcony space and plantings to mitigate the height at the streetscape and create a two-story visual effect that is compatible with the adjacent streetscape on the block. An exception to exceed the maximum allowable height of 26-ft 2-in has been requested, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c), in addition to an exception to utilized a pitched roof design in a streetscape in which fewer than 50% of the surrounding structures have a pitch roof, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d), and exception criteria and responses have been provided below. Rooftop appurtenances, including a chiller, a stairwell for rooftop access, and an elevator overrun exceed the requested height by 8 feet and are excluded from the measured height, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(iii) and 14-7.1(C)(2).

The proposed building has been designed in Spanish Baroque Revival style, and arched elements at the first level reflect similar detailing on the adjacent Lensic Commercial Building. Although Spanish Baroque Revival style is allowable by the design standards in the underlying Business Capitol District – Lensic Block Subdistrict, the architectural design standards of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District do not specifically allow this style. A third exception is therefore also requested to deviate from the Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards, Section 14-5.2(E).
Existing structures on the site include an elevator formerly serving the adjacent commercial building, an exterior stair well, an ATM building, a guard shack for the parking lot, and a stuccoed concrete block wall around the perimeter. Demolition of these structures will be required by the proposed project. However, these non-historic structures do not have historic significance, and staff feels that they do not constitute essential components of a unique street section or block front.

**EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:**

*Exceptions 1 and 2: Exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable height, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(ii)(A) and to construct a pitched roof in an area where fewer than 50% of the surrounding structures have pitched roofs, per Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d).*

*(1) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.*

**Applicant Response:** The proposed building is in proportion to its setting and surroundings and fits into the context of the existing buildings in the vicinity. The 82’ El Dorado Hotel across Sandoval Street to the west and the 74’ Lensic Theater flyloft within the Property to the east are both substantially taller than the proposed 49' tall building. The proposed building complies with the maximum allowed height that the City Council set when approving the Subdistrict Design Standards in 2006 (including the intermediate stepbacks).

By approving the 49' maximum height and intermediate stepbacks, the City Council necessarily concluded that a building meeting these requirements would not damage the character of the streetscape. The substantially taller buildings to the west and east stand as evidence that proposed building will be compatible with the context of the vicinity and will not damage the character of the streetscape. The purposes of the roof pitch are to further reduce the apparent height of the building from the streetscape and to screen rooftop appurtenances while maintaining the building’s utility for its intended hotel use.

Also, in approving the Subdistrict Design Standards, the City Council required that the streetscape portion of the building be stepped-back, with a maximum height of 26.5' and the intermediate portion also be stepped-back, with a maximum height of 36.5'. The proposed building is consistent with each of these standards, which the Council set as part of its Design Standards for the Lensic Block. The stepbacks required by the Council are not provided for in the Historic Overlay Ordinance and are not accounted for in the applicable height calculation. Overall building height is but one element of the Design Standards, which taken together and viewed as a coherent whole, set forth the Council’s vision for the building.

Existing buildings around the proposed building are substantially taller. Adjacent to the east, measured from San Francisco Street the Lensic flyloft is 71' - 22' taller than the proposed building. Across Sandoval Street to the west, the El Dorado hotel is 68' (measured from Sandoval Street) 19' taller than the proposed building. The other buildings surrounding the Subject Property are the 42' Lensic Commercial building, the 30' Municipal Parking Garage and the 42' County building.

The Historic Overlay regulations do not consider 4 of the 5 buildings surrounding the Subject Property, two of which are substantially taller than the proposed building. However, in
setting a 49' maximum height limit, the City Council did take the context of the Subject Property into account and concluded that a building of 49', with specified step-backs and underground parking would be harmonious with the character of the streetscape. The proposed building, with a maximum height of 49' and a parapet height of 46', is in proportion to its setting and will enhance, rather than damage the character of the streetscapes.

Staff Response: Staff agrees with this response.

(2) Prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

Applicant Response: In approving the Redevelopment Subdistrict, the City Council adopted a comprehensive set of Design Standards, of which the 49' height limit is but one component. The City Council also required that parking be provided underground and that the building include two intermediate stepbacks. The Council also allowed the building to be built to the front property line on San Francisco and Sandoval Streets, with portals within the public right-of-way. Instead of maximizing the building footprint, the applicant pulled the building back along its entire perimeter so that a publicly-available portal could be provided within the Subject Property, substantially increasing the width of the pedestrian walkway along San Francisco and Sandoval Streets as well as Palace Avenue and providing pedestrians with shelter under the portals.

The Council's adoption of the 49' height limit reduced the otherwise applicable height limit in redevelopment subdistricts by 16'. In adopting this standard, the Councilors were well aware that a building of that height would need a height exception from the HDRB.

Strict enforcement of the Historic District height standard would constitute a hardship by substantially reducing the height standard adopted by the City Council as part of its Redevelopment Subdistrict approval and frustrating the Council's intent and property owner's expectation that the Design Standards would apply and control with respect to building design. Imposition of the historic overlay height standard without taking into consideration the other Design Standards required by the Council would constitute an additional hardship.

The Council adopted the 49' height limit in combination with other design standards including two intermediate building stepbacks. The primary purpose of separating the rezoning decision from the building design was to provide Council direction to guide building design and avoid carrying out the design process in a vacuum. Strict imposition of a lower height limit in addition to the otherwise applicable Design Standards would violate the context of the Redevelopment Subdistrict approval to the injury of the applicant. Granting the requested exceptions for height and roof pitch would prevent the hardship and would be consistent with City Council's Subdistrict approval including the Design Standards.

Staff Response: Staff agrees with this response.

(3) 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.
**Applicant Response:** The City Council's approval of the 49' maximum height as part of the Subdistrict Design Standards demonstrates its determination that completing the Lensic block with a 4-story building will strengthen the unique character of the Lensic Block and, by extension, the heterogeneous character of the downtown. The Lensic Theater is an iconic downtown building that will be complimented by the new hotel, which will provide an opportunity for visitors to enjoy the downtown and further the purpose of the BCD as Santa Fe's economic engine.

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

(4) **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.**

**Applicant Response:** The Subject Property comprises about one third of the 0.99 acre parcel that accommodates two existing buildings: the Lensic Performing Arts Center and the Lensic Commercial building. The Property was larger until the mid-1960's, when the City condemned the western and northern portions of the property to accommodate the extension of Sandoval Street as part of an urban renewal project. Also, in conjunction with renovation of existing buildings on the property in the 1990's, Burro Alley was closed to traffic and some surface parking spaces were removed. These actions and the pre-existing buildings left a relatively small remnant area with limited vehicular access that has been used for private surface parking. Also, the Property was included in two BCD Townscape Subdistricts (Marcy and Plaza/San Francisco) each of which have different design standards. The City Council took these special conditions and circumstances into consideration in approving the Subdistrict and providing a single set of design standards for this block, including the 49' maximum height with intermediate stepbacks. No other development site in the vicinity is burdened by the obligation of constructing an underground parking garage that includes replacement of existing surface parking spaces.

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

(5) **Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of actions by the applicant.**

**Applicant Response:** The City Council approved the maximum height for the building as part of its Subdistrict Design Standards. Achieving a building height that complies with the City Council's approval requires approval of the requested exception by the HDRB. Neither the size of the Subject Property, the requirement for provision of underground parking in an amount equal to the demand of the new building as well as replacing the existing private surface parking spaces, or the requirement for step-back massing are the result of actions by the Applicant.

**Staff Response:** Staff agrees with this response.
(6) **Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in 14-5.2(A)(1).**

**Applicant Response:** As discussed above, the proposed building is lower than existing buildings adjacent to the property and in the immediate vicinity. The maximum height set by the City Council for the Property is 49' and was adopted as part of comprehensive Design Standards. The proposed roof pitch requires a separate exception because the only other building in the vicinity that has a roof pitch is the historic Delgado House.

The proposed roof pitch starts from behind the 46' high parapet and gradually extends to 49' at the top edge of the roof. The roof pitch was included to minimize the actual and apparent height of the building and to screen rooftop appurtenances while maintaining viable use of the Subject Property. The Applicant could have proposed a building with a 49' parapet and avoid the need for the pitch exception but chose to do so in an effort to provide the least negative impact with respect to building height, in compliance with this requirement.

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

---

**Exception 3: An exception is requested to deviate from the design standards for the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, per Section 14-5.2(E).**

(1) **Do not damage the character of the district.**

**Applicant Response:** By identifying Spanish Baroque as an allowed style as part of the Design Standards, the City Council concluded that this style would be appropriate for this site. The proposed building has been designed in the Spanish Baroque architectural style with the intent of complimenting the Moorish style Lensic Theater and the Spanish Baroque style Lensic Commercial building without imitating or duplicating the distinctive appearances of those buildings. The proposed style of the buildings on the Lensic block is unique in the downtown and the proposed building will provide a cohesive design for the three buildings on the block. The arches along the outside of the ground floor portales and the limestone coping on the tower at the southwest corner of the building exemplify the Spanish Baroque style. The balcony railings and window designs draw from features of the Lensic Theater and Lensic Commercial building, providing continuity and reinforcing the unique character of the Lensic Block, the smallest block in the downtown.

