

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
November 5, 2008

| <b>ITEM</b>   | <b>ACTION TAKEN</b>    | <b>PAGE(S)</b> |
|---|------------------------|----------------|
| Approval of Agenda  | Accepted as published  | 1              |
| Business from the Floor   | None.                  | 2              |
| Administrative Matters  |                        |                |
| 1. <b><u>Case #H 08-095A</u></b><br>SW Corner of Palace and Paseo | Discussion             | 2-11 ✓         |
| 2. <b><u>Update on Chapter 14 Rewrite</u></b>                     | Discussion             | 2 ✓            |
| Matters from the Board  | Not Considered         | 11             |
| Adjournment   | Adjourned at 7:55 p.m. | 11             |

**MINUTES OF THE**

**CITY OF SANTA FE**

**HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**November 5, 2008**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A special meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Design Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms Sharon Woods, Chair  
Mr. Dan Featheringill  
Ms. Cecilia Rios  
Ms. Deborah Shapiro  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Two Vacancies

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner  
Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. Greg Smith, Current Planning Division Director  
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

**NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department.**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as published.

## **D. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None.

## **E. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

Chair Woods asked for Mr. Smith's report first.

### **2. Update on Chapter 14 Rewrite. (Greg Smith)**

Mr. Smith presented the report for this case. He said it had become almost triple in length but some of it had been deleted. They were working from the Clarion draft. The revisions were not a major overhaul of authorities or powers of the HDRB but a clarification and refinement of their current roles.

He was optimistic that by December there would be a complete draft ready for public review.

Chair Woods said they had been meeting each Wednesday. She appreciated the progress the group was making.

Mr. Rasch distributed copies of the current draft revisions of the ordinance. He noted that in this one, each of the five historic districts had its own descriptions. He asked the Board to look at the editing that had taken place.

Chair Woods asked that a copy be emailed to each Board member.

Mr. Smith said the text paralleled the information in the old historic ordinance.

- 1. Case #H 08-095A. SW Corner of Palace Avenue and Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Hogan, agent for Drury Plaza, proposes an Informational Study Session regarding the redevelopment of the Old St. Vincent Hospital and Marion Hall property. (David Rasch)**

Mr. Brian Nenninger with Drury Southwest, Inc. introduced himself and his association, Kevin Whitfield. He thanked the Board for the time and promised would be brief. He then introduced Steve Flance who was the Project Director.

Mr. Flance said he had been consulting with Drury for about a year. He thanked the Board for taking this time.

He said they wanted to work with the Board to flesh out the issues the Board had regarding their project and examine options for dealing with those issues. Trying to get agreement on the rules of the game out on the table and understand where the Board was coming from was their goal.

They would briefly orient the Board to the project and then go into the key issues. He said they had a list to would share with the Board [attached as Exhibit A].

He asked Mark Hogan go through the site plan and models

Mr. Hogan pointed out the elements of the site plan that included the cathedral, Marion Hall, the hospital, Paseo; the cathedral project was included for scale. Also the Archdiocese project. The walk way started at Cathedral Park and ran all the way to Paseo de Peralta. They were trying to create pedestrian crossings throughout. The elements included renovation of Marian Hall for hotel rooms, less than 6000 sq ft of gallery space fronting on Paseo, a parking structure below grade. The ht of it would be one story as it faced the street and went to two on the back side.

He pointed out where the property lines were adjacent to the Cathedral and Archdiocese projects.

Ms. Rios suggested they color code the model to show what was cathedral and what was archdiocese and not Drury.

Mr. Hogan explained that this was just a massing model and they would have another model to show other aspects of it.

Ms. Shapiro asked him to point out what were new buildings and what was existing. Mr. Hogan pointed them out.

Ms. Rios asked if between Marian Hall and hospital they wanted a car turnaround.

Mr. Hogan agreed and said they wanted to replicate the turnaround that was there previously. He pointed it out on a rendering. He explained it would provide access for Marian Hall and an entry into the parking garage.

Mr. Flance had a list of issues to talk about. He said they met with downtown leaders and historic preservation people. Some of the issues came out of those discussions. He passed out the list [attached as Exhibit A].

Chair Woods asked where additions were in relation to primary facades. Mr. Hogan pointed out where the additions were and where restoration of facades would occur.

Mr. Flance noted that with Marian Hall, they were taking it back to its original status with porches. But they wanted to get into the whole discussion on designations because those were important to the project and how they would arrange the massing on the site.

