CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Liaison Planning Services, agent for Christina Halaburka, owner, requests to partially demolish a contributing yard wall and to construct a 5 ft. high coyote yardwall and gate at a contributing residence. An exception is requested to remove historic material from contributing structure, per Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case number:</th>
<th>2020-001732-HDRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>HDRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT LOCATION (S): 868 and 868½ East Alameda Street

OW – Christina Halaburka 868½ East Alameda Street Santa Fe, NM 87501 chalaburka@me.com

AP – Liaison Planning Services P.O. Box 1835 Santa Fe, NM 87504 liaisonplanning@gmail.com

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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

YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION

PROJECT TYPE
Status ☐ Primary Elevations ☐ Remodel ☐ Demolition ☑ New ☐ Other ☐

USE, EXISTING
Residential ☐ Non-Residential ☑ Vacant ☐

USE, PROPOSED
Residential ☐ Non-Residential ☑

HISTORIC BUILDING NAME
DATE: April 28, 2020
TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members
FROM: Daniel Schwab, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division

Case # 2019-001732-HDRB
Address: 868 & 868 ½ East Alameda Street
Historic Status: Contributing (yardwall)
Historic District: Downtown and Eastside

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

☐ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.
☐ Historic Inventory Form
☐ Zoning Review Sheet
☐ Other:

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

☐ Proposal Letter
☐ Site Plan/Floor Plan
☐ Elevations
☐ Photographs
☐ Other:
  • Street Wall Research by Architectural History Services
  • Sight triangle analysis by City of Santa Fe Traffic Technician
  • Applicant responses to exception criteria

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff defers to the Board as to whether the exception criteria in Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) have been met and whether the Demolition of Historic Structures Standards in Section 14-3.14(G) have been met.
BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

This case refers to a wall running parallel to the public right of way at 868 and 868 ½ East Alameda Street. At its hearing on February 25, 2020, the HDRB designated this wall a contributing structure due to its distinctive character and importance to the surrounding streetscape.

The owner proposes demolition of 13 ft. of the wall at the southern end, removal of the upper stuccoed portion of the wall along its length, and replacing it with coyote fencing to a height of 5 ft., as well as removal of a wall corner on the opposite (south) side of the driveway. The purpose of this is to make possible a second parking space next to the driveway and to improve vehicular access to the driveway. This proposal requires an exception and the applicant returns today to the Board with responses to the exception criteria.

The City of Santa Fe Traffic Technician has determined that the wall blocks the sight triangle for the driveway at 868 East Alameda and thus constitutes a legal nonconformity. To be brought into conformance with federal sight triangle requirements, the southern portion of the wall extending about 13 ft. to before the southern-most gate would need to not exceed 3 feet in height.

Recently, a vehicle backed into the wall and knocked over a portion approximately equivalent to that which the owner proposes to demolish. This portion constitutes less than 66.6 % of the whole structure, so that it may be rebuilt to its original height exceeding 3 ft. according to Section 14-10.3(C) and is not required to be brought into conformance regarding the federal sight triangle requirements.

In determining whether a request for demolition in a historic district should be approved or denied, the HDRB shall consider the following pursuant to 14-3.14(G)(1):

(a) Whether the structure is of historical importance: The wall has been in place since at least 1958, making it historically important to the streetscape.
(b) Whether the structure for which demolition is requested is an essential part of a unique street section or block front and whether this street section or block front will be reestablished by a proposed structure: This wall is an essential part of a unique street section on East Alameda Street. The planned demolition does not foresee its reestablishment. However, the Board should consider whether removal of a portion of it will substantially impact its contribution to the streetscape.
(c) The state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration: The wall portion was knocked down by a truck. The stones that make up the lower portion of the wall are still intact and are on site. Staff sees no reason why the wall portion cannot be reestablished with sufficient structural stability.

The demolition of this structure may be considered to have the potential to jeopardize its contributing status according to 14-5.2(D)(1) and thus requires an exception according to
Section 14-5.2(c)(5)(b). In deciding whether an exception may be granted, the board must assess the exception criteria. The complete staff and applicant responses to the demolition and exception criteria are included in this report. In short, based on the historic report, staff recommends that the structure is historically important and an essential part of a unique street section. The board should weigh up whether the exception criteria have been met, and whether the demolition of a portion of the wall as well as the replacement of the upper portion of the wall with coyote fencing will degrade its historic status.