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

(2) **Are required to prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;**

**Applicant Response:** In its two-decade long application history, plans for the proposed building have reflected several different styles. Differences of opinion over what style would be appropriate have constituted a hardship for the property owner and their ability to obtain approval of a building and design. The hardship led, in part to the separate application process
that the property owner undertook in 2006 to request rezoning of the Lensic Block and creation of a single Redevelopment Subdistrict so that direction could be provided as to style and development parameters to guide design of the application before you. The City Council included the Spanish Baroque style in its approved Design Standards for the Redevelopment Subdistrict. This style requires an exception to avoid the hardship that would otherwise exist because the historic overlay was not amended at the time the Subdistrict was created to include the Spanish Baroque style approved by the City Council for this property.

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

**(3) 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.**

**Applicant Response:** The City Council’s approval of the Spanish Baroque style as part of the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict demonstrates its determination that this style will strengthen the unique character of the Lensic Block and, by extension, the heterogenous character of the downtown. The Lensic Theater is an iconic downtown building that will be complimented by the new building, which will provide an opportunity for visitors to enjoy the downtown and further the purpose of the BCD as Santa Fe’s economic engine.

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

**RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:**

14-5.2(A)(1) General Purpose
In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the city and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and development of the city, it is deemed essential by the governing body that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve property values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and preservation of historical areas and buildings;
(b) The continued construction of buildings in the historic styles; and
(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards
(1) Old Santa Fe Style
Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with adobe, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

(a) With rare exception, buildings are of one story, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the buildings are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight
slope and surrounded on at least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the walls or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the walls except to cover an enclosed portal or porch formed by setting back a portion of the wall or to form an exterior portal, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns. Two-story construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the floor of the second story. Façades are flat, varied by inset portales, exterior portales, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-spouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, often slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding walls;

(b) All exterior walls of a building are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under portales, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a wall under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color, or have mural decorations;

(c) Solid wall space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;

(d) The rule as to flat roofs shall not be construed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof structures, but such structures other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the street on which the building fronts;

(e) True old Santa Fe style buildings are made of adobe with mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the adobe effect can be simulated is permissible; provided, that the exterior walls are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating adobe, laid on smoothly, is required; and

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style
Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

(a) No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks or other design elements;

(b) The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;

(c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;

(d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible
façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;

(e) The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic; and

(f) Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

14-5.2(D)(9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing and Floor Stepbacks

The height, pitch, scale, and massing of any structure in an historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted within this chapter.

(c) Height

(i) Official map of building heights in the historic districts - procedures.

A. The historic districts review board shall recommend the adoption of an official map reflecting building heights in the historic districts to the governing body. This map shall be used for the purpose of regulating building height in the historic districts. The map shall be adopted at a public hearing of the governing body, which hearing shall be advertised in a local newspaper no less than fifteen days prior to the hearing. All affected property owners and owners of lots or of land within one hundred (100) feet, excluding public right-of-way, of the property affected shall be notified of the public hearing by first class mail, mailed at least fifteen days prior to the public hearing. The official map shall be adopted by the governing body by ordinance.

B. The official map of building heights in the historic districts may be amended from time to time. This historic districts review board shall make recommendations to the governing body for the amendment of the official map, at a public hearing. Such hearing shall be advertised in a local newspaper no less than fifteen days prior to the hearing.

C. The governing body shall hold a public hearing on any amendments to the official map. The official map, inclusive of amendments, is hereby adopted by reference and incorporated as if set out herein. Such public hearing shall be advertised in a local newspaper no less than fifteen days prior to the hearing. All affected property owners and owners of lots or of land within one hundred (100) feet, excluding public right-of-way, of the property affected shall be notified of the public hearing by first class mail, mailed at fifteen days prior to the public hearing.

D. The official map is available in the city planning office and is accessible at all reasonable times for inspection.
(ii) In exercising its authority under this section, the board shall limit the height of structures as set forth in this section. Heights of existing structures shall be as set forth on the official map of building heights in the historic districts.

A. If a proposed building has a parapet, the façade shall not be in excess of two (2) feet of the average of the height of the façades in the streetscape.

B. If the proposed building has a pitched roof, the ridge height of the proposed building shall not be in excess of two (2) feet of the average of the ridge height of the pitched roofs in the streetscape.

C. Yard walls and fences shall be limited to a height that does not exceed the average of the height of other yard walls and fences in the streetscape.

D. Pursuant to Section 14-7.4(C), the height of any other structure shall be limited to the allowable building height within the applicable streetscape, as defined in this section. (Ord. No. 2002-37 § 26)

E. The height and dimension of signage are as set forth in Section 14-8.10(H).

F. The board may increase the allowable height for proposed buildings and additions located on a sloping site where the difference in the natural grade along the structure's foundation exceeds two (2) feet. In no case shall the height of a façade exceed four (4) feet above the allowable height of the applicable streetscape measured from natural or finished grade, whichever is more restrictive. This increase in height shall be constructed only in the form of building stepbacks from the street.

(iii) In historic districts, height shall be the vertical distance measured between the highest part of a structure and the existing grade or finished grade, whichever is more restrictive, at the midpoint of the street facing facade, excluding rooftop appurtenances, the increased height of walls or fences over pedestrian and vehicular openings, and gates (either in opened or closed position). For structures which do not have street frontage, height shall be determined by the facade which contains the tallest vertical distance measured between the highest part of a structure and the existing grade or finished grade, whichever is more restrictive. The height of walls and fences is measured from the street-facing side of the wall or fence. (Ord. No. 2002-37 § 27)
## Preliminary Zoning Review Worksheet

**City of Santa Fe Land Use Department**

### To Be Completed By Applicant:
- **Date Submitted:** 1/28/20
- **Property Owner of Record:** GE SemiC LLC
- **Applicant/Agent Name:** Samuels Kames * Assoc. LLC
- **Contact Person Phone Number:** (505) 997-3960
- **Site Address:** 711 W. SAN FRANCISCO
- **Proposed Construction Description:** 70 Room Hotel
- **TOTAL ROOF AREA:** 15,916 SF

### Zoning District:
- **Overlay:**
  - Escarpment: NA
  - Flood Zone: Historic
  - Other: Historic

### Submittals Reviewed with PZR:
- Legal Lot of Record
- Development Plan
- Building Plans
- Existing Site Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Elevations

### Supplemental Zoning Submittals Required for Building Permit:
- Zero Lot Line Affidavit

### Access and Visibility:
- Arterial or Collector
- Visibility Triangle Required

### Use of Structure:
- Residential
- Commercial Type of Use: Hotel

### Terrain:
- 30% slopes NA

**Notes:**
* Requires an additional review conducted by Technical Review Division.
** Requires an additional review conducted by the Traffic Engineering Division.

---

**This review does not grant zoning approval for building permit. Final zoning review will be performed at the time of building permit application.**

---

**[Signature] Joseph K.**

[OWNER APPLICANT AGENT]

---

**hereby certifies that the information provided for preliminary zoning review is accurate and will not be modified without consulting Land Use Department staff prior to submittal for Historic Districts Review Board review.**

---

**To Be Completed By City Staff:**
- **Additional Agency Review if Applicable:**
  - Escarpment Approval by [ ] Date: / /
  - Flood Plain Approval by [ ] Date: / /
  - Traffic Engineering Approval by [ ] Date: / /

**Notes:**

---

**Zoning Approval:**
- Preliminary Approval [ ] with conditions [ ] Rejected

**Comments/Conditions:** Subject to Design approval before the Governing Body for the Development Plan.

**REVIEWER:** [ ] DATE: 2/7/20

---

Original color form must be submitted with Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) application packet.
City of Santa Fe
Historic Design Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case #H-08-046
Address – corner of San Francisco Street and Sandoval Street
Owner/Applicant’s Name – Greer Enterprises
Agent’s Name – Studio S.W. Architects

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Design Review Board (Board) for hearing on May 13, 2008 and June 10, 2008 upon the application (Application) of Studio S.W. Architects, as agent for Greer Enterprises (Applicant).

211 San Francisco Street, known as the Lensic Performing Arts Center, was constructed in 1930 in the Moorish Revival style which is unique in Santa Fe. Infill on the west side and a rear addition that was approved for 65’ high by exception has not diminished the integrity of the building. The building is listed as significant to the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

219-225 San Francisco Street, originally known as the Santa Fe Vogue College and known today as the Lensic Commercial Building, was constructed in 1930 in the Spanish Baroque Revival style. Minor alterations have occurred in non-historic times. The building is recommended for significant historic status, but it is officially listed as not-resurveyed in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The Applicant requests the approval of the Board for a project (Project) to construct a mixed-use four-story building (New Building) with a 17,013 square foot footprint on the vacant lot currently used for parking next to the Performing Arts Center and the Commercial Building. The building will be 46’ feet high where the maximum allowable height is 28’ 4” on Palace Avenue, 27’ 6” on Sandoval Street, and 22’ 7” on San Francisco Street. The Applicant therefore requests a height exception to the requirements of Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c). The Project includes the removal of a 1970s elevator at the southwest corner of the Commercial Building, the free-standing ATM kiosk, and the low wall surrounding the parking lot.