Mr. Rasch read what the Code said about primary façades (having features that defined the architecture of the structure). Owners were limited in the changes that could be made on a primary façade so the Board needed to define which of the twelve façades were primary.

He explained that staff would start at the front of the building (typically the one facing a street) and catalog the qualitative features on that elevation and work their way around the building. There was nothing in the code about how to do that. They would look for another street-facing elevation and assessed the features on each elevation. Just because there were historic features on all sides didn't mean they were all primary and that was where the challenge was on this building. Public visibility was not in that definition although it might come into play here.

Mr. Fiance said they had prepared an assessment of each of the facades, using the rationale Mr. Rasch gave. When they felt they were not primary, they assigned a secondary position. He clarified that he was not looking for agreement but feedback. They put the drawing on the front because it was the first determinant. When built, Palace Avenue was the most important street along with San Francisco and Alameda. East and west along the river, Palace was residential with very fine homes. He oriented the building to Palace and Marian to Cathedral. The parking lot at the corner provided the primary entrance to the hospital. The emergency entrance was at the back of the hospital.

In the 1980's the southeast façade was changed when a minor overhang was added but it was a major change on that elevation.

On page 11, they identified 4 major features of the building: Stepped massing, Classical Details, Brick Detailing and Modulated window patterning.

Mr. Hogan pointed out several characteristics, cruciform, balustrades and a very classical detail at the entrance on the pediments themselves. They used that as a basis for the character defining features.

He pointed out the window details on the more important facades that Meem did not include on lesser facades. The sill heights were changed to identify various groupings of windows.

Then they used that checklist to go around the building.


Mr. Fiance asked if there were other things the Board felt they should be looking at.

Ms. Walker acknowledged they had worked hard on this but the Board might have a disagreement on some of it

Mr. Fiance agreed. They were trying to get an agreement on the approach, not necessarily the result. The status they used was principal façade. If there were other characteristics to add, they would like to know. They want to know if this was a good approach.

Mr. Featheringill agreed with the approach. He thought there was a lot more than just saying it was most decorative so it was primary. The streetscape of facades did need to be preserved in the historic district. So the most visible was important to consider.

Mr. Fiance said they met with some neighborhood folks last week. One said this was a hospital and



defined a symbol of the community of place and time when it was the only hospital there. He seemed to be saying that he did not want that character to be lost in any development of the site.

Mr. Featheringill agreed.


Ms. Rios said to determine what was primary, she looked at what defined the character. What they had listed was on her list. But she added that you have to look at the parapet itself, what materials were there, the size and orientation of the windows, what the building materials were. This has exposed brick and detail between the windows. You also have to consider how it was occupied; what the use of it was; who designed it; were they well known in the community.

Ms. Shapiro thought the façade on page 14 was probably the most contentious. There were a few elements not on the list.

Mr. Flance asked if they were saying it was not just architecture

Ms. Rios agreed there were other things to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Flance asked if there was a middle ground where the building could be modified but still retain enough of its original architecture but allowed some modification of the façade.



Chair Woods felt they were not yet at that point of seeking an agreement. They were in a subjective place. Perhaps they should back up to be more objective. There were licensed historic surveyors who did this for a living that could be employed – someone that did not have the investment in it to get their definition as well. They were not reinventing the wheel here.

Mr. Flance thought that was a very good suggestion and was glad she brought it up. They wanted to know what the approach was that they could all agree on. The standards used by a qualified historic surveyor related to national register or whatever, could help.

Chair Woods said it would help shine the light on it. It was too premature to get the Board to agree with their assessment.

Mr. Featheringill noted that when they first discussed it, they were missing a lot of information. They now had some additional facts they would have to look at.

Mr. Flance said they would proceed with that recommendation.

Chair Woods added that the City had an approved list.

Mr. Flance felt they needed to do it on some basis of credibility. Having someone who was objective with solid historic status could make a big difference.

Ms. Rios reminded him that the ultimate decision rested on the shoulders of this Board but they would listen to a respected surveyor.

Mr. Flance said they wanted to make this project work with this Board and didn't intend to go to the Council if they don't like what the Board said nor was he looking for answers tonight.

Ms. Rios asked if the City Council had to ratify the decision of the Board regarding primary facades.

Mr. Rasch said it did not since the Council gave that authority to the Board in 2005.

Mr. Flance asked if there were other issues.

Ms. Shapiro had concerns about the façade on page 14. They thought the portal was historic but in the model it was completely cut.