The opinion of staff is that reducing the length of the wall to create a parking space could be a reasonable accommodation which would not injure the public welfare or diminish the character of the district and that the exception criteria have been met in this regard. However, removal of the upper stuccoed portion of the wall along its length, and replacing it with coyote fencing would damage the character of the streetscape of which the wall is an essential part because it would constitute a significant change in the character of the contributing wall. Furthermore, this action does not appear to offer any benefit to the public welfare.

**EXCEPTION CRITERIA:**

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

Applicant Response: This request will not damage the streetscape because it is not to demolish the entire wall but only a portion for safety reasons. The small section of wall does not play a major role in defining the streetscape and, therefore, its removal will not harm the streetscape’s character.

Staff Response: Staff sees a partial demolition of the wall, which extends currently almost the whole length of the frontage, as damaging to the streetscape.

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

Applicant Response: A denial to remove a portion of the wall will result in a hardship by preventing the applicant from removing a section of the wall to bring it into conformity with parking requirements and provide a safer driveway situation. This would be an injury to public welfare by not being able to provide an existing residential unit. Partial demolition will advance the property toward legal conformity.

Staff Response: The demolition will relieve a hardship in allowing a second dwelling unit to conform by having a parking space. It will also improve public safety for automotive traffic. However this should be balanced against the possible loss of a contributing wall in the district.

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

Applicant Response: The proposed removal of a portion of the wall will strengthen the heterogeneous character of the City within the Historic District by providing a required parking space and preserving the openings and character of the wall. The removal of the section of wall will result in a property, with two conforming parking spaces and residential units that provide a full range of housing within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.
Staff Response: The design option makes possible an additional dwelling unit and allows safer automobile access. It is not clear to staff whether other design options were exhaustively considered.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

Yard Wall Height:
14-5.2(D)(9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing and Floor Stepbacks
(c)(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.
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.

14-5.2(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts
(1) Purpose and Intent
It is intended that:
(a) Each structure to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken;
(b) Changes to structures that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most structures change over time;
(c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure be preserved; and
(d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

14-12 Contributing Structure:
A structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

14-12 Primary Façade:
One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.

14-12 Noncontributing Structure:
A structure, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H district.
Removal of Historic Material/Demolition:

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

(1)(a) The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.

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.

14-3.14 Demolition of Historic or Landmark Structure
(A) Summary of Procedure
(1) Upon receiving an application for demolition of a structure within the historic districts the HDRB shall, within sixty-five calendar days from the date of application, either grant or deny the application. Ordinarily, the HDRB will act on an application for demolition at its next regular meeting, if the application is submitted in proper form at least seven days before its next regular meeting; however, the HDRB may use the entire sixty-five day time period if the HDRB, on motion duly passed, determines such delay is necessary.
(2) Upon receiving an application for demolition of a landmark structure the HDRB shall, within sixty-five calendar days from the date of application, make a recommendation to the governing body to either grant or deny the application.

(B) Hearing Required
(1) In all applications involving the demolition of a structure, provision shall be made for a hearing, as set forth in the preceding section.
(2) The HDRB or governing body, as applicable, shall restrict its review to a consideration of whether the application will be in conformity with the standards established by this section.

(3) Notice of the time and place for each hearing shall be sent in writing to each applicant.

(4) An agenda of the HDRB shall be sent to all groups requesting notification and copies of meeting agendas, as set forth in the officially adopted neighborhood planning policies.

(5) On-site notice, by a sign of proposed demolition and of the time, date and place of the HDRB or governing body review shall be posted by the city on the affected property fourteen days prior to HDRB or governing body review of application for demolition. Such notice shall be prominently displayed, visible from a public street and securely placed on the property.

(C) Staff Review and Report

Before granting approval or denial to a demolition request, the land use director shall provide the following information on the structure under consideration.

(1) A report on the historic or architectural significance of the structure;

(2) A report from the city building inspector on the state of repair and structural stability of the structure;

(3) If the structure is more than seventy-five years old, and the entire project of which demolition is a part requires an archaeological clearance permit, a report from the land use director on whether the demolition would damage possible archaeological artifacts; and

(4) Other information as requested by the HDRB or governing body.

(F) Denial of Demolition Request

A determination that the structure should not be demolished shall impose a duty on the owner or other persons having legal custody and control to immediately take the action required under Section 14-5.2(B) (Minimum Maintenance Requirements).

(G) Standards

(1) In determining whether a request for demolition in a historic district should be approved or denied, the HDRB shall consider the following:

(a) Whether the structure is of historical importance;

(b) Whether the structure for which demolition is requested is an essential part of a unique street section or block front and whether this street section or block front will be reestablished by a proposed structure; and

(c) The state of repair and structural stability of the structure under consideration.
January 29, 2020

City of Santa Fe  
Historic Design Review Board  
P.O. Box 909  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-0909

LETTER OF INTENT

Re: 868 and 868 ½ E. Alameda  
Santa Fe, NM

Dear Board Members,

Please consider this letter as a formal request to approve an application for the above reference addresses. The property is located within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

This request is to remove portions of the street wall located at 868 E. Alameda which has been damaged by the roofer’s vehicle and to remove the stuccoed portion of the wall and replace it with coyote fencing not to exceed the allowable height as shown on the enclosed plans. In addition, the property owner also owns 868 ½ E. Alameda and is requesting to shave off a portion of the retaining wall on the northwest corner of her property in order to widen the driveway (see enclosed plans).

This street wall height and location does not meet City Code regarding clear site on a major arterial and is a safety issue. I have met with Ladd Lucero, City Traffic Technician on site and he confirmed this fact. He recommended that we remove a portion of the entire wall west of the driveway opening to the edge of the arched gate and the stucco part above the river rock past the arch and replace with coyote fence 4” apart. Enclosed is a site plan the he has initialed that supports this request.
The applicant has retained John Murphey of Architectural History Services to determine the age of the wall. His findings and supporting documents are attached.

Please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Dolores I. Vigil

Attachments: Application
               Authorization Letter
               Preliminary Zoning Review Worksheet
               Vicinity Map
               City Traffic Technician Approval
               Site Plan
               Elevations
               Photographs
               Historic Assessment Architectural History Services
January 28, 2020

Christine Halaburka
868 East Alameda Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

RE: 868 East Alameda Street — Street Wall Research

Dear Ms. Halaburka:

Responding to your request, I researched the background of the street wall in front of your home at 868 East Alameda Street. The scope of the work was informed by communication with your consultant, Dolores Vigil, based on guidance given to her by Santa Fe Historic Preservation Division planner Carlos Gemora.

The research consisted of reviewing historical aerial photographs and period maps. It additionally included a limited review of government documents, newspaper accounts, and Santa Fe city directories. The goal of the effort was to determine the wall’s era of construction and how it may have evolved over the years. The evaluation included a January 24 site visit, in which the structure was photographed, measured, and analyzed for its construction materials.

In summary, a wall has been in place at least since 1958, situated in the same location as the current structure. The specific design of the earlier wall, as compared to the current structure, is unknown.

Based on shadow projections observed on aerial photographs, the original wall may have been of a lower height. In addition, several stucco coatings exposed by recent damage indicate that the wall has experienced a degree of alteration, at least concerning the design and appearance of its upper portion.

The findings of the site visit and the attendant research follow.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this report.

Sincerely,

John W. Murphey, Project Historian

John W. Murphey
Architectural Historian/Researcher/Planner
Santa Fe, New Mexico
San Francisco Bay Area, California
john@archhistoryservices.com
Existing Conditions

The subject wall is located in front of a Pueblo Revival adobe duplex at 868 East Alameda Street, in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. While the house is designated a Contributing resource to the district, the wall is without status.

The structure, approximately 62' in length, parallels nearly the entire west elevation of the house, and is penetrated at three points (Photos 1 & 2). It is terminated at the south by an approximately 9' - 8"-wide gravel driveway leading to a one-bay garage. A shorter wall of similar composition continues from the northern terminus at a right angle but is not part of this study. Extracting the entry gate arch, the wall is on average 6' high.

The three openings hold (from north to south): a wood pedestrian gate to a side yard, a section of a wood “window” grille, and a wood door near the center of the wall, providing street access to the house (Photo 2). The focus of the composition -- the center entry -- is a wood board door surmounted by a rounded arch (Photo 3). All wood elements are painted blue.

An approximately 16' section of the wall at the driveway was damaged recently by a roofing truck (Photos 5-7).

Construction

The wall is composed of two distinct sections. Its base is made of stone set in concrete mortar. The tabular and round pink coarse-grained quartz, feldspar, and other native stones are laid in roughly regular courses (Photo 4). No lime mortar, which would suggest older construction, is evident. This section is approximately 3’ above the sidewalk. The stone base is slightly wider than the upper portion of the wall.

The upper portion is finished with stucco with the damaged section at the south end exposing its interior construction. The core is made of adobe bricks slathered in concrete mortar (Photo 8). Based on their appearance, it is assumed they are traditional, unamended bricks, although it is possible some may have been enhanced with Portland cement. Even at the core, there was no observable mud plaster or lime mortar, elements indicative of traditional construction.

Overall, the top portion of the wall is approximately 12” wide. In the visible section, its thickness is 9.5” to 10”, representing the width of a single adobe course.

The adobes are finished with several different stucco coatings, of likely different periods. These, because of the impact of the collision, are peeled back in areas, revealing a succession of layers (Photo 9).

The layers show what appears to be at least three separate stucco coats, each with a different adhesion system. The arrangement of one layer is unusual in that it does not follow the typical coloration strata of the three-coat system (e.g., typical colors used with the brown, scratch, and finish coats).
Each coating cycle has a distinct reinforcement, beginning with the innermost (and assumed oldest) stucco, which is adhered by chicken wire (Photo 9), followed by metal lath (Photo 10), and finally, the outer layer revealing fiberglass mesh (Photo 11). Pieces of exposed lath and fiberglass mesh along other parts of the wall suggest the entire structure experienced the same chronology of stucco coatings.

The wall is presently finished with a mixture of cementitious and Elastomeric stucco.

**Origin of Wall**

The only known historical survey for the house (H284, 1985), gives a construction date of 1934 to 1944. This is validated by the limited research conducted for this project, through a 1940 federal census enumeration which identifies a house of the same address occupied by Josephine Benavidez, a widow, and her six children. A brief review of Santa Fe city directories and newspaper accounts shows it was leased for several decades, often with a high turnover of tenants.

The 1985 survey does not mention the street wall as a character-defining element, but it is clearly visible in the accompanying photograph (Figure 1).

The first available aerial photograph from 1958 shows what appears to be a low wall paralleling the sidewalk (Aerial 1). Due to the photograph’s poor resolution, it is unclear whether the two pedestrian openings are present. A clearer picture of the structure is found on a 1966 aerial, which definitively reveals a wall punctuated with openings to the side yard and front entry (Aerial 2). Based on the height of its shadow line in comparison with shadows made by the house, the wall seems to be lower than its current 6’ height.

Two aerial images from the 1970s show the same basic configuration (Aerials 3 & 4). Looking at the shadow, the wall still appears to be shorter on the 1973 photograph (Aerial 3). This is supported not only by a comparison with the house shadows, but also with shadows cast by a fence or wall across the back yard.

**Conclusion**

Based on aerial photographs, a linear structure existed in the same position as the current wall since at least 1958. This structure continues to appear, in likely the same basic form, through the 1970s. Shadow lines visible on various aerials seem to indicate it was of a lower height than its current dimension.

The appearance of the “window” might indicate an alteration, as the Board and Historic Preservation Division staff have often required this treatment when a wall is increased in height. The division’s master case database, covering the years 1993 forward, was searched for a related project. No wall project for this address was found, though the alteration may have happened prior to these records.
The various stucco coatings register some amount of change to the exterior appearance and relative dimensions of the upper portion of the wall.

The damaged section of wall allowed almost a forensic investigation of its construction and subsequent layers of stucco. The materials observed did not indicate traditional construction (no lime mortar or adobe plaster), but instead materials and techniques common to the postwar period.

In conclusion, it is likely that a portion of the wall is older -- potentially the structure shown on the 1958 aerial photograph. The origin of its upper half is unclear but was in place by the time of the 1985 survey.

Figure 1: Copy of 1985 survey photograph.
Aerial Photographs

Aerial 2: 1966 aerial photograph.
Presence of a wall is evident with two openings at the arrows.
Courtesy NMDOT: 05-02-66_0017.
Aerial 4: 1978 aerial photograph.
Presence of a wall is evident with two openings at the arrows.
Courtesy NMDOT: 09-11-78_0074.
Surveys Photographs

(All photographs were taken by Robyn Powell on January 24, 2020).

Photo 1: Street view. Camera facing north.
Damaged section in foreground.

Photo 2: Street view. Camera facing east.
Pedestrian gate to house at center.
Photo 3: Back side of pedestrian gate to house. Camera facing west.

Photo 4: Undamaged stonework of lower portion of wall.
Photo 5: Damaged section of wall. Camera facing north.
Photo 6: Back side of damaged section. Camera facing northwest.

Photo 7: Damaged section of wall, inside at meter. Camera facing southwest.
Photo 8: Composition of upper portion of damaged section of wall. Camera facing northeast. Note adobe block and layers of stucco.

Photo 9: Back side of portion shown in above photograph. Note layers of stucco and chicken-wire concrete.
Photo 10: Exposed stucco lath at “window”.
Camera facing east.

Photo 11: Fiberglass mesh netting at top of gate.
Existing stucco yardwall on stone base

**Remove**
Existing stucco yardwall to stone base & add coyote fencing on top

New 6.0' high coyote yardwall & gate

Remove stucco yardwall & stone base to this point

Remove corner of low stone planter wall to improve visibility

Existing Residence

---

Typical Parking Space Sizes:
Standard: 8.5' x 19'
Small Car: 7.5' x 15'

868 East Alameda
10/19/19

Approved
Sight Visibility

1-16-20
868 E Alameda

Exception for the Removal of 13’ of an Existing Wall

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

Response: This request will not damage the streetscape because it is not to demolish the entire wall but only a portion for safety reasons. The small section of wall does not play a major role in defining the streetscape and, therefore, its removal will not harm the streetscape’s character.

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

Response: A denial to remove a portion of the wall will result in a hardship by preventing the applicant from removing a section of the wall to bring it into conformity and it would be an injury to the public welfare to not be able to provide a conforming residential unit. Partial demolition will advance the property toward legal conformity, preventing financial hardship.

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

Response: The proposed removal of a portion of the wall will strengthen the heterogeneous character of the City within the Historic District by providing a required parking space and preserving the openings and character of the wall. The removal of the section of wall will result in a conforming property, creating two residential units that provide a full range of housing within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

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

Response: The wall was built around 1958 without adherence to current City code regarding clear sight requirements. The wall is in non-conformance with this section of the code. With the partial removal, the requirements will be met which will make it safer for the residents to back out of the lot onto a major arterial and increase safety for pedestrians using the sidewalk.
(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the actions of the applicant

Response: December 2019 a roofing company truck backed into the wall and demolished a portion of it which crumbled. This portion of the wall is structurally unstable and should not be constructed to its original state.

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

Response: The removal of the section of wall will promote a harmonious outward appearance, by the creation of its design that is within the limits of the Historic District. Thus, preserving property values, promoting economic and cultural welfare of the people of Santa Fe. Removal of a portion of the wall and preserving the remainder would allow the property owner an improved vehicular access, legally conforming driveway and a parking space as required by code.
(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the actions of the applicant

Response: December 2019 a roofing company truck backed into the wall and demolished a portion of it which crumbled. This portion of the wall is structurally unstable and should not be constructed to its original state.

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

Response: The removal of the section of wall will promote a harmonious outward appearance, by the creation of its design that is within the limits of the Historic District. Thus, preserving property values, promoting economic and cultural welfare of the people of Santa Fe. Removal of a portion of the wall and preserving the remainder would allow the property owner an improved vehicular access, legally conforming driveway and a parking space as required by code.
Existing Residence
Lot Size
±3,605.5 SF

Existing interior
courtyard wall
Existing yard wall on property line

Approximate line of 100 year floodplain
(property line within floodplain)

Existing painted wood gate with lintel above
Existing painted wood "window" with lintel above
Existing stucco yard wall on stone base (stone base ±3'-3" tall, stone wall height = 0'-0")
Existing stucco yard wall entry with arched top and painted wood gate
Existing concrete sidewalk
Existing brick sidewalk
Existing public sidewalk
Existing curb cut

Existing low coyote fencing (4'-2" above planter)
Existing 3'-0" tall stone planter
Existing stucco yard wall (4'-2" above planter)
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Existing Site Plan
Existing Residence

Existing yardwall: remove upper stucco finished yardwall and add coyote fencing on top of stone base to a maximum height of 5'-2". Provide 4' spaces between fence pickets.

Springline of existing stucco "arch" over gate.

New 5'-0" high coyote yardwall & gate.

Remove stucco yardwall & stone base to this point (portion of wall has been damaged by vehicular collision).

Increase width of curb cut to 22'-0".

Remove corner of low stone planter wall to improve visibility.

Short term rental parking requirements: 1 space per bedroom.

Typical Parking Space Sizes:
- Standard: 8.5' x 19'
- Small Car: 7.5' x 15'

Proposed Site Plan
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