The New Building is designed in an architectural style that is not Territorial Revival or Spanish-Pueblo Revival, as required in this District. There are no elements that suggest the Moorish Revival style of the significant Performing Arts Center. The rounded arches at the street portal are Spanish Baroque Revival in character and reflect similar detailing on the adjacent Commercial Building. Also borrowed from the adjacent building are the brick window surrounds. They have been reduced in scale except at the southwest tower. The parapet cornices, metal railing details, and other character-defining elements on the southwest tower are not firmly rooted in any particular architectural style. An exception is therefore requested to the Santa Fe style requirement for the Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Section 14-5.2(E).

A pitched roof on the top story is proposed. The roof is visible only minimally from certain locations. There are very few pitched roofs in the defined streetscape, so an exception permitting a pitched roof is requested, Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d).
After conducting a public hearing and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Board heard testimony from staff, the Applicant, and other people interested in the Application; and
2. Zoning staff has determined that the Application complies with underlying zoning standards; and
3. Board staff recommended that the Board deny the exception requests for excessive height, lack of Santa Fe Style design, and a pitched roof which does not comply with Sections 14-5.2(D)(9)(c), 14-5.2(E), and 14-5.2(D)(9)(d); and
4. The Property is located in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District and is subject to the requirements of the following sections of the Santa Fe Land Development Code:
   (a) Section 14-5.2(D)(1)-(9), General Design Standards for All H Districts; and
   (b) Section 14-5.2(E), Downtown & Eastside Historic District; and
5. Under Sections 14-5.2(A)(1)(b) and (c), 14-2.7(A)(1), and 14-2.7(A)(3), the Board has the authority to review, approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant’s proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards; and
6. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(3)(b), the Board has the authority to approve an application for alteration or new construction on the condition that changes relating to exterior appearance recommended by the Board be made in the proposed work, and no permit is to issue until new exhibits, satisfactory to the Board, have been submitted; and
7. Under Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c) the Board has the authority to grant exceptions and impose conditions if the Board finds that the Applicant has conclusively demonstrated that such exceptions:
   (a) Do not damage the character of the streetscape;
   (b) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;
   (c) Strengthens 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;
   (d) Is due to special conditions or circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;
   (e) Is due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the actions of the applicant; and
   (f) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of Section 14-5.2(A)(1);
7. With respect to the requested exceptions to exceed the maximum allowable height from 17’ 8” to 23’ 5” at various locations for additional square footage and rooftop mechanical equipment screening, to construct a non-Santa Fe Style building, and to construct a pitched roof where there are not 50% pitched roofs in the defined streetscape, the Applicant has conclusively demonstrated that all such exceptions comply with the criteria set out in 14-5.2(C)(5)(c).
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the Application as follows:

The Board concludes that the Project is in compliance with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H-Districts and Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District Design Standards, subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the main portal arches be retained;
(b) That rooftop equipment cannot be publicly visible;
(c) That the brick-faced wall next to the loading dock be replaced with stucco;
(d) That the massing above the loading dock be set back approximately one to two feet and supported by side pilasters;
(e) That the window on the Palace Avenue elevation have reveals created by pilasters or columns with a recess like that on the San Francisco Street detail;
(f) That the brick window surrounds be replaced with wood;
(g) That the tower opening surrounds be reduced to twelve inches wide and different from the brick on the Commercial Building;
(h) That the trash door design be submitted to staff for approval; and
(i) That the color palette, including for cement stucco and trim, be submitted to the Board for approval.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THE 23rd OF JULY 2008 BY THE HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE

[Signature]
Sharon Woods
Chair

Date: 7-22-08

FILED

[Signature]
Yolanda Y. Vigil
City Clerk

Date: 7-23-08

APPROVED AS TO FORM

[Signature]
Kelley Brennan
Assistant City Attorney

Date: 7/23/08
City of Santa Fe, New Mexico
200 Lincoln Avenue, P.O. Box 909, Santa Fe, N.M. 87504-0909

David Coss, Mayor

Councilors:
Rebecca Wurzburger, Mayor Pro Tem, Dist. 2
Patti J. Bushee, Dist. 1
Chris Calvert, Dist. 1
Rosemary Romero, Dist. 2
Miguel M. Chavez, Dist. 3
Carmichael A. Dominguez, Dist. 3
Matthew E. Ortiz, Dist. 4
Ronald S. Trujillo, Dist. 4

Project description: Construct a 17,013 sq. ft. building footprint on a significant commercial property with a 4-story mixed-use building totaling 53,789 sq. ft. to a maximum height of 46' where the maximum allowable height is 28'4" on Palace Avenue, 27'6" on Sandoval Street, and 22'7" on San Francisco Street. Three exceptions are requested: to exceed the maximum allowable heights (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)); construct a pitched roof (Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); and in one of two proposed options to use a design vocabulary which is not Santa Fe Style (Section 14-5.2(E)).

Project number: 08-10100046
Case number: H-08-046
Project type: HDRB

PROJECT LOCATION(S): Corner of San Francisco and Sandoval Streets

PROJECT NAMES:

OW - Greer Enterprises
Santa Fe, NM 87504
PO Box 1627
505-982-7191

AP - Studio SW Architects
Santa Fe, NM 87501
301 Staab Street
505-982-7191

BOARD ACTION

This is to certify that the Historic Design Review Board (HDRB) at their meeting on, June 10, 2008, acted on the above referenced case. The decision of the board was to approve your request with the exceptions for height, pitch, and architectural style having been met with the following conditions: that the main portal arches are retained; that rooftop equipment cannot be publicly visible; that the brick-faced wall next to loading dock be replaced with stucco; that the massing above the loading dock be set back approximately 1 to 2 feet and supported by side pilasters; that the window on the Palace elevation have reveals that are created by pilasters or columns with a recess like on San Francisco; that the brick window surrounds be replaced with wood, that the tower opening surrounds be reduced to 12 inches wide and different from the brick on the commercial building; that the trash door design be submitted to staff for approval; and that the color palette including cement stucco and trim colors be submitted to the Board for approval.

For further information please call 955-6605.

Sincerely,

David A. Rasch
Planning Supervisor Historic Preservation Division

NOTE: Applicant cannot apply for building permit until after the 7-day appeal period is completed beginning on the date of filing of the Findings and Conclusions in the City Clerks office (SFCC 14-3.17(D)). HDRB expire one (1) year after the date of their decision. Renewals of such decisions are available for one (1) additional year upon request. Your permit will be denied if any changes on plans that were not approved by the HDRB or if conditions of approval are not met. Please attach copies of this letter to all sets when submitting for building permit. Building Permit will not be approved through Historic Preservation until the Findings and Conclusions and appeal period is complete.
Case No: 2019-1535  
Hearing Date: February 20, 2020  
Applicant: Sommer Karnes & Associates LLP, & agent for GE Senlic, LLC & Development Partner Legacy Hospitality & Management, LLC  
Request: Development Plan Approval  
Location: 211 W. San Francisco  
Case Mgr.: Dan Esquivel  
Zoning: BCDLEN (Business Capitol District Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict)  
Overlay: Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District  
Pre-app. Mtg.: August 22, 2019  
ENN Mtg.: October 22, 2019,  
Proposal: Development plan for a 84,276 square foot, 4-story building which will consist of a 70-room hotel, other amenities and a 2-level underground parking garage.

Case #2019-1535. 211 W. San Francisco Development Plan. Sommer Karnes and Associates LLP, Agent, for G.E. Senlic LLC, and Legacy Hospitality & Management, LLC, requests approval of a development plan for a 84,276 square foot, 4-story building which will consist of a 70-room hotel, other amenities and a 2-level underground parking garage. The property is approximately 0.99 acres, is zoned BCDLEN (Business Capitol District - Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict), and is within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District.

I. RECOMMENDATION
The Commission should recommend the Governing Body APPROVE the Development Plan requests subject to conditions of approval and technical corrections.

Two motions will be required in this case, in the following order:

- Recommend the Governing Body approve the Development Plan for Case #2019-1535, subject to Staff recommended conditions of approval and technical corrections;
• Approve the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law for Case #2019-1535 as shown in Exhibit B.

The Planning Commission’s recommendation will proceed to the City Council for final decision of the Development Plan per Ordinance 2006-4(A).

II. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Table 1 Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Dept. or Division</th>
<th>To be completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Archaeological monitoring for ground disturbance is required in the vicinity of southeast corner of the property.</td>
<td>Historic Preservation / Archeological Review</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>An Archaeological-monitoring plan shall be submitted for review and approved before the Archaeological Review Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to filing a building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Applicant shall include a sign plan to be included in the development plan prior to filing and recording. The sign plan shall comply with Subsection14-8.10(H) &quot;Special Sign Regulations in the H Districts&quot;.</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Prior to recording /filing the Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The subject site totals 0.999 acres which is bounded by Sandoval Street to the west and northeast (56' Right-Of-Way), Palace Avenue to the northeast, Burro Alley to the east (26' 6" Right-Of-Way), and W. San Francisco street (56' Right-Of-Way) to the south. The application comprises two Applicants: Property owner, GE Senlic, LLC, and the development Partner Legacy Hospitality & Management, LLC.

The Applicants are requesting to construct an 84,276 square foot, 4-story building which will consist of a 70-room hotel, other amenities, and a 2-level underground parking garage. No variances are requested as part of this proposal.

On January 11, 2006, the Governing Body adopted Ordinance 2006-4(A) (Ordinance) establishing the Lensic Redevelopment Subdistrict ("Subdistrict". Ordinance 2006-4(A) established Subdistrict objectives and design standards (reference Exhibit E)). Included with the rezoning approval was development plan application for a 4-story, 46' high, 47,691 square feet building, plus 2.5 levels of underground parking garage, which is now expired.

The Applicant has complied with 14-3.1(E) "Pre-application," 14-3.1(H) "Notice Requirements" for Public Hearings, and 14-3.1(F) "Early Neighborhood Notification.

The City's Development Review Team ("DRT") reviewed this development application for compliance with applicable City Code sections (reference Exhibit D).
Staff's analysis identifies the application has satisfied Development Plan approval criteria according to § 14-3.8(D) "Development Plan," subject to conditions of approval and technical correction listed in Exhibit A.

IV. SITE ANALYSIS

A. Adjacent Properties

Table 2 Adjacent Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>County Courthouse 102 Grant Ave.</td>
<td>BCDMAR (Business Capitol District Marcy Townscape Subdistrict)</td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>St. Sandoval Parking Structure 220 W. San Francisco</td>
<td>BCDPLA (Business Capitol District Plaza/San Francisco Townscape Subdistrict)</td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Santa Fe West Fine Jewelry, Art &amp; Pottery 218 W San Francisco St., Tia Sophia's Restaurant 210 W San Francisco St., Uli's Clothing Boutique 210 W San Francisco St.</td>
<td>BCDPLA (Business Capitol District Plaza/San Francisco Townscape Subdistrict)</td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Bokum Building: Santa Fe County Office 142 W Palace Ave, Los Magueyes Mexican Restaurant 28 - 31 Burro Alley The Burger Stand At Burro Alley 207 W San Francisco St</td>
<td>BCDMAR (Business Capitol District Marcy Townscape Subdistrict)</td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Eldorado Hotel 309 W. San Francisco St.</td>
<td>BCDPLA (Business Capitol District Plaza/San Francisco Townscape Subdistrict)</td>
<td>Nonresidential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 0.99-acre area within the Subdistrict is vacant and is currently used a parking lot containing 46 surface parking spaces.

The West half of the Subdistrict contains an ATM structure, the Lensic Commercial building, and the Lensic Performing Arts Center and Fly Loft (reference Exhibit D "Existing Uses").

B. Historic and Archaeological

Existing development of the Lensic Block includes a parking area (46+ parking spaces) and the subject site for the proposed hotel, the ATM structure, Lensic Performing Arts Center, and the Lensic Commercial
building (separated by a ten-foot-wide atrium), built between 1930 thru 1946.

Both Lensic Performing Arts Center and Lensic Commercial buildings are designated as "significant" under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, Subsection 14-5.2(C). The addition (Fly Loft and office space) to the theater were approved by the Board of Adjustment and Historic Design Review Board in 2000.

"SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE
A structure located in a historic district that is approximately fifty years old or older, and that embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction. For a structure to be designated as significant, it must retain a high level of historic integrity. A structure may be designated as significant:

(A) for its association with events or persons that are important on a local, regional, national or global level; or

(B) if it is listed on or is eligible to be listed on the State Register of Cultural Properties or the
National Register of Historic Places.

Archaeological clearance was conditionally approved in August and December of 1999 (Case AR-9-1999). The conditional approval required archaeological monitoring for ground disturbance in the vicinity of the southeast corner of the property. With this proposal a monitoring plan is required to be submitted and approved by the Archaeological Review Committee prior construction activities.

C. Utilities
Extensions for wet and dry utilities were put in place at the north end of the property during the addition of the fly loft and theater office space. An underground vault will be constructed to house the electrical transformer for the project.

1. Water
The Applicant’s water budget states that 10-acre feet of water is being submitted to the City for the water offset credits. The Water Division agrees with the submitted water budget and water offset credits. The City Water Division states that water service exists for this property.

2. Sewer
The City Wastewater Division required technical Corrections to the Plans:

1. An IPSP and Sewer Backwater Valve will be required. The IPSP cannot be installed in the sidewalk were pedestrians have access. Will need to coordinate the IPSP location with the Wastewater Division.

D. Fire
The Applicant is proposing to sprinkler the building, along with supplying fire flows to the building at 1,750 gallons per minute. The City’s GIS map identifies three fire hydrants 150 feet from the Lensic Block Subdistrict (northeast, southeast, and southwest).

The Fire Division provided technical corrections required at the time of new constructions or remodel (reference Exhibits A and C).

E. Traffic and parking
Included in the hotel development is a proposal to construct a two-level underground parking garage. The underground parking garage will utilize a two-vehicle freight elevator together with valet parking to access the parking levels and to park the vehicles. The entrance to the underground parking garage and vehicle elevators will be located off Sandoval Street, approximately 135 feet west of the Sandoval/Grant/Palace intersection. The Application states that the hotel will utilize a pullout on the east side of Sandoval Street for guests and use the valet service for vehicle access into the vehicle elevators, parking garage and the Archdiocese lot. Proposed ingress and egress to the underground garage will be limited to right-in/right-out movements onto Sandoval Street. Minimal modifications to Sandoval Street are proposed to prevent traffic disturbance along the curve near the entrance to the garage. There will also be ADA complainant sidewalks as part of the street improvements (reference Civil Site Plan Sheet C-101 and Civil Demolitions Plans Sheets C103).

Traffic Control:
The “traffic control plan (sheets C-702 and 703) shows that two lanes of traffic on Sandoval Street north of the San Francisco intersection will be closed during construction allowing for two-way traffic” flow on Sandoval Street.

Pedestrian Control:
“[B]arricades during construction as shown on Sheet C-702. The sidewalk along the east side of
Sandoval will be closed during construction and pedestrians will be directed to use the sidewalk on the west side in the same fashion as the ongoing El Dorado construction.”

Construction Time Frame:
“The Project will be constructed in a single phase and is scheduled to take 18 months. Construction is anticipated to commence in the 4th quarter of 2020, which will enable the excavation for the garage to be completed well before the 2021 tourist season.”

Dust Control:
“Dust control specifications are addressed on Sheet C-802 including specific watering requirements, tire washes for all construction vehicles and specific details to be set forth in the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan including use of Best Management Practices.”

Noise:
Construction operations are limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM (no night construction), “engines will be muffled in accordance with manufacturer specifications. This requirement will be included in all contractor agreements.”

F. Environmental Services
The Applicant is proposing a 20-yard compactor for the development. The compactor is located adjacent to the loading area (most southeast end of the hotel). The compactor will be fully shielded by a 6’ high-stuccoed wall. The stucco color will be made to match the building.

The City Environmental Services Division agrees with the Applicant’s waste management plan.

G. Terrain Management and Landscape
The property is 100% impervious, with existing drainage historically flowing uncontrolled onto West San Francisco Street. Proposed stormwater management will capture rooftop drainage and direct it into the existing storm sewer on Sandoval Street, instead of West San Francisco Street. All development is outside the 100-year flood zone (1% FEMA Flood Zone).

Review comments from the Land Use Technical Review Division require a note to be placed on the Development Plan before signing the Development Plan. The required note shall provide flood zone determination of the property. Additional comments will be provided at the time of the building permit.

H. Lighting
The proposed lighting plan identifies three styles of lighting using Light Emitting Diode (LED) technology: pendent, shielded wall-mounted and recessed (downward projecting) lights. The pendant fixtures will be mounted under the portal, starting at the pedestrian walkway at the east end of the hotel, wrapping around the building along West San Francisco Street and terminating just before the pullout along Sandoval Street. All shielded wall-mounted fixtures are mounted on all floors facing West San Francisco and Sandoval Streets. The recessed lighting will be located within the loading area (most southeast end of the hotel).

The Applicant submitted a photometric lighting plan in compliance with Section 14-8.9 “Outdoor Lighting.”

I. Signage
The Application did not provide a sign plan for the project. All signage shall comply with Subsection 14-8.10(H) "Special Sign Regulations in the H Districts."

The Applicant shall submit a sign plan, prior to Development Plan recordation, in compliance with
Subsection 14-8.10(H) "Special Sign Regulations in the H Districts" for staff review.

V. LENSIC DESIGN REVIEW

The Governing Body adoption of Ordinance 2006-4(A) created the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict (Lensic Block). As with all BCD Townscape Subdistricts, the Ordinance establishes design objectives and design standards for the Lensic Block reference Exhibit E "Ordinance 2006-4(A)". Additionally, the Ordinance included eight conditions of approval shown on Table 4, which the Applicant has complied with.

A. Lensic Block Objectives

The BCD is comprised of 15 Townscape Subdistricts. Each Subdistrict contains unique design objectives. The objectives encourage diversity of design while preserving the existing qualities of the Subdistrict. The Lensic Block strives to achieve the following objectives:

Lensic Block Objectives:
- Reinforce the continuity of block form,
- Strengthen the built edge street section,
- Improve the sense of the enclosure to pedestrian space,
- Provide for architectural harmony within the sub-district reflecting the unique character of the block.
- Accentuate the diversity among BCD Sub-districts, and
- Protect the historical character of the sub district.
- Better articulate vehicle and pedestrian circulation.
- Encourage and support the public benefits the block provides.

The proposed development design continues the framing of portals along West San Francisco Street. The portal wraps around the hotel along Sandoval Street, ending at the garage entrance. The hotel is built to the property line, reinforcing the uniform streetscape designs of the subdistrict and provides a sense of enclosure from the streetscape perspective. The proposed development is designed in a Spanish Baroque style of architecture which accents the existing Spanish Baroque design of the Lensic office building as well as, historic Moorish style of the Lensic Performing Arts Center. The proposed architecture continues the diversity of styles found throughout the BCD Subdistricts. The controlled access to the underground parking together with pedestrian paths around and through the hotel, provide safe and functional vehicle and pedestrian circulation. Together, these design features address the Lensic Block Objectives of the Ordinance.

Table 3 LENSIC BLOCK DESIGN STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Height of Structures (feet): 49’ at the tallest interior of the building, 3.5’ at the intermediate, step-back portion of the building 26.5 at the streetscape portion of the building</th>
<th>Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed height of the hotel is 49’, which complies with Ordinance 2006-4(A) for height. Sheets A-201 and A-202 identify the proposed building complies with Ordinance 2006-4(A) for step backs. At the time of this writing, the Applicant was planning to submit an application on February 12, 2020, for a March 10, 2020 meeting before the Historic Design Review Board for architectural review and an exception to the 26’ height averaging limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Lot Coverage. No requirement 100 percent permitted. (14-7.4(B)(2)(a)(iii) - The maximum baseline floor area ratio permitted is 2.5:1 unless provided otherwise in</th>
<th>Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the master plan or at the time of rezoning pursuant to Section 14-4.3(E)(4)(b)(iii)

The hotel takes up 91% of the lot. The floor area ratio calculates to 0.5:1 and complies with Subsection 14-7.4(B)(2)(a)(iii). The development plan complies with this requirement.

| Building will be built to the front property line on San Francisco and Sandoval Street. Varying setbacks along Palace Avenue, San Francisco Street and Portions of Sandoval Street | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| minimum Open Space Requirements: No requirements. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| Landscape Treatment yards: No requirements. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| Height of Walls and Fences (feet): 6' High Maximum. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) N/A |

No walls, other than the walls of the structure, are proposed.

| Placement of Off Street Parking: All parking shall be underground with ingress and egress along Palace Avenue. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |

All Parking is underground.

| Portals: Portals permitted within public Right of Way. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) N/A |

All portals are proposed within the property lines therefore this criterion does not apply.

Table 4 Ordinance Conditions of approval

| Curb Cuts Must Conform to Chapter 23-3 SFCC. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |

The Applicant did not apply for an Ordinance amendment to change this condition. Compliance with Chapter 23-3 is mandatory. The City Traffic division did not provided any concerns associated with the submitted plans relative to this condition. More detail will be provided at the time of construction.

| Applicant shall submit for a major project plan for the Lensic Block proposal meeting approved townscape design standards and all applicable requirements of chapter 14 SFCC. Proposal shall include mitigation of traffic (vehicular and pedestrian), noise, dust, lighting, and parking during term of construction. Proposal shall also include construction phasing and how construction corresponds, to peak tourist seasons. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |

Chapter 14 changed the term "Major Project Plan" to a Development Plan. The Application included material that addresses issues related to traffic (vehicular and pedestrian), noise, dust, lighting, parking during term of construction and construction phasing and how construction correspond, to peak tourist seasons. These issues were addressed in Section IV.

| Criteria represented within Tables 1-3 identified as "proposed" represent the new design criteria for the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
The proposed design of the project complies with the design criteria for the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict (Ordinance 2006-4(A)). This is addressed in detail in Table 3 above.

| Architectural style comprises Pueblo/territorial or Spanish Colonial Baroque or a combination of both styles. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| As proposed, the development architectural style comprises elements of both Spanish Baroque and Spanish Colonial Baroque architecture. | |
| Historic Design Review Board shall review and approve Architectural Style. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| The Applicant is complying with this condition as they have submitted a Application for review by the Historic Design Review Board | |
| Any Variance or exceptions to the design standards would come back to the BCD/DRC (Replaced by the Planning Commission) for review and recommendations. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) N/A |
| There are no variances proposed for the project. The Applicant is requesting an exception to height from the Historic Design Review Board, however the proposed height satisfies the BCD standards. | |
| Design shall be forwarded to the Governing Body for approval. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| This Application, pending review and recommendations by the Planning Commission, will be presented to the Governing Body for final design approval. | |
| Design genre shall avoid a canyon affect. | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| The design of the development includes step-backs massing along Sandoval Street to satisfy this condition. | |

## VI. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**Approval Criteria - Development Plan (§ 14-3.8(D)(1))**

| Criterion 1: that the Planning Commission is empowered to approve the plan under the section of Chapter 14 described in the application; | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| Santa Fe City Code (SFCC) Subsection 14-2.3(D)(1) authorizes the Planning Commission to review and approve or disapprove development plans and subdivision plats. Subsection 14-3.8(B) requires approval of a development plan for projects with a gross floor area of thirty thousand feet or more. The City’s Development Review Team has reviewed the application requiring minor technical correction prior to a filing. The Application complies with City Code subject to conditions of approval and technical corrections. | |
| Criterion 2: that approving the development plan will not adversely affect the public interest; | Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A) YES |
| The term “Public Interest” is not specifically defined in Chapter 14; however, the Governing Body has implemented the General Plan as stated in Subsection Section 14-1.3 (General Purposes). The resulting ordinances establish minimum standards for health, safety and welfare affecting land uses and developments as a means to protect the public interest from within the municipality. Staff has reviewed the proposed development plan application in accordance with these ordinances. Subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, the proposed development plan application complies with minimum standards of Chapter 14 SFCC and would not adversely affect the public interest. |
Criterion 3: that the use and any associated buildings are compatible with and adaptable to buildings, structures and uses of the abutting property and other properties in the vicinity of the premises under consideration.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Met: (Yes/No/N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Chapter 14 "Table 14-6.1-1-Table of Permitted Uses" qualifies the first finding by identifying Hotels, as a permitted use in a BCD District.
2. The Applicant has complied with the architecture requirements of the Ordinance 2006-4(A).

VII. EARLEY NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATION (ENN)
On October 22, 2019, an ENN was conducted at the Main Library, located at 145 Washington Avenue. There were 10 members of the public in attendance, along with the Applicants and staff. The meeting started at 5:30 PM with an introduction of the city staff and the Applicant’s agents, followed by the presentation of the project and the question and answers section. The following questions/concerns were raised:

1. Canyon effect of the project:
   Ordinance 2006-4 (A) also raises this issue as a condition of approval. The Applicant addressed this issue by incorporating step-back massing in the design of the hotel. The step-back massing is in contrast to the vertical façade of the Eldorado Hotel along Sandoval Street, eliminating the feeling of canyon effects along Sandoval Street.
2. Icing along Sandoval Street:
   The issue of more icing on Sandoval Street was raised, given the proposed height of the hotel as a concern. The Applicant discussed the concern in an addendum to the Application, stating that “shadows cast by the Bokum building and the Lensic Performing Arts Center fly loft already shade all of Sandoval Street to the northwest of those buildings. The addition of the proposed building would increase the extent, but not the nature of shading.” The Traffic Division did not provide comments regarding icing along Sandoval Street.
3. Vehicle Stacking:
   The concern of vehicle stacking at the garage entrance was raised. The Applicant addressed the issue in the parking analyses. The parking analyses provided recommendations to implement, such as appropriate valet scheduling, property maintenance of the elevators, and a heater in the elevator during freezing tempters.
4. Shared Loading Zone:
   The concern was raised of potential conflicts regarding a shared loading zone located on the south side of Sandoval Street and perpendicular to Sandoval Street north of the Lensic Commercial building atrium. The Applicant addressed this issue in the addendum to the application stating: “The Project will result in the extension of the on-street loading area through modifications to the existing bulb-out near Burro Alley and expansion of the off-street loading area through the reduction in the size of the trash dumpster/compactor compared to the existing condition.”

VIII. ATTACHMENTS:
EXHIBIT A: Technical Corrections

EXHIBIT B: Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law

EXHIBIT C: Development Review Team Memoranda
   2. Water Engineering Division Memorandum, Brian Snyder P.E.
   3. Water Resources Division Memorandum, Alan G. Hook
4. Wastewater Division Memorandum, Stan Holland, P.E.
5. Fire Marshal, Geronimo Griego
6. Traffic Engineering Division Memorandum, John Romero P.E.
7. Environmental Services Division, Eric J. Lucero
8. Technical Review Memorandum, Dee Beingessner P.E.