Mr. Flance clarified that on page 14, they were trying to provide information and showed how much alteration had taken place in 50 years. All of this apparently took place by the State in the early 1980's.

Ms. Shapiro asked if there were modifications to windows.

Mr. Flance said it was changed to a more formalized entrance probably by Presbyterian or State. The window pattern was different from the window pattern that Mr. Hogan discussed.

Mr. Hogan noted that the portal on the back was greatly changed. He pointed out the differences which were made by changing the sills. There were doors changed to windows and vice versa.

Chair Woods felt it was good for him to have different fenestration on the primary from the other façades.

Mr. Hogan explained that they turned the corner and then they began the addition. They also tried to develop a stepping on that side so it didn't "hit you all at once." He said they looked at several variables and had discussions with staff on whether it compromised that. On top, the windows would be kept intact. There were several things that did not follow the traditional pattern. They also looked at whether or not the little addition could be taken off.

Mr. Flance said the base architecture would play through. He reviewed a couple of options but they were inaudible. The last option would be to pull away the addition and put in a glass façade and allow some of the original building to show. That was a technique seen in a lot of restorations.

Mr. Featheringill was not enthused by any of the options.

Ms. Rios didn't know if she would support the glass wall option, depending on what that façade would be. She asked how much space the additions would provide.

Mr. Flance clarified that the additions were essentially restaurants.

Ms. Shapiro liked the atrium. To have it transparent so you could see what was under it was a good idea. She was confused by the window detail. The top windows were very tall and the lower ones square

Mr. Hogan said the ground floor had a walk out patio so they wanted to maintain height (taller).

Ms. Shapiro was not seeing those there now.

Mr. Hogan said they were there. Then on the upper level, it was set back and would have some doors incorporated on them.

Ms. Shapiro thought it looked a little flat and just a duplication. It was too symmetrical, but if they added an atrium on it, it would help.

Mr. Hogan said the top was a completely separate block.

Chair Woods pointed out that the façade was four floors going straight up. So when they take the little addition off, it mitigates the height. It needed some kind of step back or something that would mitigate the "jarring" of it. With this particular façade, something could make the building better.

Mr. Flance said something that would modulate the massing of the building was exactly what they were thinking of.

Ms. Shapiro said that was what made this façade so unique.

Mr. Flance understood there were two options they could explore.

Mr. Featheringill suggested putting the little addition on the other side.

Ms. Shapiro excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Hogan pointed out a problem they would have in moving the little addition to the other side. It would just shorten those rooms.

Mr. Featheringill thought the lowering of one level would work. He asked if they could step just the hallway back 2-3 windows.

Mr. Hogan asked for clarification and Mr. Featheringill explained it at the model.

Mr. Featheringill didn't think the glass wall would work well in the historic district.

Ms. Rios asked how they would characterize that architecture style.

Mr. Flance said it was presented as Territorial style. They hadn't filled it out yet as they were trying to deal with massing, scale and height.

Mr. Hogan explained the east elevation briefly with a stepped back portal. He showed the elevator tower. They were looking at more simplified Territorial to help distinguish it from the historic portions.

Chair Woods was concerned about sticking a big mass on a big mass.

Mr. Rasch reviewed more of the code. If the proposed addition causes it to lose its status, it shall be denied. Additions should have similar materials and styles but not duplicate so as to make it indistinguishable. They were talking about a massing change and he cautioned them not to go too far on it.

Mr. Flance said they heard some questions from the public about how they intended to camouflage the garage. The street front of the garage would be bermed and reflect a commercial front similar to what one would see elsewhere downtown that was pedestrian friendly and would be screened heavily. So the model didn't say much about it but the drawings did.

Mr. Hogan said it went well below the street level on that street. He pointed it out so it would not read as a parking garage there.

Ms. Walker was confused because on page three it showed the main entrance on the east façade, not where the trees were.

Mr. Hogan pointed out the original entry and where they would have it.

Mr. Flance said the entry and drop off at Marian Hall would take place after removing the breezeway.

Ms. Walker understood.

Chair Woods invited the public to examine the model and then they would take comments from the public. She declared a brief recess.

Mr. Martínez was concerned that they not stop the traffic with the design they build. The old hospital needed a lot of work to bring it up to where it should be. He felt they should not close the street down. It should never be closed.

There were no other speakers from the public.

Ms. Rios was concerned about the appearance of the garage on Paseo.

Mr. Flance addressed height issue.

Mr. Hogan said if the allowable height was 16' 2", they were at 22' stepped back.

Ms. Rios asked what the exception would be.