EXHIBIT D: Maps and Photos
1. Zoning Map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Existing Uses
4. Proposed Project Site
5. Subdistrict
6. Street View Photo

EXHIBIT E: Ordinance 2006-4(A)

EXHIBIT F: ENN Materials
1. ENN October 22, 2019
   a. ENN Notes
   b. Sign-in Sheet

EXHIBIT G: Correspondence
1. Joseph Schepps
2. Joel Aalberts
3. Joseph Garcia
4. Stephen Fox
5. Joseph De Bella

EXHIBIT H: Applicant Materials
1. Application Submittals

APPROVED BY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim Land Use Department Director</td>
<td>Elias Isaacson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Current Planning Planner Manager</td>
<td>Noah Berke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Department Case Manager</td>
<td>Dan Esquibel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 11, 2020

Santa Fe Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB)
200 Lincoln Ave.
Santa Fe, NM 87504

Re: 200 Block Hotel (the "Property")

Dear HDRB Members:

On behalf of property owner, G.E. Plaza Galeria, LLC and development partner Legacy Hospitality & Management, LLC, we are pleased to submit the attached application for demolition of existing structures and historic approval of the proposed building in the western portion of the Property including 3 exceptions for architectural style, height and roof pitch.

We appreciate your consideration and request your approval of the proposed building, which will replace the existing private surface parking lot with a 70-room hotel that will add a socially and culturally appropriate use to the downtown, furthering the purpose of the BCD as Santa Fe’s economic engine.

Background. The 0.99 acre Property attained its current configuration as a result of a 1960’s urban renewal project, which included the City’s condemnation of the western and northern portion of the property to provide for the extension of Sandoval Street north to Palace Avenue.

The Property is bound by West San Francisco Street, Sandoval Street, Palace Avenue and Burro Alley. The Lensic Theater and Lensic commercial building occupy the eastern and central portions of the Property. A 2-story commercial building existed in the western portion of the Property until the early 1970’s, when it was demolished following the urban renewal condemnation. Since that time, the site has been used for a private parking lot. Existing structures on the site proposed for removal include an elevator, formerly serving the commercial building, exterior stairs, an ATM building, a guard shack for the parking lot and the existing perimeter concrete block wall (the "Existing Structures"). None of the
Existing Structures are designated as contributing or significant and all are less than 50 years old. The Lensic Theater and the Lensic Commercial building will not be altered as a result of the project.

**Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict (the “Subdistrict”).** Under the City Code as it existed in the 1990’s, the Lensic Block was bisected by two BCD Townscape subdistricts: Marcy and Plaza/San Francisco, which contained different design standards. In 2006, the City Council approved the Subdistrict to provide a unified set of design standards and conditions to facilitate the intended development of the site with a harmonious building that will further the policies of the BCD.

The Subdistrict describes the Lensic Block as consisting of “large, tall buildings with stepback massing” and sets forth requirements including a 49’ maximum building height with intermediate second and third story stepbacks, accommodation of project parking and the existing on-site parking in an underground parking garage and either a Pueblo/Territorial or Spanish Colonial Baroque architectural style. In approving the Subdistrict, the Council was aware that the building height and architectural style allowed in the Subdistrict would require approval of exceptions by the HDRB.

In 2007, the property owner applied for a 4-story mixed use building, including requested exceptions for architectural style, height and roof pitch. The design of that Spanish Baroque-style building was similar to that of the currently proposed building and was approved by the HDRB, Planning Commission and City Council in 2008. That building was not constructed due to the economic downturn.

**Proposed Alterations.** The property owner proposes to demolish the Existing Structures to accommodate the new building. The demolition will not affect either of the existing structures on the Property.

The proposed building will face west toward Sandoval Street, with the main entrance being served by a vehicle pullout accommodating three vehicles. The hotel will be served by all-valet parking in a 2-level underground garage served by two vehicular freight elevators at the Council-approved ingress/egress on the north side of the Property adjacent to the shared loading area for the theater, commercial building and hotel.

The Subdistrict Design Standards allow for the building to extend to the property lines, with portals permitted within the public right-of-way. In an effort to maximize public pedestrian circulation rather than building size, the portals are located within the property. While losing 1,433 SF of developable area on the ground floor (and additional area on the three floors above), the on-site portals will provide pedestrians with protection from weather and will maintain the existing streetscape on the Lensic Block, which does not have portals extending to the street. The portal along W. San Francisco Street provides an opportunity for outdoor dining, further enlivening the street compared to existing conditions.

The Subdistrict Design Standards allow a maximum building height of 49’, with intermediate stepbacks of 26.5’ at the second story and 36.5’ at the third story. This
"wedding cake" design contrasts with the tall vertical facades of the El Dorado Hotel across the street to the west and avoids creation of a "canyon effect" which was a design concern when the Subdistrict was being created. Locating the portals within the Property will further widen the distance between the new stepped-back building and the El Dorado, compared to a building with portals in the public right-of-way.

The stepped back portions of the proposed building create an opportunity to provide attractive and usable balconies, particularly on the third and fourth stories. These balconies will add life to the street and will provide opportunities for providing plantings in containers, adding to the building’s visual interest.

The step-back massing creates the perception of a 2-story building for pedestrians on the Lensic Block, similar to the existing streetscape along San Francisco Street and other downtown streets. As with the previously approved building provision of a roof pitch will reduce the perceived height of the building compared to a vertical parapet on the fourth story.

The proposed design meets all the Design Standards and conditions set by the City Council for the Property. The HDRB approved the requested exceptions for architectural style, height and roof pitch for the project approved in 2008. The documents included with this application address the criteria for the 3 exceptions requested as part of the Application and demonstrate that the requested exceptions warrant approval considering the City Council’s approval of the Subdistrict, the project setting and the proposed building design. Exhibit A itemizes each element of the proposed project.

**Conclusion.** The City Code recognizes the fact that the economic health of the city depends on the economic viability of the BCD. Over the past two decades, the City and the Applicant have made extraordinary efforts to achieve conversion of the private surface parking lot to a well-designed building that will contribute to Santa Fe’s status as one of the world’s top visitor destinations.

The proposed building design is consistent with the Subdistrict Design Standards and condition and compliments the unique design of the existing buildings on the Lensic Block. The City and Property owner’s efforts to achieve completion of this block will be a long-term credit to the City, its residents and visitors.

Thank you for your consideration,

Joseph Karnes
EXHIBIT A

Elements of the Proposed Building

1. **Architectural history** – The Moorish style Lensic Theater and Spanish Baroque style Lensic Commercial building were constructed on the Property in about 1930. Improvements were made to those two buildings in 1948, 1972, 1995 and in 2000, when the 74’ tall flyloft was added to the Lensic Theater. A two-story building existed in the western portion of the Property, in the area of the proposed building, until it was demolished in about 1972. Since that time, the western portion of the property has been used for a private surface parking lot. The proposed project will not result in any alteration to the Lensic Theater or the Lensic Commercial building.

2. **Demolition** – The Application proposes demolition of the elevator formerly serving the commercial building, exterior stairs, an ATM building, a guard shack for the parking lot and the existing perimeter concrete block wall. (See sheet AS 101E) All of these structures are less than 50 years old.

3. **Proposed building** – The proposed structure encompasses a total of 50,500 SF (above ground) and has a building footprint of 15,916 SF. (Sheet AS-101)

4. **New rooftop appurtenances** – The proposal includes stairs to the roof, two passenger elevator overrides and relocation of the existing ground-based chiller on the north side of the building to the northern portion of the roof. None of the proposed rooftop appurtenances exceed 8’ above the proposed building height.

5. **Yard walls** – The proposal includes a pair of 6’ x 6’ metal gates for the dumpster enclosure on the north side of the building in the existing loading area shared with the Lensic Theater and Lensic Commercial building. The gates will be painted to match the building stucco color. There will be a 6’ high wall made of 8” block with stucco to match the building color enclosing three sides of the dumpster.

6. **Planters** – The proposal includes metal planters on the third and fourth floor balconies that will contain decorative vegetation. The planters will include metal screen walls 7’ high by the depth of the balconies painted to match the building stucco color. The screen walls will provide separation along the balconies between rooms.

7. **Railings** – The proposal includes 3’6” high metal railings at the second, third and fourth floor balconies, painted a steel grey color.

8. **Doors and windows** – Doors on the first floor are proposed to be 8’ high by 6’ wide metal clad wood with horizontal divided lights and transoms above with horizontal and vertical divided lights. 8’ high by 6’ wide metal clad wood doors with horizontal divided lights will be located at the second-floor balconies. Second floor doors will have brown brick surrounds. Doors on the third and fourth floor balconies will be 7’ x 6’ wide.
These doors will also be metal clad wood with horizontal divided lights. The color of all doors will be chestnut bronze.

Windows will be metal clad wood with horizontal divided lights with varying sizes on all four floors. The window colors will be the same as the doors.

The two vehicular elevator doors on the north side of the building will be set back 20’ from the building façade. The metal doors will be painted to match the building stucco color. The elevator doors are each 10’3” wide and 8’1” tall.

9. **Building stucco** – The proposed building includes cementitious stucco colored El Rey #106 Buckskin.

10. **Arches and casings** – The ground floor features inset portales created by the arched openings along the south and west property lines. Arches, corbels, door and windows casings and parapets will have precast concrete trim of varying sizes. The color of these elements will be warm white.

11. **Exterior light fixtures** – the proposal includes wall mounted metal light fixtures at the third and fourth floor balconies. On the first floor, there will be wall mounted and hanging light fixtures. All light fixtures will be fully shielded, downlit only, in compliance with the City’s Dark Skies ordinance. The color of the light fixtures will be dark bronze.

12. **Pitched roof** – The pitched roof at the fourth floor will be 3’-0” high, standing seam metal, colored dark gray.
211 W. San Francisco Hotel

 Applicant’s Response to Exception Criteria
 Height and Roof Pitch

Following are the exception criteria stated in City Code section 14.5.2(C)(5)(c), along with Applicant’s responses to each criterion as they relate to the requested exceptions for building height and roof pitch.

In approving the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict (the “Subdistrict”), the City Council adopted Design Standards for the new building including height. The Council lowered the otherwise applicable 65’ height limit for buildings in a BCD Redevelopment Subdistrict to 49’, with intermediate stepbacks of 26.5’ at the second story and 36.5’ at the third story. The Council did not adjust the building height limits for the historic overlay applicable to this property and therefore an exception for height is necessary.

The HDRB and City Council approved a 46’ tall building on the property in 2008, with a pitched roof that serves to minimize the perceived height of the structure. The pitched roof element has been incorporated into the currently proposed building and therefore an exception for roof pitch is also necessary.

With respect to the 2008 application, the City’s then-Historic Preservation Manager determined that there were three streetscapes, each with its own maximum allowable height (San Francisco Street, Sandoval Street and Palace Avenue). The chart at the end of this document shows the necessary height exception based on the City’s Official Height Map as well as surveys of the buildings that the Applicant commissioned at the time. This information is included as background for the City’s consideration and, if the HDRB concludes that the three streetscapes apply, supports the Applicant’s requested exceptions for height and roof pitch.

With respect to this Application, the Historic Preservation Manager reviewed the information relating to the previous application and determined that one maximum allowable height should be considered based on an average of the three heights previously determined for the three streetscapes. That allowable height is 26’2”, which is 2’ higher than the average height of the buildings in the streetscapes as provided by City Code §14-5.2.9.c.ii.A.

In addition, for sites such as this one where the difference in grade along the structure’s foundation exceeds 2 feet, the HDRB may, in its discretion, increase the allowable height up to 4’ above the allowable height. (City Code §14-5.2.9.c.ii.A) Therefore, assuming the HDRB grants the discretionary additional 4’ based on the slope of the project site (City Code §14-5.2.9.c.ii.f), the necessary height exception for the proposed 49’ building is 18’10”. Otherwise, if the Board does not allow any additional height pursuant to this provision, then the necessary height exception would be 22’10”. Either way, approval of a height exception will be necessary to achieve the 49’ height allowed by the City Council in approving the Subdistrict.

The following addresses each criterion as they relate to the requested exceptions for height and roof pitch.

(1) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

Response: The proposed building is in proportion to its setting and surroundings and fits into the context of the existing buildings in the vicinity. The 82’ El Dorado Hotel across Sandoval Street to the west and the 74’ Lensic Theater flyloft within the Property to the east are both substantially taller than
the proposed 49’ tall building. The proposed building complies with the maximum allowed height that the City Council set when approving the Subdistrict Design Standards in 2006 (including the intermediate setbacks).

By approving the 49’ maximum height and intermediate setbacks, the City Council necessarily concluded that a building meeting these requirements would not damage the character of the streetscape. The substantially taller buildings to the west and east stand as evidence that proposed building will be compatible with the context of the vicinity and will not damage the character of the streetscape. The purposes of the roof pitch are to further reduce the apparent height of the building from the streetscape and to screen rooftop appurtenances while maintaining the building’s utility for its intended hotel use.

Also, in approving the Subdistrict Design Standards, the City Council required that the streetscape portion of the building be stepped-back, with a maximum height of 26.5’ and the intermediate portion also be stepped-back, with a maximum height of 36.5’. The proposed building is consistent with each of these standards, which the Council set as part of its Design Standards for the Lensic Block. The setbacks required by the Council are not provided for in the Historic Overlay Ordinance and are not accounted for in the applicable height calculation. Overall building height is but one element of the Design Standards, which taken together and viewed as a coherent whole, set forth the Council’s vision for the building.

Existing buildings around the proposed building are substantially taller. Adjacent to the east, measured from San Francisco Street the Lensic flyloft is 71’ - 22’ taller than the proposed building. Across Sandoval Street to the west, the El Dorado hotel is 68’ (measured from Sandoval Street) 19’ taller than the proposed building. The other buildings surrounding the Subject Property are the 42’ Lensic Commercial building, the 30’ Municipal Parking Garage and the 42’ County building.

The Historic Overlay regulations do not consider 4 of the 5 buildings surrounding the Subject Property, two of which are substantially taller than the proposed building. However, in setting a 49’ maximum height limit, the City Council did take the context of the Subject Property into account and concluded that a building of 49’, with specified step-backs and underground parking would be harmonious with the character of the streetscape.

The proposed building, with a maximum height of 49’ and a parapet height of 46’, is in proportion to its setting and will enhance, rather than damage the character of the streetscapes.

(2) Prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;

Response: In approving the Redevelopment Subdistrict, the City Council adopted a comprehensive set of Design Standards, of which the 49’ height limit is but one component. The City Council also required that parking be provided underground and that the building include two intermediate setbacks. The Council also allowed the building to be built to the front property line on San Francisco and Sandoval Streets, with portals within the public right-of-way. Instead of maximizing the building footprint, the applicant pulled the building back along its entire perimeter so that a publicly-available portal could be provided within the Subject Property, substantially increasing the width of the pedestrian walkway along San Francisco and Sandoval Streets as well as Palace Avenue and providing pedestrians with shelter under the portals.
The Council's adoption of the 49' height limit reduced the otherwise applicable height limit in redevelopment subdistricts by 16'. In adopting this standard, the Councilors were well aware that a building of that height would need a height exception from the HDRB.

Strict enforcement of the Historic District height standard would constitute a hardship by substantially reducing the height standard adopted by the City Council as part of its Redevelopment Subdistrict approval and frustrating the Council's intent and property owner's expectation that the Design Standards would apply and control with respect to building design. Imposition of the historic overlay height standard without taking into consideration the other Design Standards required by the Council would constitute an additional hardship.

The Council adopted the 49' height limit in combination with other design standards including two intermediate building stepbacks. The primary purpose of separating the rezoning decision from the building design was to provide Council direction to guide building design and avoid carrying out the design process in a vacuum. Strict imposition of a lower height limit in addition to the otherwise applicable Design Standards would violate the context of the Redevelopment Subdistrict approval to the injury of the applicant. Granting the requested exceptions for height and roof pitch would prevent the hardship and would be consistent with City Council's Subdistrict approval including the Design Standards.

(3) **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.**

**Response:** The City Council's approval of the 49' maximum height as part of the Subdistrict Design Standards demonstrates its determination that completing the Lensic block with a 4-story building will strengthen the unique character of the Lensic Block and, by extension, the heterogeneous character of the downtown. The Lensic Theater is an iconic downtown building that will be complimented by the new hotel, which will provide an opportunity for visitors to enjoy the downtown and further the purpose of the BCD as Santa Fe's economic engine.

(4) **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.**

**Response:** The Subject Property comprises about one third of the 0.99 acre parcel that accommodates two existing buildings: the Lensic Performing Arts Center and the Lensic Commercial building. The Property was larger until the mid-1960's, when the City condemned the western and northern portions of the property to accommodate the extension of Sandoval Street as part of an urban renewal project. Also, in conjunction with renovation of existing buildings on the property in the 1990's, Burro Alley was closed to traffic and some surface parking spaces were removed. These actions and the pre-existing buildings left a relatively small remnant area with limited vehicular access that has been used for private surface parking.

Also, the Property was included in two BCD Townscape Subdistricts (Marcy and Plaza/San Francisco) each of which have different design standards. The City Council took these special conditions and circumstances into consideration in approving the Subdistrict and providing a single set of design standards for this block, including the 49' maximum height with intermediate stepbacks.

No other development site in the vicinity is burdened by the obligation of constructing an underground parking garage that includes replacement of existing surface parking spaces.
(5) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of actions by the applicant.

**Applicant’s Response:** The City Council approved the maximum height for the building as part of its Subdistrict Design Standards. Achieving a building height that complies with the City Council’s approval requires approval of the requested exception by the HDRB.

Neither the size of the Subject Property, the requirement for provision of underground parking in an amount equal to the demand of the new building as well as replacing the existing private surface parking spaces, or the requirement for step-back massing are the result of actions by the Applicant.

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

**Applicant’s Response:** As discussed above, the proposed building is lower than existing buildings adjacent to the property and in the immediate vicinity. The maximum height set by the City Council for the Property is 49’ and was adopted as part of comprehensive Design Standards. The proposed roof pitch requires a separate exception because the only other building in the vicinity that has a roof pitch is the historic Delgado House.

The proposed roof pitch starts from behind the 46’ high parapet and gradually extends to 49’ at the top edge of the roof. The roof pitch was included to minimize the actual and apparent height of the building and to screen rooftop appurtenances while maintaining viable use of the Subject Property. The Applicant could have proposed a building with a 49’ parapet and avoid the need for the pitch exception but chose to do so in an effort to provide the least negative impact with respect to building height, in compliance with this requirement.
# 211 W. San Francisco Hotel

## Comparison of Building Height Information
Based on 3 streetscapes used for 2007 Application

### Palace Street Frontage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building #</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Surveyed Height</th>
<th>Official Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Lew/Allen/Patina Gallery #129</td>
<td>23' 10&quot;</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Lensic Commercial</td>
<td>42' 1&quot;</td>
<td>33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Lensic Theater</td>
<td>57' 8&quot;</td>
<td>38'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Bokum Bldg #142</td>
<td>36' 10&quot;</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Peterson Extension</td>
<td>20' 5&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Peterson Gallery #128-136</td>
<td>20' 5&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Delgado House #124</td>
<td>31' 6&quot;</td>
<td>28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>First National Bank</td>
<td>35' 0&quot;</td>
<td>28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>(8 bldgs.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>33' 6&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>26' 4&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Allowable Height</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Average + 6')</strong></td>
<td><strong>39' 6&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>32' 4&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Necessary Exception if max height is allowed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Building Height = 49'</strong></td>
<td><strong>9' 6&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>16' 8&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 211 W. San Francisco Hotel

**Comparison of Building Height Information**

Sandoval Street Frontage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building #</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Surveyed Height</th>
<th>Official Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Lensic Commercial</td>
<td>42' 1&quot;</td>
<td>33'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>El Canon Cafe</td>
<td>19' 8&quot;</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average (2 bldgs.)**

|         |                     | 30' 11"         | 25' 6"       |

**Maximum Allowable Height**

(Average + 6’)

|         |                     | 36' 11"         | 31' 6"       |

**Necessary Exception if max height allowed**

| Building Height = 49' |                     | 12' 1"         | 17' 6"       |
## 211 W. San Francisco Hotel

### Comparison of Building Height Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building #</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Surveyed Height</th>
<th>Official Map Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>TAD Tribal Art</td>
<td>15'1&quot;</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Thai Café</td>
<td>14'7&quot;</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Articulations 325 W. SF</td>
<td>13'6&quot;</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Il Vicino 321 W. SF</td>
<td>20'4&quot;</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Lensic Theater</td>
<td>52'10&quot;</td>
<td>38'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Magique Gallery #207</td>
<td>17'2&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Moxie #205</td>
<td>17'7&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>#203</td>
<td>17'7&quot;</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Trading Post #201</td>
<td>17'10</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>Origins #137</td>
<td>20'8&quot;</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>Romancing The Stone</td>
<td>28'11&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Mineral Fossil #127-125</td>
<td>33'7&quot;</td>
<td>27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>Clearwater Creek (Paris Theater)</td>
<td>42'4&quot;</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Parts Unknown #121</td>
<td>19'1&quot;</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>406/408 W. SF</td>
<td>15'11&quot;</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>Nicholas Ortiz III Estate Bldg</td>
<td>12'0&quot;</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>El Canon Cafe</td>
<td>19'8&quot;</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Indian House Gallery #214</td>
<td>23'11&quot;</td>
<td>28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-18</td>
<td>Tina Sofia's</td>
<td>16'8&quot;</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>Cornell Bldg #208</td>
<td>31'2&quot;</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>Indian Trader West</td>
<td>17'7&quot;</td>
<td>13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>Evangelos</td>
<td>18'2&quot;</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-22</td>
<td>Chicos #122</td>
<td>31'0&quot;</td>
<td>45'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-23</td>
<td>NMCDLA #110</td>
<td>33'8&quot;</td>
<td>34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-24</td>
<td>Laughlin Bldg #102-106</td>
<td>32'1&quot;</td>
<td>32'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average (25 Bldgs) 23'4" 20'7"

Maximum Allowable Height (Average + 6') 29'4" 26'7"

Necessary Exception if max height allowed Proposed Building Height = 49' 19'8" 22'5"
Lensic Property Height Calculations

- Palace Avenue frontage:
  - Total: 211
  - Count: 8
  - Average: 26.375
  - Maximum Allowable Height: 28' 4"

- Sandoval Street frontage:
  - Total: 51
  - Count: 2
  - Average: 25.5
  - Maximum Allowable Height: 27' 6"

- San Francisco Street frontage:
  - Total: 514
  - Count: 25
  - Average: 20.56
  - Maximum Allowable Height: 22' 7"

Average = 26 ft 2 in

DAR 1.24.07

LGHP
211 W. San Francisco Hotel

Applicant’s Response to Exception Criteria

Style

Following are the exception criteria stated in City Code section 14.5.2(C)(5)(b), along with the Applicant’s responses to each criterion as they relate to the exception request contained in the Application with respect to architectural style.

In 2006, the City Council approved an ordinance creating the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict setting forth Design and Development Standards and conditions for the new building on the west side of the Lensic Block. (Ordinance No. 2006-4, the “Ordinance”) Rather than also establishing specific style criteria and amending the Historic Overlay district to reflect such style criteria for the Lensic Block, the City Council relied on the Design Standards set forth in the Ordinance to provide guidance for the specific development proposal for a building on the site – recognizing that the Spanish Baroque style is not included in the styles allowed by the Historic Overlay thereby necessitating approval of a style exception by the HDRB.

Ordinance condition 4 provides for either a Pueblo/Territorial architectural style, a Spanish Colonial Baroque style or a combination of both. The proposed building style is Spanish Baroque, completing the Lensic Block through a transition from the Moorish style of the Lensic Theater to the Spanish Baroque style of the Lensic Commercial building. The proposed style for the new building requires approval of a style exception by the HDRB because Spanish Baroque is not identified as an allowed style in the Downtown historic district.

Following the City Council’s approval of the Subdistrict, in 2007, the property owner applied for a 4-story multi-use building in the Territorial Revival style. After holding meetings with the local historic community and receiving feedback from the City, the owner proposed an alternate Spanish Baroque design, which the HDRB approved. The approved building was not constructed due to the economic downturn.

The current proposal for a single use building provides an opportunity to refine the Spanish Baroque style in conjunction with the single-use building and to further simplify the building massing.

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

Response: By identifying Spanish Baroque as an allowed style as part of the Design Standards, the City Council concluded that this style would be appropriate for the site. The proposed building has been designed in the Spanish Baroque architectural style with the intent of complimenting the Moorish style Lensic Theater and the Spanish Baroque style Lensic Commercial building without imitating or duplicating the
distinctive appearances of those buildings. The proposed style of the buildings on the Lensic block is unique in the downtown and the proposed building will provide a cohesive design for the three buildings on the block.

The arches along the outside of the ground floor portales and the limestone coping on the tower at the southwest corner of the building exemplify the Spanish Baroque style. The balcony railings and window designs draw from features of the Lensic Theater and Lensic Commercial building, providing continuity and reinforcing the unique character of the Lensic Block, the smallest block in the downtown.

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

Response: In its two-decade long application history, plans for the proposed building have reflected several different styles. Differences of opinion over what style would be appropriate have constituted a hardship for the property owner and their ability to obtain approval of a building and design. The hardship led, in part to the separate application process that the property owner undertook in 2006 to request rezoning of the Lensic Block and creation of a single Redevelopment Subdistrict so that direction could be provided as to style and development parameters to guide design of the application before you.

The City Council included the Spanish Baroque style in its approved Design Standards for the Redevelopment Subdistrict. This style requires an exception to avoid the hardship that would otherwise exist because the historic overlay was not amended at the time the Subdistrict was created to include the Spanish Baroque style approved by the City Council for this property.

(3)  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.

Response: The City Council's approval of the Spanish Baroque style as part of the Lensic Block Redevelopment Subdistrict demonstrates its determination that this style will strengthen the unique character of the Lensic Block and, by extension, the heterogenous character of the downtown. The Lensic Theater is an iconic downtown building that will be complimented by the new building, which will provide an opportunity for visitors to enjoy the downtown and further the purpose of the BCD as Santa Fe’s economic engine.
Corner of Palace and Grant Avenues – Looking West
W. San Francisco St. — Existing Lensic Theatre

W. San Francisco St. — Existing Lensic Commercial Building
W. San Francisco St. – Existing Parking Lot – Looking North

W. San Francisco St. – Existing Parking Lot – Looking NE
Sandoval Street – Corner of San Francisco St. - Looking North

Sandoval Street – Looking North
Stucco - El Rey #106 Buckskin
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MATERIAL PALETTE

1. BEIGE STUCCO
2. CLAY BRICK VENEER
3. PRECAST CONCRETE
4. METAL RAILING
5. METAL SEAM ROOF
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SOUTH ELEVATION