Mr. Hogan said the height calculation as defined by code was shown in the elevation as the dashed line at 16' 2". The top of the building was 22' 2" from the sidewalk so it would be a 5' 5" exception.

They briefly discussed the way height was calculated.

Chair Woods noted the whole lot was sloping down.

Mr. Hogan agreed and said the height increased as you went down the slope. The height was determined on the street facing elevation at midpoint.

Mr. Rasch said anything above 4' above the 16' 2" would be an exception, wherever it was on the lot.

Chair Woods asked if they were going to ask for exceptions. Mr. Hogan agreed.

Mr. Rasch read the code on exceptions. The code addressed buildings as isolated occurrences.

Mr. Hogan said they would ask for a couple of feet.

Mr. Flance clarified they would have a height exception all the way through this site that they would have to discuss with the Board. It was a matter of degree. They wouldn't need one for the garage and they needed to sort out where they were.

Chair Woods said having cars parking on the roof, would be a problem. It would require a five foot parapet to hide them.

Mr. Hogan said they wanted it like La Fonda's garage.

Chair Woods pointed out that La Fonda have everything under the roof.

Mr. Whitfield said they didn't want those cars visible either.

Chair Woods appreciated what they were putting underground but would be mad if she paid for a room there and looked out on a parking lot. She suggested they could put a parapet wall set back from Paseo.

Mr. Hogan went through some of the other heights and pointed them out on the model (18' 8"). They were trying to come up with appropriate massings with setbacks and scale. He said the maximum exception needed was 14' 4".

Mr. Flance explained that it was for the third story.

Mr. Featheringill asked Mr. Rasch about the height percentages negotiated in the Cathedral project.

Mr. Rasch said they wanted multiple buildings and the Board came up with percentages - how much could be 3 story, how much at 2 story and how much at one story.

Mr. Hogan said they asked what was appropriate for those spaces, not what was going on adjacent to them. He gave rough estimates of the numbers for their project.

Mr. Whitfield said their percentages were less than their neighbor's. He added that there was a fifteen foot drop from Paseo.

Mr. Fiance said there was very little to be seen on Palace.

Mr. Rasch commented that currently there was a solarium on that roof.

Chair Woods asked if the needed exception for height for the ramada would affect the historic status.

Mr. Rasch said for contributing, no more than one more story to be set at the rear of the structure was allowed. But practice was to match or go slightly lower than existing heights on contributing buildings.

Mr. Fiance said this was not a solid structure and was about the height of the parapet of the cruciform.

Chair Woods explained that whatever they had on top could not be visible from the public way.

Mr. Rasch considered, because of the architectural character, that an increased parapet would make the windows look too low.

Mr. Fiance said they would study it carefully. He said their presentation was completed.

Ms. Rios thanked them, acknowledging that they had done a lot of input and that was what made a project go forward. She was sure they wanted the best project at the end.

She asked for more on the turnaround by Marian Hall. She didn't care for that. It was now a smooth walkway with no traffic – none there or at the corner for a long time. All the traffic had been in the back. So she would like it to remain a walkway.

Mr. Fiance explained the goal was to separate Marian Hall from the hospital. They wanted to remove the current connection that was non-contributing and take an entrance off Palace that would provide a drop off to Marian Hall. They wanted it so motorists would not have to enter the garage to turn around.

Mr. Hogan said it would not be constant traffic but would remain for pedestrians.

Mr. Featheringill asked if that was the original entrance. Mr. Fiance agreed.

Chair Woods said they could still provide access from Paseo. She liked the idea of separating them.

Mr. Nenninger said they definitely didn't want someone stopping on Palace.

Mr. Flance suggested they might work with the city on a bulb out there to allow a drop off.

Mr. Flance asked the Board to let them go back to the drawing board and submit ideas on how to make the drive pedestrian friendly and not an interruption to the sidewalk.

Mr. Rasch said the opening would be part of the restoration. Staff would support the opening there. He also noted that the boiler plant additions would have exceptions as well.

Mr. Flance said they were respecting that it was contributing. They hadn't determined which façade they thought was primary but they would transform a boiler plant at the rear into a restaurant. They would have to work with Mr. Rasch on which ones were primary and wouldn't mess with them. They were giving a much higher use in terms of land use.

Chair Woods thanked everyone including staff and presenters and the public for coming.

Mr. Flance said they would continue to take the steps necessary to work through these things.

#### **F. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Not considered.

#### **G. ADJOURNMENT**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Approved by:



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer