



Agenda

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2009 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 2009 – 5:30 PM

COMMUNITY ROOM-MAIN PUBLIC LIBRARY

145 WASHINGTON- SECOND FLOOR

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- G. OLD BUSINESS
 - I. Case #H-08-095B. Southwest corner of Palace Avenue and Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark A. Hogan, agent for DSW Santa Fe, LLC, proposes to assign primary elevations to contributing structures and to restore historic character on a significant building, remodel two contributing buildings by removing non-contributing additions and constructing 39,000 sq. ft. of additions, as well as constructing approximately 62,000 sq. ft. of additional buildings and site improvements. The maximum allowable height for streetscape structures is 16'9" and interior lot structures is 18'8". New structures are proposed at 25'9" and 44'4". Five exceptions are requested: height (14-5.2(D)(9)); roof pitch (14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); Santa Fe Style (14-5.2(E)); creating openings on a primary elevation (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)); and exceeding the 30" window rule (14-5.2(E)(1)(c)) . (David Rasch)
- H. NEW BUSINESS
- I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD
- J. ADJOURNMENT

For more information regarding cases on this agenda, please call the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations or an interpreter for the hearing impaired, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to hearing date. If you wish to attend the May 26, 2009 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday, May 26, 2009.

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
May 26, 2009

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Approval of Agenda	Accepted as amended	1
Communications	None	2
Business from the Floor	None.	2
Old Business		
1. <u>Case #H 08-095B</u> SW Corner of Palace and Paseo	Approved primary facades & height exceptions	2-52
New Business	None	
Matters from the Board	None	52
Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:38 p.m.	53

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

May 26, 2009

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 Community Room of the Downtown Public Library, 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
John Kantner
Christine Mather
Ms. Cecilia Rios
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Deborah Shapiro

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Marissa Barrett, Senior Planner
Mr. Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Asst. City Attorney
Charmaine Clair, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approval of Minutes was on the Agenda; the minutes were not included in the packet and would be approved at the next meeting.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

To be approved the next meeting.

E. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

F. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Case #H 08-095B** SW Corner of Palace Avenue and Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Mark Hogan, agent for DSW Santa Fe, LLC, requests assignment of primary elevations on contributing structures and proposes to restore historic character on a significant building, remodel two contributing buildings by removing non-contributing additions and constructing 39,000 sq. ft of additions, as well as constructing approximately 62,000 sq. ft. of additional buildings and site improvements. The maximum allowable height for streetscape structures is 16'9" and an interior lot structure is 18'8". New structures are proposed a 25'9" and 44'4". Five exceptions are requested: height (14-5.2(D)(9)); roof pitch (14-5.2(D)(9)(d)); Santa Fe Style (14-5.2(E)); creating openings on a primary elevation (14-5.2(D)(5)(a)); and exceeding the 30" window rule (14-5.2(E)(1)(c)). (David Rasch)

At the request of the applicant, this portion of the meeting is transcribed verbatim.

Chair Woods - Before we start this case in going through it is safe to say in all the years I've served on the Board which I think now is 12 or 13, Cecilia has been longer than I have, that this is probably one of the most complex cases that has ever come before us certainly in the years I've chaired. There could be others I'm sure. And I believe this is too much for us to make a motion on the entire presentation. And it's going to need to be broken down and what I'd like to do is decide how we are going to break it down and what I would suggest we can decide to take on something like primary façade. We could do Marian Hall. We could do the height calculation. Although I think that would be premature with the exceptions, and I can call this or we can call

this together as to what works out. The way I am going to do is say we're not going to take this on as the entire thing and make a motion its way too complex. If you want to respond to that. Why don't you get sworn in, Steve?

Ms. Clair - Under penalty of perjury, do you swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Mr. Flance - I do.

Mr. Flance - Steve Flance. I represent the Flance Company, 521 Weber Street, Santa Fe.

Chair Woods - This is Case #H 08-095B. Steve, would you want to respond to that?

Mr. Flance - We've discussed this among ourselves, knowing that there's a lot here. It would be our preference to break up the case to deal with two issues tonight. One would be the height issue. The height issue is very important to us because, frankly, it is really a matter of whether we can move on with this project or we can't.

The second would be the determination of the primary façades which is the heart of the overall design issue but again if we can't reach an agreement on the primary façades then we don't have a project to present to you. So those are the two things we would like if you are going to break the case up, to try to get through.

Chair Woods - What I would like to do is start with the primary façades and then let's see where we get with that and then we'll look at the height issue. There's a height issue basically on two or three buildings.

Mr. Rasch - There's three new ones in the rear and half of the one along the streetscape.

Chair Woods - And there's no height issue on the old hospital?

Mr. Rasch - No.

Chair Woods - So, it would be on those two. Let's take it in that order starting with the primary façade.

Mr. Flance - Let's do the best we can.

Chair Woods - Okay what I'm going to ask for then, is because we have to be out of here at 8:30, and hopefully we'll be out sooner.

Ms. Walker - David, would you please explain what is magic about 8:30?

Mr. Rasch - At 8:30 the library starts announcing that they are closing.

Chair Woods - What I would like to do is first have David do his staff report on just the primary façades and then have all your people who were going to speak all be sworn in together and then I would like to take it building by building. We are basically dealing with Marian Hall and the old hospital. So we'll start with Marian Hall-no, we're not?

Mr. Rasch - Marian Hall is a significant building so all are primary.

Chair Woods - So then we're dealing with the old hospital and the boiler, so let's start with the boiler and then we'll go to the old hospital. And what I also ask is for you guys not to review (?) yourselves and not that you have I really appreciate, you've been great, we're not selling here we're just trying to get all the facts and move on to the next so, David.

Mr. Rasch - The slide up on the screen now shows the footprint and how I have numbered those elevations. Do you want to start with the boiler right?

Chair Woods - Yes

Mr. Rasch - That starts on page 7 of your staff report and the elevations are called out on page 8. The central boiler plant building is located south of and behind the hospital is known as Central Boiler Plant.

Chair Woods - David, one second, as you do this these guys refer to north, south, east and west and you've got numbers which makes it really hard so I'm going to ask you to translate your numbers to directions so we're all on the same page.

Mr. Flance - We do have numbers and use those numbers.

Mr. Rasch - Oh good, thank you. The boiler plant is constructed with concrete and brick in 1904 to serve Marian Hall. At an unknown date, the historic stair and landing on the north elevation were removed. Also the original arch double entry doors on the north elevation were altered to a rectangular opening. In the 1950s, a large addition was constructed by John Gaw Meem on the east and south elevations, and the character of the entire structure was altered by replacing the pitch roof with a flat roof and adding Territorial detailing to match the architectural style of the new hospital that it now also served.

The building retains its historic materials, including wood double hung windows in the 1904 portion, and the non-original editions are now considered to be part of the historic character by John Gaw Meem in the 50's. A small CMU block addition was constructed on the west elevation at an unknown, presumably non-historic date.

The building was listed as contributing to the district in 2008. The following inventory by elevations helps to establish which elevations may be considered as primary. Now as you see on the screen to the top, elevation one, that's at the north end and that's the original 1904 elevation as well as the West side elevation number two. Elevation number three, the 1950s Meem addition as well as number five and four, four is a little part on the north where it is separate from one because it does set back the required definition amount by whatever feet it is to make it a separate elevation. So we have five elevations to actually assign.

So this is the north elevation of both the 1904 on the right and that little section on the left is the 1950s North elevation Meem addition.

Ms. Rios- What numbered section does that respond to?

Mr. Rasch- That would be one and four. One and four, four is at the far left, that little section, and on number one you can see the historic double pane two over two windows and almost see the quoining on corners to the main block and then the changes that were historic was coping along the top.

You also see down where the person is, the window was slightly altered in front of that, on the other side of that parking sign there's a wall-infill and then there's this big mechanical grate; that's all kind of non-historic alteration. And then at the far right you can see the CMU block addition that's being proposed to be removed from that west elevation.

So that's, elevation one I'm recommending contributing, elevation four, I don't see anything different when we get to elevation three the addition, so I'm not recommending approval of four as primary.

This is the west elevation, elevation number two. And in here you see again those historic two over two double hung windows, you do see some historic massing, the chimney, and you get the quoining as well as the brick coping and then that CMU block. So I do recommend this elevation for primary especially because they are proposing to remove that block addition. This is the east elevation which I think is probably the one that you're going to discuss the most. This elevation does not have the character of the 1904 building, it's more relevant to the 1950s hospital building and I believe Meem did this east elevation, which faces Paseo de Peralta to mimic the hospital, to tie it together so you have the metal casement windows, the brick coping which is just now on the old building, but this is a historic addition so I would consider part of the character of the building even though it's not the original character, and I'm recommending primary elevation for elevation number three.

This is elevation number five which is the 1950s addition. It's on the South elevation and I

don't see any character defining elements here that are required to be retained so I am not recommending primary elevation for elevation number five.

Finally I would say the character defining historic integrity which said substantiates the contributing historic status on elevations one, two and three; these elevations embody all of the unique architectural details and establish a record of the historic changes to the building.

Chair Woods- Kelly, before I go any further I am going to ask you for both the board and the people present, is to, for us as the ordinance defines and historic façade so we clearly understand what is needed for a façade to be termed primary.

Ms. Brennan- I'm actually going to read you two definitions okay? Primary façade is one or more principal faces where elevations of a structure, with features that define the character of a structure's architecture. Principal is the primary or predominate as applied to a use or structure, as distinguished from secondary or accessory.

Chair Woods- Want to translate that last sentence.

Ms. Brennan- The principal primary or predominate, meaning that not, you shouldn't assume that all the sides are primary. It's really what defines the unique characteristics of the structure as a whole and that's intrinsic in the primary façade definition. One or more principal faces or elevations of a structure with features that define a character of a structure, the structures architecture.

Chair Woods- How does this relate to a building keeping its contributing status when we; either one of you.

Ms. Brennan- I'd like David to speak to this too because there's practice I think that this case has brought forward the sort of importance of designating primary façades early on in these things, so David can speak to what we've done historically and answer your question.

Mr. Rasch- Sure, I guess I've two points. By procedure, since the code is silent about how to determine the primary elevation, it just gives the definition, we've, staff has kind of consistently had a procedure where we start on the street facing or main entrance and work our way around the building. And what we do is try to do is try to grab those character defining elements and if we grab it on one elevation, say the street facing one, and that same two over two historic double hung window is on every elevation we don't necessarily need to grab those elevations because we already have that character defining feature preserved on that one. So as we work our way around the building we try to amass all of those character defining elements that are essential to making that building a contributing historic building and that's why I'm recommending on elevation three on the boiler plant because it has the 1950s historic windows and massing.

So that's one answer. Now the other thing I wanted to talk about was why the primary elevation is important on a significant building like Marian Hall, all elevations are primary on a contributing building. This board assigns which elevations. And on the primary elevation a lot of the re-modeling and rehabilitation standards depend on the contributing primary elevations. On those elevations you can't replace historic material. You need to maintain it. On non-primary elevations you can replace historic material, so it's the primary elevations one or more, whichever this board determines on any building, are the ones that you need to preserve in order to maintain the contributing status. Now, if we treat a primary elevation essentially like a non-primary elevation and remove the historic material, put additions on it that would in effect remove the contributing status to the building.

Chair Woods- If you had and I'm asking for clarification so were all on the same page here and understand, if you had in this building you're saying there were three primary façades and if you say one was changed you are saying the building would lose its status.

Mr. Rasch - It can, depending on the amount of change. Now that's a hard job that this board has is once you assign those primaries you look at the way they're being altered or not, and it's the whole. In my opinion on the boiler plant, the front, elevation number one holds a lot of that 1904 character with symmetry, the Westside has unique massing but also the Eastside has that later historic addition so I see three pieces to this contributing building.

Chair Woods- Does anybody have questions for staff before I turn this over?

Ms. Rios- David do you agree that the CMU block addition on the northwest corner on the boiler room is not historic and can be removed?

Mr. Rasch- Yes.

Ms. Rios- Just a point that I wanted to make, in reference to primary façade's, you can, when you think of primary you think naturally of main. As was stated in the definitions primary- a building can have many primary façades, as long as they have character defining features.

Ms. Walker- David would you mind saying one is North, which digit is West which...

Mr. Rasch- Yes one is North, and also four, those are both North; West is number two, the 1904 elevation, number three is the East, that's the 50s Meem addition, and number five is the South. That's the Meem addition.

Chair Woods - Dan just pointed out that they're right on page 8. Are there are any other questions?

Steve do you want to get everybody sworn in at once that's going to speak.

Mr. Flance- Sure, let's see. We have Mark, Kevin, Frank, I think that's it.

Ms. Clair- Raise your right hand please. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Flance group- Yes.

Ms. Clair- State your name and address when you come up to the podium to speak, please.

Mr. Flance- One of the things we were talking about with this primary façade was who we relied on to make those kinds of judgments. We agreed with, I'll say from the outset, and this will cut through a lot of stuff, we agreed with the approach that Mr. Rasch has taken and we've also prepared and we'll submit this for the record, an independent façade (Exhibit 1) that was prepared by Gayla Bechtol, who's an art professional historian who is on your list of people who are qualified to take a building, look at a building, and determine not only what architectural characteristics are defining but then condense that and synthesize that into a determination of primary façade.

Chair Woods- Is there was only one copy for the whole board?

Mr. Flance- I have one for the whole board if you like.

Chair Woods- Yes, please give each person one and these guys need one and the recorder.

[The independent façade report was passed out to the board members, staff and the recorder.]

Mr. Flance. - There are two things that will make this project work. This is one of them. Not so much on the boiler plant, but certainly on the main hospital, we had two in existence on the St. Vincent's Hospital. For the record this was part of the application and for the record this report was included in the application and I would like the record show that we also distributed the report to the board here.

So there are three sources of our determination of our primary façade. One is Ms. Bechtol's report in which she identifies three of the façade's as being primary, all of them on the north side of the building. There is a second report which I think is probably, just as thorough and authoritative and that was the report by Mr. Rasch, who had identified it. excuse me, let's go back. Ms. Bechtol did not find any primary façades in the boiler plant. Mr. Rasch has identified virtually all of the façades as being primary on the boiler plant; we have no disagreement with that. We have a list of things that we will be asking the board to do.

Chair Woods- Steve can I ask you as you are doing that... we have this nice thing you gave us. Tell us the page number that you would like us to turn to.

Mr. Rasch- Page 22.

Ms. Brennan- Page 22 of Gayla Bechtol's report.

Chair Woods- No, that's the little one; I am talking about this one. [and held up a handout]

Mr. Flance. - I'm looking at the boiler plant that, if you look at old pictures of boiler plants basically it had a gabled roof or a pitched roof, if you want to call it, it was a brick building, it was, basically it had an entrance on the north side that, with a series of stairs going up to the landing and to the property. We are not going to sit here and argue about the boiler plant but we have come before you, and the reason I just passed out a list of things (Exhibit 2) we are going to ask approval for on this project is because, one of the things we will ask you for is an exception that would allow us to introduce two openings into what will be designated if you accept Mr. Rasch's recommendation, as primary. So we have no disagreement with Mr. Rasch's assessment and later when we get to the issue of exceptions we will be asking for exception for two openings for two windows we'd like to introduce into the east façade and the north façade. So that ought to make that easy.

Chair Woods- Okay and now is that all of your entire presentation on the boiler building at this point? You're basically accepting staff's recommendations of 1, 2 and 3 these primary façades although your historian believes, Gayla believes, nothing is primary in this building.

Mr. Flance.- That is correct. I think I am trying to follow your lead which is to cut to the chase and that's where we are. To discuss the role of the boiler building and all that we have to get into it but I don't think we're here for that.

Chair Woods- Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak because what we're going to do is vote on these things one at a time and then set them aside, we're done with that, and move onto the next thing. Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak concerning the primary elevations, that's what we'll be voting on the existing boiler plant?

[None]

Okay, so, with that let's entertain a motion for the primary elevations on the existing boiler plant.

Ms. Mather - I'd like to make the motion that regarding case #H-08-095B the existing boiler plant, that we

accept staff's recommendation for the primary façades-elevations one, two and three.

Chair Woods- Is there a second.

Ms. Rios - Second.

Chair Woods - Is there any discussion? All in favor? All opposed?

All- aye.

[The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. There was no one in opposition.]

Chair Woods- So, ok so our next...so what we're going to entertain next is the primary façades on the hospital and I'm going to ask for the staff report, please on the hospital.

Mr. Rasch- Again you have maps showing the elevations as numbered, again it starts with number one on the West end of the north elevation.

Chair Woods- What page David, we have so many things in front of us we need pages from everybody.

Mr. Rasch- Starts on page 2... I mean 3. Elevations are numbered clockwise from the northwest on Palace Ave. Elevation 6 is the one closest to the Paseo del Peralta, and then all 7 through 11 faces the interior of the lot and 12 faces Marian Hall. So it goes clockwise around the building.

Chair Woods- I'm confused David, is Paseo at the top?

Mr. Rasch - Yes, 3 is the closest...Palace is the closest to 3, and Paseo is the closest to 6, yes, thank you.

228 E. Palace Ave. known previously as La Villa Riviera, and now known as the old St. Vincent's Hospital was constructed with brick in 1950 by John Gaw Meem in the Territorial Revival Style. The building originally functioned as a hospital, then as a home for the elderly, and finally as the State of New Mexico office. The inventory is silent regarding alterations, but there are a variety of non-historic changes present including two stair towers on elevations 2 and 12, I'll point to them, yeah, thank you, those are the two stair towers. Sealing up of the north elevation entrance on elevation three, right along the street, there and opening dimension changes on the South elevation # 7. The building is listed as contributing to the district and this status was confirmed last year. The following inventory by elevations helps to establish which elevations may be considered as primary. Elevations are assigned in a clockwise manner.

Ok, now I have some photos. This is elevation one, which is the northwest corner of the building facing Palace. And a lot of the essential character defining elements you find here, you see the steel casement windows, you see the brick decorative panels on the upper stories and the brick coping. You also notice that this building is quite massive, three-four stories straight up, no set back and relief. So there's a lot of character on façade number 1.

Façade number 2, I don't see much change in character from façade number 1; we do have this stair tower there as well.

Façade number 3, this is the one closest to Palace and again some very interesting character here. The main entrance has the most elaborate classical detail of the entire building, there are Corinthian capitals on the pilasters, there's dentil pediment, it's got a lot of detail that you don't see anywhere else on the building. You also see the steel casement windows and brick coping but there's also these surrounds on the lower windows which add a little more character detail than elevation 1 or 2, and you also have for the first time that you will see over and over again, this wooden balustrade. Here it's at the street level. And there's an interesting variation balustrade as we go around the building. The uprights are all either the same dimension in diameter or they change, and you'll see that as we move around the building. But, that's elevation 3. By the way, I guess I should go through as I go: number 1, I'm recommending primary. Number 2, I'm recommending non-primary. Number 3, I'm recommending primary.

Now the east elevation facing the corner of Palace and Paseo, number 4. This facade is the first time you get a sense of that stepped massing with the height, so that I consider a character defining detail that's established with elevation 4. You also see the beautiful balustraded porches on the upper stories showing up for the first time. So that's a nice little element of character that's new. And also down under the portal that faces east are these window surrounds, with this nice classical detail. So here again, we're grabbing new character defining elements so I'm suggesting façade 4 as a primary elevation.

When we go to façade 5, façade 5 does not look any different than façade 1. It's the counterpart to 1, but I considered it important and I'm recommending primary for it, because it establishes the mass of this building along Palace Avenue. It shows it has these kind of symmetrical wings, and even though all of the character details are duplicated, I find that the massing part is important just like elevation 4 shows the step massing. Elevation 5 and 1 show that long linear four-story structure. Without 1 it would be only part of this building. So that's why I'm recommending façade 5 as primary as well.

Façade 6 is the eastern most facing the Paseo. Here we have these balustraded porches and again if you look closely at the balustrades they are two different sizes in diameter on this elevation. And we have surrounds on the doors on all three stories. I don't know if you can

see it from where you are, but on the surrounds around the doors, at the capitals you will see carved stars and in the middle of the pediment there's a scroll pattern so again there's that more detail that lends interest to this elevation and I recommend façade 6 as primary. So that is all the elevations I recommend as primary for and I will go through them again; 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Façade 7. I don't see any difference with façade 7 from 1 and 5 and I see enough alteration of that lower floor to not recommend façade 7 for contributing primary status.

Façade 8, same problem, I don't see any new character defining detail and I also have that alteration down bottom with that blue colored addition next to the new portal. So I don't recommend façade 8 for primary.

Façade 9 is a lot like façade 6. There's actually no difference and here you can see more closely that detail on the top with the scroll on the pediment and the stars on the capitals. Now these are character defining elements but they occur identically on façade 6, so I'm not finding new character here and it doesn't have that street frontage as much, so I'm not recommending façade 9 as primary either.

Façade 10, again no new detail, just like 1 and 5.

Façade 11, same thing, I don't recommend primary on 10 or 11.

And on 12, which you can barely see because it's so close to Marian Hall, it has all that same character as 9 and 6 and I'm recommending 6 for primary. So elevations 7,8,9,10, 11, and 12 I do not recommend primary elevation status for.

Chair Woods- Is there any questions for staff.

Ms. Walker – David, it sounded like you were saying the reason those last ten didn't get any recommendation is that there were no new introductions or materials.

Mr. Rasch- Yes, that's part of our procedure is as we grab character defining elements we try not to restrict the building by having duplications be the only reason to add it as primary.

Ms. Walker- Interesting. And then on the other hand, a couple of the ones that you did designate as primary, there were similarities between that and number 7. So you're saying because there are similarities, none of them can't be primary. So therefore, 1 and 4 could be changed and 7 could become primary; or 4 and 7 or 1 and 7.

Mr. Rasch- The difference-that's a good point you're making; I'm going to go back to that floor plan so we

can look at all the elevations as I speak. Clearly when you look at this elevation 1, elevation 5, elevation 7 and elevation 11 have a lot in common, except a few issues which are very important. Elevation 1 and 5 have those brick detailed panels, those decorative panels, between the windows and Meem distinctly left them off of elevations 7 and 11. It almost seems like back of house that he left them off. So 1 and 5 are distinctly different from 7 and 11 but the other problem I have with 7 and 11 that I don't have with 1 and 5 is the alterations. On 7, we have this portal alteration and window opening alterations and on 11 we have the stair tower added by the state.

Ms. Walker -- But on 4, which you recommended primary, there was a non-historic entry door that was also addition.

Mr. Rasch- The entry door right here on 4, that is not historic, but they are looking to re-establish the entrance here on 3, come down the hallway.

Chair Woods- At this point it's not...

Ms. Walker -- I'm trying to figure out his rationale, that's all.

Chair Woods- Why don't we listen to theirs and then you can go back if you still have questions. And correct me if I'm wrong David, but part of it is Meem, basically saying it's the front of the building and the back of the building, and I think part of that is the rationale.

Mr. Rasch- Yes, I would characterize that.

Chair Woods- Ok, so it's your turn Mr. Flance. Why don't you tell us what pages you will be turning to we have in front of us?

Mr. Flance- Well right now I'm going to start with page 3 of 31 of the report from Gayla Bechtol, and then what else I'm going to do Madam Chair will be on page 7.

[Mr. Flance gave directions to staff on presentation materials]

I think it's constructive to be trying to look at this the way David is looking at it. Can everyone see this? [He pointed to the drawings and turned the table so the board could see.] One of the things that I think that the board really does need to deal with is that the definition of the primary façade in the Santa Fe ordinance is specific to that ordinance and is not necessarily specific to other historic regulations you might find at the national level, let's say.

In reviewing the property Ms. Bechtol came to the conclusion there were really two primary facades to the property and both of those primary façades from the north side of the building,

frame the entrance to the building and basically for these facades, (three and four) the façade closest to Palace Ave. and the façade carrying the portal to the entrance to the building. Now, she looked at lots of different information in the 38 page report that describes architectural detail, orientation of openings in the buildings, lots of things that you'd put on a list that would define what might be primary; for example repetition of windows, or the existence of decorative brick work between windows or the presence of concrete mantels or capitals over windows or those kinds of things. Basically she came to the conclusion that if you're looking on page 3 of her report, there are really two primary façades and those were the two façades.

In considering her report, which we did submit with the application, Mr. Rasch did his own assessment and we felt that that it was up to Mr. Rasch to make its own independent determination and we were not going to try and bias that one way or the other, other than provide independent information that Ms. Bechtol had prepared. And in his determination he's identified five primary facades and in reviewing his recommendations, we are prepared to agree with his recommendation-that there are five primary façades on this building as shown; primary façades being number facade one, number three, number four, number five and number six for the reasons that he has articulated. I think if you would allow me two minutes Madam Chair, and I don't want to drift off into the architecture unless you want us to, but there are reasons why I put these particular elevations up so that you could see what our intent is and how we deal with non-primary façades that are going to be built on.

Let me start this east façade, (pointed to the map) this is Paseo del Peralta right here. This is the entry to the existing building under this portal, which would be re-established by the construction we are proposing to do and open it back up as also, as you can see on the site plan; create a garden entry into the property a portal open to the traditional entrance to the façade. We agree with Mr. Rasch and Ms. Bechtol that it was the north side of this building facing Palace Avenue that was probably one of the most important streets in Santa Fe at the time that gave it a status as a primary façade and that's where he put a lot of his emphasis on the architecture that he was trying to establish for the building.

This is John Gaw Meem. This is John Gaw Meem. So this part of the building is primary under the analysis of both Mr. Rasch and Ms. Bechtol and this is where our addition begins to the building. This becomes part of the Drury addition here and the reason I wanted you to see this was because the transition between what has been designated primary by both Mr. Rasch and Ms. Bechtol and what we plan to do, is quite complimentary. Not exactly the same, but certainly complimentary. Mark will get into the architecture if you have a chance to, a little bit later. So that's the east façade of the building.

This is the north façade of the building, but basically this is the portal that would be reopened that was cemented up by the state when they took over the building. This portal would provide a natural entry into the hotel lobby and an access into the hotel. Not the primary entrance but

a, an important entrance again on Palace Avenue.

Moving further down here [pointing on map] this façade was identified by Mr. Rasch as being a primary façade and is not identified by Ms. Bechtol. There are a few minor changes that we would like to introduce into this façade, primarily an opening into a gallery that would pass from Palace Avenue through the property to the promenade that we have discussed with you before. There will be an open space promenade that will run through the site. And that's this promenade that you see right here [pointing on drawing] that becomes the pedestrian orientation moving from Cathedral Park all the way up to the entrance to the property and out to Paseo del Peralta. That gallery will be located right here [pointing] so we have to create a doorway for that gallery. That is one of the exceptions that you see on the list of approvals that we are going to be asking from you later when we get to that point in the review of the project.

This is the south facing façade of the addition that we want to add to this building. Now remember what we are talking about here is adaptive reuse of a 55-year-old building that has gone through numerous iterations and deterioration and has become frankly a blight on this part of downtown. And in doing so, what we are doing here is we are adding the majority of the hotel rooms that are added are on these additions that you've already seen and we've presented to this board earlier. This drawing has a lot more detail and architectural elements than you've seen before and this is the main entrance to this building. So, this is the south facing façade or façade number 7 and these additions that we are talking about all fall within the limits and requirements of the historic design review code and, both in terms of height and massing, and do not affect if Mr. Rasch's recommendations and Ms. Bechtol's recommendations is accepted by this board, do not affect in a primary façade either the southeast facing façade, the middle of the building where we are trying to create some massing with some torreons and some massing here and on the southwest side of the building.

So, in short...and this is taking a little longer than last time....

Chair Woods- It's a little bigger building...

Mr. Flance- In short, we have submitted a report as a finding of fact and I would like this reflected in the record, please, that was done by a qualified historian registered with the City of Santa Fe to determine primary façades on this building and she has identified two façades which I have described which are contained in the report that we have just submitted for the record. And we have reviewed Mr. Rasch's report and had an opportunity to discuss his findings and we understand where he's coming from and we agree with his findings in terms of primary façade and are willing to come back to you once again with some minor exceptions particularly for that one opening for the gallery that runs through the hotel on one primary façade that he is

designated as façade number one.

Mr. Hogan [inaudible]

Mr. Flance - I'm being told it does not require an exception because we are taking the window down to the ground. Thank you very much.

So with that our presentation is essentially is that we agree with Mr. Rasch's recommendations and we will proceed accordingly.

Chair Woods- I think what we'll do before I have the board ask any questions is ask if anyone from the public wishes to speak concerning the façades on this building and the designation of primary.

[No one came forward.]

Chair Woods- I'm going to ask the board if they have questions for Mr. Flance.

Ms. Rios- I actually have a question for David. On the south elevation here you've indicated that none of those façades are primary. Is that correct?

Mr. Rasch – Yes that is my recommendation.

Ms. Rios- Including the portion, if we see the top of the building that's existing the bottom is proposed. Is that correct? Including the top part which I think corresponds with your nine, is that correct?

Mr. Rasch – That's correct.

Ms. Rios- It has the balcony features and you indicated in other elevations that those balcony features were primary.

Mr. Rasch- Yes, correct.

Ms. Rios- So, in this particular elevation I disagree with your nine; I think that, that portion of that building at least, corresponding to your nine, should be primary and also 12 on the west... where's the elevation? When you showed it up on the projector it had similar features and I think those are really character defining features, those, those in my opinion, those definitely should be included as primary.

Chair Woods- Does anyone else have questions?

Ms. Mather- My question is for Mr. Flance, I believe that when you pointed out to us where the window was

going to become a doorway that you actually pointed to the driveway instead to the back part of the building, if you look down on your bottom drawing.

Mr. Flance- [pointing to the drawing] this right here.

Ms. Walker- Yes, you pointed to the drive way down below and I just want the board to know.

Mr. Flance - Yes, you're right.

Ms. Walker- So it's not that big broad opening.

Mr. Flance- No this is, I apologize, this is the entry that we are going to establish for the Marian Hall and this is the gallery entrance after the promenade across from the restaurant. Thank you for pointing that out.

Ms. Mather- David when you talked to us earlier about how you would establish primary and the reiteration of the same features, again, then you remove them from primary because of that reiteration factor?

Mr. Rasch- Yes, we tend to start with those elevations that are more publically visible facing streets to grab those elements. If they exist on non-street building and don't have any unique character then we usually don't recommend them as primary.

Ms. Brennan- If I could just add to that, that goes to the distinction of the principal and predominant façade from secondary or accessory that falls into that definition; which is why I read the second, the print definition of principal as well as primary.

Ms. Walker – So David then a logic would be, if I'm following you, that if a façade isn't 100% representative of the others, would make it more likely to be primary.

Mr. Rasch – Yes, especially even if it doesn't have public visibility, we don't dismiss it. If it doesn't have public visibility and its unique definitely its primary. But if it brings in unique character I would recommend it. But on nine and 12, 12 is identical to six which is right on Paseo. And on 9 we have a lot of the same character but it really reads back of house to me and it doesn't read like six or 12, and that's just my opinion.

Ms. Walker – No, I think that Ms. Bechtol's report is very interesting in describing what Mr. Meem intended 55 years ago but that doesn't change history for the fact that the south façade 7 has been part of our visual history for 55 years. To me that is definitely an element that is significant enough to describe.

Chair Woods- So, you're saying by it being part of the visual history it makes it primary?

Ms. Walker- I think it's worth discussing. It's got some of the elements of the legend; it's not repetitious which is what David is trying to avoid, too much repetition of the same things of these added items that is removable. So I would like the board to discuss it, when the time comes, Madam Chair.

Chair Woods- I'd ask Kelly to respond to that of Karen, adding this element of visual history of how that is, how that would be addressed as part of the legal definition within the ordinance.

Ms. Brennan- I think that the definition there was really referring to the physical architectural elements of the structure; one or more principal faces for elevations of the structure with features that define the character of the structures architecture. So, it's a piece of the structure that defines the whole, essentially. And then principal is primary or predominant as applied to a use or structure as distinguished from secondary or accessory. And I think that when David is talking about the practice that has typically been applied that's the aspect that he's saying, by repetition of elements.

Mr. Rasch- They're secondary.

Mr. Fiance- A couple of things; first of all, the...up on the balconies, [pointed on map] that you see, this is the west elevation down here, this is the east elevation here, so this is what is being referred to as the west elevation of the building and I believe this is the east elevation. Am I correct? Is this what you're talking about?

Chair Woods- I think you were talking about elevation 12 west....

Mr. Rasch- 12 and 6.

Mr. Fiance -- Let me just cut to the chase, there. The balconies that you are talking about will be preserved. We have on the elevation, on elevation 6, the east facing façade, those balconies will be preserved; some are not in very good shape, they will be restored to natural condition, the openings on those balconies will be restored as they are shown. Same with the curve on elevation # 12 even though it is not primary our intent is to maintain that elevation. So let me deal with that particular issue.

As far as elevation # 7 is concerned, there have been a lot of changes on elevation #7. I've looked at the early drawings we presented earlier to this board, and went through extensively, both aerial photographs and straight on photographs that was back of buildings, parking lots, the delivery entrance to the building, Mr. Meem's drawings themselves identified the north facing elevation and the corner of Palace and what was then Castillo Street which was the

intersection of two major streets in Santa Fe so again, remember we have an important building that was going to be a symbol of community being built.

Chair Woods- Steve, Steve, they are not voting; we're voting.

Mr. Flance- The presence of this building at that important intersection oriented it to the north and to the east, not to the south. If you look at the level of detail on the south facing façades that currently exists, it nowhere near compares to the level of detail that you see on the north facing façades that had been designated as primary by Mr. Rasch and by Ms. Bechtol.

Chair Woods- I have a question Steve. So you're saying on 6, David is saying that that is primary which they are agreeing with. Twelve is the one that faces right on to Marian Hall, is that what you're saying? Which is the other one you were talking about?

Ms. Rios- 9 and 12.

Mr. Flance- I thought you were talking about 7.

Ms. Rios – No, I was talking about 9 south and southwest.

Mr. Flance- Ok, I apologize, 9 is this façade [pointed on map] currently exists with these two balconies here and those two balconies would be maintained and what is essentially a rather ugly façade at this point will become the main entrance to the hotel.

I guess we would maintain that the...these balconies, while they exist on this element of the building, this is a five story element with two stories of balconies, it's not something that is a major element of that particular façade.

Chair Woods- Is there any other questions for the applicants.

Ok, so if there's no other questions let's just review quickly so everybody understands. Our applicant, as I understand, has asked Gayla Bechtol, who is a licensed historic surveyor for the city, to identify the primary façades. She's identified 4 and 5...

Mr. Rasch- 3 and 4.

Chair Woods- 3 and 4.

Mr. Flance- Ms. Bechtol's here if you'd like to swear her in.

Chair Woods- Yes, I think that'd be great. Could you be sworn in so the board can you ask some questions.

Is that Okay?

Ms. Bechtol- Yes.

Ms. Clair- Ms. Bechtol, please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Ms. Bechtol- I do.

Ms. Clair- State your name and address for the record.

Ms. Bechtol- When I get up there?

Ms. Clair- Yes.

Ms. Bechtol- Gayla Bechtol-1813 Hondo Road, Santa Fe.

Chair Woods- Do you want to talk a little bit about your background and how you came to your conclusions on this building.

Ms. Bechtol- On my background in terms of this building?

Chair Woods- Your background in terms of being a licensed surveyor, historic surveyor with the city.

Ms. Bechtol- When I arrived in Santa Fe, seventeen years ago, I initially worked for Beverly Spears and we did a lot of historic work and surveys as well. I came from Maxwell, New Mexico where I also did some historic work there. During the course of the last twelve years I've done various historic surveys for the City of Santa Fe, on Agua Fria, mostly. I was also involved in the historic height ordinance. So, when the State of New Mexico started the historic architect, you know, certification, I don't really know if it's a license particularly, I applied, and with my background, my education as well as my experience in New Mexico they agreed that I could act as an historic architect. So that is sort of that background.

When I was approached by Drury Southwest, by Brian and also Steve Flance, I thought they just wanted a survey and I thought oh, that's easy. It's gotten more complicated. I had not really paid very much attention to this building in the last year I just drove by it and it had just changed use and it changed owners. When I began really looking at it and studying it and also began studying some of Meem's other work, I had been involved with the First Presbyterian Church when that was added on to, so I knew a little bit more about that piece of Meem but I didn't know that he was instrumental in the Territorial Style being used in almost all the institutional buildings in Santa Fe. That came as news to me.

This building as I went around looking at first, I agreed mostly with where David ended up, with pretty much all the north facing facades being primary as well as the one on Paseo, mostly because they were so visible, they did contain many of the elements that Meem used to define the institution of this hospital. But as I started writing the report and having to defend those arguments it became a much narrower focus for me because of the use, the Palace Avenue at that time, this was before the suburban development of Santa Fe when this building was built and Palace Avenue was still, and also the connection to the plaza was really important. People were still congregating as I imagined it. I wasn't here obviously. But as I imagined it this was still a neighborhood and this was the neighborhood hospital, in some ways. And so I imagined people, that he wanted to continue the urban quality of Santa Fe connecting people to the sidewalk, to the entrance and yet at the same time responding to what was then, the post world war boom, that was happening with parking, the automobile becoming important and so the corner solution to this, what could be a suburban building, in a cruciform, was a hospital form used at that time sort of cutting edge technology., but it was more often set in the middle of a field or a parking lot in a suburban situation. And so Meem, I thought very cleverly, put the suburban form into an urban context and when he used, and the way that he did that, was the portal that faced north, I'm sorry, that faces east, and then the very decorative façade that faces Palace. So that's why I came back and sort of contracted my view because those are truly the most important primary facades of this building. Those couldn't be primary unless there were some supporting, and so then 1 and 5 for me became supporting and so they became the background that set up what could happen with 3 & 4. So, I was quite amazed at actually at the cleverness of the architecture of getting in a suburban typology of this hospital into an urban context and that was most important to me in my façade, you know...

I tried to think about how I would address the idea of the visual history of 7 because I knew that argument was out there, and I couldn't find a way architecturally, for, you know, based on the definitions I felt like were most important in terms of a primary façade, what were the intentions, I couldn't find an argument to say that that was important, that it truly was the back of the house. And if my charge was to determine what primary façades were; 3 & 4 and then 1 & 5 were the runners up for secondary.

Chair Woods-

Does anyone have any questions?

Ms. Walker-

Gayla on your postscript, page 37, definitions of primary facade you've listed different sources, Encyclopedia of Architecture: "the front of the building or any of its sides, facing a public way..."

Ms. Bechtol –

Especially one that is distinguished by its architectural (indecipherable)..

Ms. Walker- Especially, but not necessarily required, according to that that you put in there and I would just get your comments on that.

Ms. Bechtol- The front of the building? I don't think you could ever say that 7 is the *front* of a building.

Ms. Walker- No, it says the front of building or, and here is the significant word, any of its sides facing a public way; and number 7 faces a public way.

Ms. Bechtol - It doesn't face a public way, it's *visible* from a public way.

Ms. Walker- So you don't consider, even though we've been looking at it for 50 years,

Ms. Bechtol- I tried to go there, I really did try to go there because, and I thought, well how, because it is important and you can actually see the top of 9 all the way from Alameda. In some ways 9 is more defensible in that argument as a "from visible from a public way." And I'm wondering if that's why the balconies and that detail were ultimately put up there because it is so visible, because it is such a tall façade that when you walk around, that 9 is more important than 7 as a visual history. Seven you kind of have to really have to take a look at. I tried to get there and I couldn't make that argument stick for myself.

Chair Woods- Does anyone else have any questions?

I think that's really interesting, I never thought of this suburban footprint that's usually surrounded by parking lot, and then to respond as opposed to a parking lot landscape and buffer from the street. I've never thought of that of those terms from that observation.

Mr. Fiance - Not only a public street but probably at that time one of the most important public streets in Santa Fe.

I'd like to make one comment if I may, Madam Chair, in light of the (indecipherable.) We're here to evaluate this project under the ordinances of the City of Santa Fe and the definition of primary façade which has now been repeated three times, is clear that it does not take into account whether or not you've been able to look at this building for 50 years or 100 years. That is not one of the criteria. I think it's incumbent upon the board frankly as an applicant to stick to the definition within the City of Santa Fe code and as the representative of the applicant, I am going to ask the board to do so and make the finding of fact accordingly.

Chair Woods- Why don't you help out here Kelly when we're being asked to make the finding of fact, how you would coach the board in doing that in making their motion. I would ask you to speak up, it's hard to hear. Oh! They turned on the air conditioning; now it's cooler but we have noise.

Kelly I think that when you make the motion if you want to make that specific fact, that you just say so. That you find that

Chair Woods- Why don't you, I think you have to give it to us more specifically; if we were to make a motion say that was...

Are you asking if we are in disagreement Steve, with either Gayla or David that a finding of fact be stated, or no matter what's stated in the motion? What are you specifically asking us for?

Mr. Flance- My feeling, both personally and professionally and having served on this board and lots of other boards, is that a finding of fact is finding of fact in context of the regulatory authority granted the board. So, in this case were talking about the historic design review board ordinance, or whatever it's called these days. And the finding of fact means that it either does or does not meet the requirements of that ordinance.

So that if you make a finding of fact for example, that façade number 6 is a primary façade, it's a primary façade because of the information, which I won't go through, in Mr. Rasch's report. He does list in his report the criteria that he has used to make that determination.

Ms. Rios- That is what you usually do.

Mr. Rasch- Madam Chair, I have two sentences that may be useful. Character defining historic integrity which substantiates the contributing historic status exists on elevations one, three, four, five and six. These elevations embody all of the unique architectural details and establish the building massing and step backs with upper floors. That's on the middle of page four.

Chair Woods- Could you please cite the number of the ordinance Kelly, that, so we can draft that?

Ms. Brennan- That is the Definitions-it's 14-12.1 of Definitions.

Chair Woods- 14-12.1 under Definitions. Can I have one more minute and then we do have here a licensed surveyor who has made her recommendations which is façade 4 and 5, I'm sorry 3 and 4. And we have our staff who has cited 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 based on our ordinance. So we understand if you are in disagreement; the applicant has agreed to go with staff and be more restrictive than the surveyor. If you are going to do something different than that, what Mr. Flance is asking is that you cite ordinance based on why you believe it's that, that then becomes a primary façade. With that said, then you want to be sure.

Ms. Rios In reference to the old hospital building I move to adopt all the façades as primary as identified by staff's report on page 3 and 4; 1-NWN , 3-N, 4-NEE, 5-NEN, 6-E, 9-S, and 12-W. As a finding of fact all, of these meet the definition in the ordinance as cited in 14-

12.1 and they use the definition that they all have character defining features and the elevations all embody all of the character architectural details that call for a primary façade.

Chair Woods- Is there a second?

Ms. Walker- Second.

Chair Woods- Is there discussion?

Ms. Mather - I'd like to discuss façade number 9. I find the upper half of that to be character defining, but the lower half has had all of these strange things added to it.

Ms. Rios- In my opinion I think that the character defining features outweigh the few changes in the lower (indecipherable.)

Chair Woods- Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Featheringill- If you look on page 17 of the Gayla Bechtol report it has a picture of elevation 9. It has all those windows with a 50's view which makes it basically over 50 years old and historic.

Ms. Rios- Where are you?

Mr. Featheringill- On 17, figure 16 and 18, it has all those windows and they are all in original locations so it's not as if it's been changed and is not primary. It's not as if there's been renovation and it's definitely a primary elevation.

Chair Woods- And that's...we're talking about which one?

Mr. Featheringill- Nine. It's not exactly a beautiful elevation down at the bottom part of it; it's just kind of hodge-podgy, but it is original.

Chair Woods - Now, in saying whether something is original or not doesn't necessarily make it a primary façade.

Mr. Featheringill - But I kind of heard that it was hodgepodge...I thought I heard somebody mention that it had been changed or altered and so I was just showing it has not been changed or altered, it is original and so I agree with Ms. Rios.

Chair Woods – So you agree based on its original, not but..that that makes it a primary façade.

Mr. Rasch- No it's the fact that there are character defining features at the top and I didn't want the

hodgepodginess of the original to be misconstrued as being changed. It is original and has character defining features and should be a character defining (indecipherable.)

Chair Woods- So are there any further? Yes, John.

Mr. Kantner- I guess because I'm newer to the board I'm assuming there's two separate issues here; one is whether or not all the façades have integrity, they are all features that still have their integrity issues preserved or whether we just preserve...by ordinance preserve representative features. And I guess I was going to ask, what would be the rationale for only preserving a representative sample of all façades that might otherwise have integrity? Does that make sense?

Ms. Brennan- Yes, it does. I think that the code, and this is a general statement, is always searching for balance between interest and this may be one of the places where the use and reuse of buildings. It's a recognition that some buildings are extremely distinctive and have a high degree of integrity and those would be significant buildings and all facades of significant buildings are primary. Contributing buildings are sort of a step down and I don't think that it is they are picking and choosing; let's just say a couple of representative ones, that's somewhat of a simplification. I think they're trying to say these are primary and these are secondary and our focus is on making sure the primary façades remain but retain their integrity. And David could probably speak more practically.

Mr. Rasch- Besides what I was going to say with the definition, also you have to remember that in a primary elevation alterations have much stronger restrictions. So when we get to the re-model what is primary and what is not primary are very critical. But I want you to really think very clearly and hardily about, does 9 or 12 define the character of this building without, and it's hard to say, you look at one elevation-does it define it? Because I'm asking for a number of elevations but can you do with or without 9, can you do with or without 12; just like can you do with or without 3 because anything that is non-primary is certainly on the table for alteration.

Chair Woods- So, David let me ask for a little further classification. If there are and not necessarily with their proposal, but if there are changes to the facades that you are proposing to, that we ranked as secondary and there or changes to those, would the impact, would that change the contributing status?

Because I think that's the final goal, the purpose of doing that is to maintain the contributing status of the building- so and this is a way to get there. These are steps. So these are things that obviously have a significant building by all facades being primary that you can't make changes, that building remains significant.

So the bottom line here to me is, by the façades that you have defined as primary, if there

were changes to the others, would with the building maintain its contributing status; assuming that it's still within the ordinance.

Mr. Rasch - Madam Chair that's a very important question and I believe that any non-primary elevation that's altered will not change the character of the building. Additions can be added, openings can be changed. On the primary elevations in order to alter them, needs an exception to retain its contributing status.

Chair Woods- Okay, so at this point you are saying , the ones that you have defined as secondary, there's changes to those, this building will still maintain its contributing status.

Mr. Rasch- Yes, in my opinion, it would.

Mr. Flance- Can I ask a question.

Chair Woods- No, not when we are in the middle of a motion, it's been closed off Steve; we can't at this point.

Ms. Walker- David you were also saying if a façade is declared a primary they can make the changes but it just requires an exception to keep..

Mr. Rasch- To keep the contributing status, yes, an exception would be required if it violates code. And there was a clarification about elevation 1. The proposal there to alter elevation 1, wouldn't defy code when we look at it closely, when we get down there.

Mr. Kantner- So are you saying if we define a number of primary facades and then we allow changes to them, we're actually jeopardizing its' contributing status?

Mr. Rasch- Jeopardizing is probably the correct word. It's the board's authority to determine if a proposed exception alteration change does degrade the character and that's part of your reason for when you decide if an exception is warranted or not.

Chair Woods- Because of the rather extraordinary..Kelly, am I ok in taking a question at this time from the applicant, even though...since we're in a motion I would assume no.

Ms. Brennan- Typically no.

Ms. Walker - David, John asked a question I asked earlier. If two sides of the building have all these yummy architectural touches, you know? You're saying by procedure in the past, not based on ordinance you'll just pick one, is the image redundant?

Mr. Rasch – We have in the past not restricted the building in a way that may preclude adaptive reuse or development or whatever. But if it's...if two facades are identical, the only reason I would probably recommend both as primaries was either if both had street frontage or the building was so incredibly symmetrical; four-sided symmetrical that you would need the two to establish that but otherwise I would probably only recommend one.

Ms. Walker – So earlier you said you didn't say they were identical but you said this façade has a great number of the things that are already in this façade therefore this first façade I won't recommend primary but the one that's similar to, I will; which is not logical.

Mr. Rasch- But on 1 and 5, I am recommending both thought they are essentially identical, they're a mirror image of one another.

Chair Woods- I think Karen a lot of it has to do with the position of the façade to what's happening. As Gayla said, as David said, this is like the back of the building. And in my mind coming from my profession it is important to establish what's primary, what's the important part of the building, and what's not as important. It's like what makes something beautiful, you also recognize something that's not so beautiful and that that's part of developing architecture in the building. I agree with David, personally, in that these are...this is the parking lot, this is the back of the building, and it doesn't.. and the front of the building in relationship to the street makes that primary. Otherwise if it was all of these, it should be a significant building not a contributing building.

Mr. Featheringill- But, it's also a little bit disturbing in the fact that we define primary elevation by how much gingerbread they have on them. There are elevations that are plain that are character defining. And so, you know, we pick only the pretty elevations and even if an elevation does face public thoroughfares and is probably the one that most of the city would recognize as part of the hospital. Now that one, because it doesn't have the gingerbread, will not be the primary elevation. I understand how the ordinance is written, it sounds like it needs some help. So, this is more a statement as much as anything else.

Chair Woods- Then again I think it's positioning and if there's a part of the building that's a back of the building, yes, there's gingerbread. There's all these things that are taken into account. One of them is character defined features. One of them is where is it in relationship to the building and so all of that comes together to decide what are the primary façades. And if again, if it's a significant building then they're basically whether they're plain or gingerbread or whatever it is they are all primary. We're dealing with contributing buildings so I think that criteria changes.

Mr. Featheringill- But a character defining elevation of that building is the fact that it's a hospital. It's a large expansive U and it's what you see from the street which really portrays more to the south side of the building than the north side. Because the north side has all the trees, you really can't

see it as you're driving past Palace as you can from Paseo. But that's not the way the ordinance is written, and I guess we're stuck with that.

Ms. Mather- Yes, I just want to make comment, that in some ways Meem helped define what the primary façade was of this building by putting all of the elements of the ornament on that north side. Of course the trees have done their job, and have grown and have obscured parts of that north side but I think it's pretty clear that he meant the grand entryway to be through that the front door, although the only time I was ever in the hospital when it was a hospital, was through the emergency room. We really weren't looking at the building. It's pretty clear that that's where the business took place, actually on the back but the ceremonial part was on the north side.

Mr. Featheringill- As a historic district aren't we supposed to maintain what we saw as historic fabric of the neighborhoods; and the historic fabric of that neighborhood was the fact that 90% of the city went into that building through the back door.

Chair Woods- Do you want to address that if that's...Kelly, David..as to how that, because that's been brought up a couple of times.

Mr. Rasch -- Yeah, Madam Chair I do see this dilemma and I do see the dilemma of the ordinance because the definition is so clearly physical. When you look at the definition of contributing versus significant, that's where this other story comes to play; cultural importance, the fact that you come in through elevation 7 when it used to be a hospital, but that's not part of the primary elevation definition. It's truly physical at that level and the reason why I don't believe this is not, why I believe this is not a significant building is that it has had enough alteration. The other criteria for significance is little or no alteration but I don't think it's eligible for the significant status.

Chair Woods- Are there any other questions?

Ms. Rios- I'll just make one comment, I do believe that character defining features can be found in elevations that are not publicly visible. In my 18 years on this board you can find character defining features on the back of a building if those features are important and define, help to define that building from an architectural standpoint. So again that's why and in reference to my including 9-S and 12 West, look at them, they're just small portions which I do believe have the character defining features, particularly in the balconies and in the pediments.

Chair Woods- So David, Kelly, could you respond to that because it's different from what you have stated in that, yes these are character defining features, therefore it makes these primary facades.

Mr. Rasch- Certainly, elevation 12 is identical to elevation 6 and Member Rios is suggesting 12 for the same reason I believe that I suggested 1 and 5, because they help establish something more.

Nine again, as the same type of balustrades as 6 and 12 but it doesn't carry through to the lower elevations. There's just something about elevation 9, where yeah, it has some of that character defining detail which is not unique on 9 and that's why I didn't recommend it.

Mr. Kantner- Just quick question in reference to 12; is there something in the ordinance that would say that because that façade is next to a significant building that that could lend weight to its definition of a primary façade or at least significant so you could alter, even right next to Marian Hall, you could alter that façade all you want.

Mr. Rasch- In terms of alteration there is something but in terms of establishing primary, no. But in terms of alteration yeah, elevation 12 could not be altered in such a way that it degrades Marian Hall's status.

Chair Woods- Any other questions or comments?

So we have the motion on the table asking that façades 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 which are in agreement with staff, be primary and also in addition façades 9 and 12. And we have a second. All in favor? All opposed?

Who's opposed; John's opposed. Okay, let's do it again.

All in favor?

[All were in favor except for Mr. Kantner who opposed.]

So that is the establishment according to the board of the primary façades. If you wish to appeal to the governing body you could do that within seven days.

Why don't we continue? Do you want to continue on to heights at this point?

Mr. Flance- Yes, I guess we better.

Could you give us a couple of minutes?

Chair Woods- Okay, Why don't we take a five-minute break?

The meeting broke at 7:10 p.m. and resumed again at 7:20 p.m.

Chair Woods- I'd like to call the meeting back to order please.

Kelly, did you have something you wanted to add.

Ms. Brennan- I did just to clarify on seven days for an appeal. Because you're taking action on small pieces of a larger application, what triggers the appeal period is the adoption by the board of the findings of fact and conclusion of law, so those won't be adopted until you've acted on everything in the application and that will trigger the appeal period, just to clarify that.

Chair Woods- Do you guys have any questions?

Mr. Hogan- We are completely in agreement with that and we would ask actually, that the board confirm that that's true in light of prior comment; we just don't want to be...

Chair Woods- My comment was only to say that you have the right to appeal; and I understand it's seven days but, I.. the board would be in agreement after seven days after the findings of facts, so we have that clear.

Mr. Flance- On the whole project?

Chair Woods- Yes, on the entire project. Okay so did anyone have any questions or are we ready to go on to staff report? Did you have questions?

Mr. Flance- I do, before we go on to the height issue, [he asked that the drawing for the south elevation be displayed]. Members of the board, these projects all have interesting aspects to them and interpretation is always part of any board decision. Please bear in mind we are working as hard as we know how, on creating an adaptive reuse of this property that is appropriate to both to down town Santa Fe and the community as a whole.

Our main entrance happens to be on what you have just designated as primary façade. We understand that, and heard I believe in between the discussion going on, that there is the opportunity to request as we have in a couple of other instances...as we have in a couple of other instances, we're going to be requesting exceptions to what the ordinance prescribes. But I would like to know before, and I'll try to word this as carefully as I can, is that if we come back, because we're not going to finish this, when we come back from another meeting right? If we properly submit an application for the exception for development of this element, this particular façade, as our main entrance, perhaps the changes to the architecture that you may dictate in terms of what are we using for... how are we supporting this entrance, how we are creating this portal, what have you.

Our intent has always been to be to maintain the two balconies and the capitals that you see shown over the balconies, that has never been a dispute. The question I have for you is if you could give us an indication tonight of your willingness to consider, without obligation, the development of that particular façade as the entry to our property. That will affect, I can tell

you our ability to continue with this project. If we haven't got an entrance, we're going back to square one, this property may be something else but.. so I'm asking Madam Chair if there's a way for you, we didn't advertise this particular exception, but we did include this in the plan that has been presented to you, properly advertised and I would like to know if conceptually if you are comfortable with the entrance being on that façade if we can meet the exception requirements.

Chair Woods- So we would not do this Mr. Flance, as a formal vote since it hasn't been, since we did not have a, there was not a public notice...

Mr. Rasch- You can give advice.

Chair Woods- But what I would be willing to do is poll the board and so each person on the board can give you some feedback. Does that work for you? And obviously we're not voting, but at least you can get some idea...

Mr. Flance- Then at least we get a sense of what direction we're going. If we have a wagon without wheels on it, guess what, we're probably not going to...

Chair Woods- I think we got that part.

Mr. Rasch – Madame Chair, just for the boards clarification, with 9 as primary elevation, I see, I believe, two exceptions and I'll ask if there's a third but I don't think so. The first one, and when it was not a primary elevation, see, these exceptions weren't required, that's the consequence of primary. Opening dimension alterations on primary elevation and an addition on a primary elevation; this entrance has this structure in front. Those are the two exceptions I see. If you look at lower illustration on the bottom, their addition on elevation seven and eight, as long as its ten feet back from elevation 9, there's no exception for a set back and I believe it is more than ten feet. So it looks like there are two exceptions that are potential with elevation 9.

Chair Woods- The two being that you are changing the openings and adding this...

Mr. Rasch- Yes, and they already have advertised the thirty inch rule exception and we can get into that.

Chair Woods – I think that's a different type of thing.

So, Christine could you start?

Ms. Mather – Sure, I have no objection to the plan that you've proposed here.

Ms. Rios- I don't oppose.

Ms. Walker – Was that your question Steve or was it would we look at something?

Mr. Flance- Would you consider it or if you don't have a problem you could say that; whatever you would like to advise me. I need some help here because, we're, this is a very critical element of our project.

Ms. Walker- And do we consider the exceptions of...

Chair Woods- The exceptions of adding the portal and changing the opening side.

Ms. Walker – And the question is *would we consider*, not are we *approving* now.

Mr. Flance – We are asking you to approve the architecture; we're not asking you to approve the ...

Chair Woods- They are asking if you would consider it.

Ms. Walker- But you're asking if we would consider? Sure of course, we consider everything.

Chair Woods – He's trying to get some feedback of if this is absolutely out of the question and we don't want to

Ms. Walker- You mean as an entrance?

Chair Woods- Well, there's going to be two exceptions on that façade now that it's considered a primary façade. One is they are adding on a portal,

Ms. Walker, I got it, yeah,

Chair Woods- And they are also changing the opening and these are the two exceptions and they are maintaining the historic balconies. Would, we are asking each person individually, would, how do you feel about these exceptions. Is it something you feel works or doesn't work?

Ms. Walker- Well, I would look at it. I am assuming they would redesign the entrance or not? Would you just leave it the way it is?

Mr. Flance- The entrance if I may Madame Chair, the entrance needs to be where it is.

Ms. Walker – Well I didn't mean Steve, are you, is that your final...

Mr. Flance – Well that's our current proposal but we are certainly open to modifying the detail of the

elements that you are seeing.

- Ms. Walker – So the question is would I consider, or would each of us consider...
- Mr. Flance- Would you have a problem, let me phrase it the way two other members said it, would you have a problem of us putting the entrance to the hotel there if we meet the exception requirements for the ordinance.
- Ms. Walker – No I wouldn't have a problem with that; that isn't what I heard you say earlier.
- Chair Woods- Well it's not just- by putting the entrance there, would mean changing the openings which you would do on a primary façade and it also means adding a portal.
- Ms. Walker – I understand, but I'm assuming now that it is a primary façade you might work with that a little bit or...
- Mr. Flance – We can work with the detail, but the question is would you have a problem with a portal and significant openings there that represents a reasonable access to a major hotel.
- Ms. Walker – No but I would just need to see your final.
- Mr. Featheringill- I think we just wanted that to be a primary elevation just to keep, you know, the upper part, and so you've done that pretty well. I'm assuming because we didn't make 7 and 11 primary, what you propose now won't change.
- Mr. Flance- Well you have the authority to advise us of architectural changes to what's been proposed in the record and discussed on those tonight. And when we get to them you certainly have the opportunity to say, you know, we prefer that you not use the shed roof over one of the portals or something like that.
- Mr. Featheringill- Right, but we discussed some concessions on the way on those and I think because we did not make those primary, that this has kind of a semi-complete view of the massing.
- Mr. Flance- Right, what we'd be talking about would be changes to the detailing of the portal, the two-story portal, with major glazing that would allow a refracted light to come into a lobby and focus of the main entry of the hotel to be used to that entry.
- Mr. Featheringill- Yes I don't have any trouble looking at that, I think this is probably where it needs to be, I just don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater with all the other concessions that have been on both people's parts to get to this design on the south elevation, the whole building design.

Mr. Flance- We understand that and we are willing to meet..we are intending, have been intending to maintain the view pretty well defined, that you think are the character defining elements and rather than go to the city council, I'll go back to the first meeting we had; I said we wanted to try to work things out with this board and not be on appeal to the city council on some of these things. Procedurally we find ourselves able to reach an accommodation. You get a primary façade that maintains the main elements that you're concerned about and we get to take the lower part of that building and introduce a major entrance, the major entrance, to the hotel in some form or another, just call it similar to what you're looking at but with changes that you may make. Do you have a problem?

Mr. Featheringill - No.

Mr. Kantner- I'll have what he said. I'm fine with that.

Chair Woods- So are we done with this now? Do you feel comfortable with...you've got...

Mr. Flance- Yes, we're done with it and we can work it out. And we will probably, Mr. Rasch we will need some help from you, but we will probably want to submit a, an exception to this particular decision with the criteria appropriate and have come in...when we come in the next time for the rest of our discussion.

And let me also say that for the record that we do not have a problem with your designation of elevation number 12, façade number 12, its primary. It's gonna face what will be the main entry into the Marian Hall portion of the hotel.

Chair Woods- Steve, I think that the board has expressed to you their feelings on that. I think in looking at the design, I would ask that it be a little bit more in keeping with the other architectural features. I think that that sort of square parapet that says Drury on it, I understand that it brings people in, but if we could look at that little more carefully to bring in some of the architectural elements on the rest of the building. And I understand why you want it unique, because you want people to see here's the entrance, here's who owns the hotel and has gone through all this aggravation to get it, but it's not quite in keeping, it's a start. If you could look at that a little more carefully I think that would be helpful. And one of the ways, and David you may disagree with me on that, is that you almost, that you push in an inset as opposed to adding such a big element. You could still put something on there but if you inset a little bit of the entry that might help mitigate this kind of large element that's that's going on there. But I think the board is pretty much telling you that you can look at that as the entrance.

Mr. Flance- Okay great, I think that's good advice. Guys thank you very much.

Ms. Walker- Yes, I agree with her.

Mr. Flance- That's fine we certainly hear you loud and clear.

Chair Woods- Okay so now are we moving to height exceptions?

Mr. Flance- Yes.

Chair Woods- If we're doing that we have something else here, gentlemen?

Mr. Flance- May I have one minute with my client? [Confided with client for a moment.]

Madam Chair, thank you.

Chair Woods- Are we done? We're done. So when we talk about the height exception, I'd rather take it an area, a building at a time so we, if that's okay. Which one would you like to start with?

Mr. Flance- Well, the easiest...might as well start in the order shown on your sheet. Actually, you know, I would like to hold the garage, I think that's kind of a separate discussion. I'd like to discuss buildings 1, 2 and 3 in that order. I think they all have plenty of characteristics (indecipherable).

Chair Woods- I think since they're clustered we don't have to vote on it separately, I think we can handle it in the motion as clustered buildings.

Mr. Flance- If it's all right with you can we start with those three.

Chair Woods- Yes, one, two and three David can you do your staff report on those exceptions?

Mr. Rasch- Yes, now Madam Chair board members, for all the new buildings I talk about all the stuff for the new building including the style and other exceptions, but Madam Chair if I'm correct, you want me to just focus on the height of these new buildings only.

Chair Woods- We're only doing exceptions tonight and they've asked that we only do, because we're done in another hour here, so, that we're going to go with height's here because that lets them know if they have a viable project.

Mr. Rasch- Okay I will read page 13 and I'm going to read from new buildings one, two and three only the elements that are relevant to height exceptions.

Chair Woods- Right, and what page.

Mr. Rasch -

Page 13, new building number one; a 21,209 ft.² three-story building is proposed to 36 feet high where the maximum allowable height is 18'8" as determined by a radial calculation. A height exception is requested and the required criteria responses are attached and those are under the Garage Building. All the height exceptions answers are under one of the citations, there are four height exceptions.

The Business Capital District Design Review Committee granted a variance to the underlying maximum allowable height of 27 feet for only a portion of the third-floor at a hearing on April 9, of this year. The hearing committee reduced the area of the third-floor to mitigate a perception of "canyon effect" along the south side of the pedestrian promenade. The applicant requests that the H. board consider the application as submitted to determine whether the board feels that there is or is not a canyon effect at this location.

So, on building number one you see here, 18' 8" is the maximum and they're going to 36. And now, on building, and there's a nice color rendition on building 1. On building 2, a 23,232 ft.² building three-story building is proposed to 36 feet high where a tower element, with a tower element at 44 feet high where the maximum allowable height is the same, 18'8" as determined by a radial calculation. And here's a color rendition of building number two.

And finally on page 15, a 7,486 ft.² two-story building is proposed to 27 feet high where the maximum allowable height is the same 18' 8" as determined by a radial calculation. So those are the three height exceptions of the buildings that are located on the interior rear of the lot.

Ms. Rios-

So David, on building number one, the Business Capital District Review Committee, they suggested they go up to 27 feet? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. Rasch-

What happens with building number one is because it's closer than 2 or 3 to Marian Hall and the old hospital. There were some members that thought there might be a canyon effect. So they didn't allow the entire amount of the proposed three-story; they only allowed half of it.

Chair Woods-

Is there any other questions for staff?

[There were no other questions for staff]

Mr. Flance, you're up.

[Mr. Flance gave some directions to his staff for setting up display]

Mr. Flance-

I think I'm going to start with a couple of facts about the property that I think ought to be considered by the board in the context of the site exceptions that we are asking for, for height.

This is a site plan for the property [pointing to drawing]. This is the existing hotel with the additions that would be added on. The front entrance, [indecipherable], we can work something out with you. This is the parking lot, this is the gallery. We'll talk about that in just a minute. This is Marian Hall. This is St. Francis Cathedral. And over in this area here is the Hunt Development, which has a ready been granted a certain height, both restrictions and levels that they are able to achieve that are beyond the scope of the board, beyond the ordinance.

One of the things that we tried to do... there is several things we tried to do, with height. First of all there's a 15 foot drop in elevation from Paseo del Peralta which is the main window on, and I'll agree with Ms. Walker, the main window into the property, a window into the property. And there's a 15 foot drop from here to this end of the property.

We chose the lower part of the property to site the suites that are going to be constructed in multi-story configurations. The suites are going to be constructed in two-story and three-story configurations. When we went to the Business Capital District, again we pointed out that we were working with the lower part of the property that essentially is surrounded by buildings that are much higher than these buildings will be even with the exception.

So for example, Marian Hall's at an elevation of about 50 feet rounding off, the Cathedral is at an elevation of 80 feet, the hospital itself is a five-story structure, there are going to be buildings built in front of, if you will. These buildings will be relative to the Paseo del Peralta frontage. And these buildings will essentially be hidden by the surrounding development, all of which is higher in elevation than the buildings. There will be some small windows into this area that will be visible. One window will be between Marian Hall and the hospital. This little driveway that comes down and goes into our parking lot will provide for a window of approximately 30 to 40 feet in width. There will be a window, a very small window, on Paseo del Peralta at the entrance to our property into this area. But one of the things we've done is provide a lot of curvature in the promenade, in the street system itself, so that you're not coming into a property with the wide straight multilane street; you're coming into the property with the narrow curving street that basically will direct your eye to other elements of the property such as the restaurant which will sit in front of, if you will. These buildings here.

So these buildings are all surrounded by buildings that are either, mostly would be taller than these buildings and in most cases the line of sight is broken by another building or another element of the site plan of the development of the property. When we went to the Business Capital District Commission, we showed them this drawing here. What you see in green are second-story elements of the buildings. And what you see in orange are the third story elements of buildings. At that meeting the Business Capital District Commission asked, and we agreed, to remove part of the third-floor component of building number one. Is that right?

Mr. Hogan- It's reflected on the plan.

Mr. Flance- Right, it says it's a big X.

To remove a part of the third story component of building number one, so that basically it contained the third story in about half of the square footage of the second floor, first and second floor. And then building number three is basically a two-story building. So, our height exceptions that we're asking for on these three buildings are as follows. They are on your sheet and you can follow them easily on your sheet:

Building one -we're asking for...

Chair Woods- Can you just tell us where you are in our book? You're on page 27 in our book?

Mr. Flance- You know where I am is on the sheet I handed out.

Chair Woods- Oh, Okay, I got it, I got it.

Mr. Flance- On building # 1 we are asking for an exception of 13'4" to a height of 36 feet. Now that..all of these height exceptions take into account the 4 foot allowance for slope on the property, so I want that to be clear, I don't want to mislead the board. But basically so if you add 4 feet to that that's 17'4" but the bottom line is that that building is being built in a location that is 10 to 15 feet below the street elevation of Paseo del Peralta and hidden behind other larger buildings.

Building number two, which is, this building right here [pointing], this is building number 1, we're asking for a partial third story, as dictated by the Business Capital District Commission. Building number two we're asking again for a partial third story and that would be another 13.4 feet to a height of 36 feet.

And building number three, which is this building right here [pointing] we're asking for an exception, even though it's a two-story building, to a height of 27 feet. That would be an exception of 4.4 feet. Now part of the exception for building number three is, I feel like I'm jumping around a little bit but it's important to know, we tried to pick up the roof system that we have on Marian Hall and incorporate that into the (indecipherable) so that added height to the building and is part of the reason why we need an exception on the height to get to the south on the full second-story.

We prefer that you consider these exceptions in context of how many stories they represent. And the height we are asking for is the typical height for a two or a three story building. I want

to be quite candid with the board. You've been candid with us. This is one of the most important elements of our project. This and the issue of primary façade are really the two key elements; that of making this adaptive reuse of this property work. Without it, frankly, we don't have a project. We gave up half of the third story element to the Business Capital District Commission. That represented how many rooms? About six suites. That may not seem a lot but when you're working on a pro forma, that can be fairly tight on these things. That's a significant amount of use of the building.

In this context, Madam Chair, we haven't had an opportunity to have the number of people who came to support our project tonight, say anything. And I don't think you want to have... you've asked for comments. They haven't said anything. I just would like to, I almost walked into that one. What I'd like to do is simply ask, because I don't think we have the time at this point for a lot of comments, a show of hands if you wouldn't mind of those in the audience who would support the two and three story configurations that I just described in the location where they've been shown. If that would that be all right with you?

Chair Woods- I still haven't had the public comment section of people who were not in favor of it at all. So, I don't think...it's not fair to them to have a show of hands. I'm happy if they just want to raise their hands, but if other people wanted to speak or not in support, they do get to speak and not just raise their hands.

Mr. Flance- Can I ask for a show of hands both ways?

Chair Woods- I can. So are you ready to open this to public comment?

Mr. Flance- Let me just finish with one general comment. It's a comment we've made before. The height issues here that obviously we need in order to accommodate the use of the property; the height issues are first of all a trade off against the amount of open space, which we really didn't have a chance to get into the whole site plan here with you tonight. But over 50% of this site is open space, and it is significant open space, it is significant park area. This area here [pointing] is comparable to about half of Cathedral Park. The open spaces that run through the property, the interior courtyards that we have left in creation of a major open space area next to Marian Hall, all of that has to do with how much height we can get in a contained site in order to accommodate the density we need to make the project work. So there is a trade off here and we'd ask you to please consider that in your assessment of our request for height exception.

There was one other thing I wanted to mention. Oh! I also think it's important to look at the urban design elements of this project against the buildings and structures that surround this, this site. This is not a site that's characterized in an area of Santa Fe... that's characterized by one-story buildings. We have numerous buildings that are multi-story in the area which

surround the site and... so that a height exception would not be out of character for example with the Cathedral at 80' or the three-story building, office building you have across the street or La Fonda's garage, which is located right here [pointing] which is a three and half story structure, or the Inn at Loretta, which is a five or six story structure, or La Fonda itself, which has always been sort of the standard by which everything else is measured, at an elevation of 65 feet. So the highest building exception we're asking for is the 36' height. We would like you to consider the three exceptions.

Chair Woods- So, can we ask for anyone who is opposed to this project to please come forward and be sworn in, or has opposition to what the applicant's requesting. Marilyn do you want to come forward?

Marilyn Bane- Yes, thank you.

And Pen, why don't you both be sworn in at one time so we can do it quickly.

Ms. Clair Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

[Ms. Bane and Mr. LaFarge were sworn]

Ms. Clair- State your name and address at the podium please.

Ms. Marilyn Bane- Thank you very much to the group members. I'm Marilyn Bane. I live at 622 ½ B Canyon Road, Santa Fe. I'm president of the Old Santa Fe Association, and I'm speaking on behalf of my organization this evening. I should start out and say that Mr. Flance is also correct. There were those of us who did testify before the BCDDRC that we had concern about the height because of the canyon effect. And I noticed in the notes that you need to determine whether or not that is the case. It was in recognition of that that indeed they asked that part of building two be reduced in height in trying to achieve that.

The problem is one of human scale when you are walking. What we're looking at is looking down on top of things. When you're actually visualizing walking through there, I think Steve's absolutely right, there are a lot of tall buildings around and I think that's exactly what our concern is. I do want to clarify that I am not against this project. I just have some concerns that I wanted to share with you.

In terms of, I think it will be fair enough, certainly there will be people very involved with these three buildings. But there are one-story buildings across the entire length of Paseo del Peralta, right opposite this, where virtually everything is a one story building with the exception of what Steve's was talking about. When you start talking height or density I am very sympathetic to these; Brian and I have talked about these. Quite frankly, I'd trade the density

for height any day; my greatest fear is we will continue to build up one building at a time over and over and over.

The ultimate result of that where you have the proverbial (indecipherable) that always happens, is that we are going to end up with a town of skyscrapers in terms of perpendicular communities(?) and that concerns us very much. My board did ask me to speak to that concern tonight. And this is not...we're not trying to delay this project. We're not asking that they redesign this project, what we're saying is, we have a height problems and we will always have a height problem when it comes to our historic district.

So truly, I do think that the board and I know most of the board is here right now(?), but right through here [pointing]... when we're over there we can't see what you all are seeing. When you are taking this path right here, guess what, the human scale, right through here is, you're surrounded. And I think that was a primary concern for me and I believe that's why at least, the BC and I believe that's why at least with BCDDRC went part way in asking that they reduce this portion of the building. Obviously, we would ask for nothing; and ask that you grant no exception there. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pen LaFarge

My name is Pen La Farge. I live at 647 Old Santa Fe Trail. I'm also on the board of the Old Santa Fe Association and I'm the president of the Historic Neighborhood Association. I won't repeat everything that Marilyn said. She's put it quite well. I think it's a matter of scale and a matter of overwhelmingness. The town of Santa Fe is characterized by low scale. I think it ought to be continued to be characterized by low scale. And I think adding to height is by and large a mistake because of the scale.

Without repeating a lot of what Marilyn has said, I would give the same exact concerns and as to the passageway she mentioned here [pointing] between Marian Hall and the west wing of the old hospital and this building in particular, does tend to become very tall and rather overwhelming. I would suggest that these marked increase in scale is a mistake and that you think about it carefully, before you say yes. Otherwise, I will also agree with Marilyn, I have nothing against the project or don't wish to sound as though I am against the whole thing. I'm not.

Chair Woods-

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in opposition?

[There were no others.]

Is there anyone who wishes to speak for the project?

Mr. Sommer-

My name is Karl Sommer and I haven't been sworn in.

Chair Woods- Is there anyone else who wishes to speak so let's get sworn in all together.

Ms. Clair- Raise your right hand please. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? State your name and address when you come up to the podium, please.

Karl Sommer- My address is PO Box 2476, Santa Fe, 87504. Madame Chairman, members of the board, I do not represent Drury, I'm not on their design team, I'm not paid by them. I'm here because I'm interested in this project and interested in what this board has been doing for the last several years with respect to the issue of height, and I will keep my comments central to that.

This board, over the course of the last several years, and I believe the council has sent a consistent message to the people in the property business, property owners, people who are.... would be developing property, people who are investing in property, and that is with respect to height in the downtown area. It is critical and important and an essential element of the job that has to be done in determining the design. With respect to the height exceptions that have been allowed in the course, I'll say, in the course of the last four years, the message has been 'impact is really critical and important on the street scale.'

The second is if you are going to grant an exception the board has generally required that the property owners centralize any height that is above the height above the requirement of the ordinance, to the center and away from the edge of the property. That is the principle that was applied to the Hunt Property, it was applied to at least three other cases I know in the downtown area. And it was for (indecipherable) certain elements that were used; step back massing, moving to the center, reduce the impact.

That has been the policy of this board in considering height exceptions. I think it's a wise policy, it's been extremely helpful to people in the design business and the legal business in advising people, that's the policy of this board. This project, in my opinion, does exactly that with respect to the buildings you're considering. This property has a hole in it right here [pointing to map]. This streetscape's going to be established with a single story. It slopes down. All of the new height is centralized. It is away from the edge of this property. I think they've done a masterful job.

We could spend decades describing the impacts of things. There is nothing like seeing it in this scale. You look down at the alleyway, the view pours into this property; your eye is not drawn to the new buildings or the height of the new buildings, in fact your eye is drawn to the elements that are already there, the heights that is already in this building. I think this design does a great job along those lines.

I'm here to say the policy that this board has established time and time again has been useful; I think that this project complies with it.

With respect to the other element that I really love about this building and this design and the new buildings, is another element that my clients and other cases have used the same ideas. That when you walk in, the scale along the buildings that are new and that are high, or higher, have a step back to them which produces a human scale. For somebody sitting on the street, they look up and as you all know, we went through several studies, the angle of your eye doesn't go to the third story it goes to the parapet of the second story. I believe that this design achieves that and I think that relates to the idea of whether or not the canyon effect or not. I think that this building, this project has sensibly addressed what I think is probably fundamental to the economic issue in a way that does not do violence to the character of the downtown district and actually takes this property and strengthens the character of this block in many, many ways.

And I applaud Mark and Steve and Ryan and Kevin and the whole design team that has worked on this for a long time. And I believe with the respect to the issue of height, the height exceptions they are asking for is reasonable. They are within the policy and the direction that this board has set and I would encourage you to grant the exceptions. Thank you very much.

Chair Woods-

If there any other people that wish to speak, that were supposed to raise their hand, please come up to speak. Do you want... I mean you asked that they all raise their hands. Would you like ...anyone that wishes to speak, come up and speak. Okay.

Ms. Jenkins-

Good evening board members. My name is Jennifer Jenkins, 130 Grant Ave., Suite 101. I like all that I'm seeing just as a member of this community. I've been following this project very closely with a lot of interest since it was...since Drury originally got involved. I honestly couldn't believe our good fortune. I have been aware for years of different groups who would look at the project, purchase the project, and I actually did a due diligence report for one of them several years ago and they all went packing. They couldn't make it work. And when a group like Drury comes in who really wants to make it work, that is really exciting. This is such an important opportunity for this community.

All of the historic communities across the country have to wrestle with adaptive re-use. At the end of the day, you have to embrace it as the method. This is the means by which we maintain historic structures, maintain their vitality and integrity and maintain a vital downtown. And so, it's really exciting that someone just as a member of this community but also in the business community, who sees the great pains that were taken to bring a proposal to you this evening that is not only tasteful and is historically accurate but really respectful of this property. And respectful of the Marian Hall and of the hospital and with these buildings have meant to people. But it's time for something to change here, because if something doesn't change here it's going to change for the worse. In our current economic climate there are not people lining up to drop millions of dollars into this project. So Drury has come here and they

really get it.

We've had people from other parts of the country who have come here and attempted projects. One that comes to mind is the Teleus in the Rail Yard; we sent them packing. They didn't get it. Drury gets it. They really have embraced what this community is about. They really made pains to apply this historic ordinance and again we cannot let this opportunity slip through our fingers.

This board serves a vital function in the community and now, I think, your role is bigger with respect to this project and what this will mean for this corner, this very important corner which has lost some of its importance over the years. A lot of people driving down Palace, they don't really pay attention that that was (indecipherable.) And this is an opportunity to really revitalize something. And you know, more service parking we lose in downtown Santa Fe? Thank you for your time.

Chair Woods- Anyone else wish to speak?

[Some applause]

We're going to hold onto applause okay, and just let people talk.

Ms. Abrahms- My name is Maureen Nestas Abrahms. My business address is 1000 Paseo del Peralta, 87501. I'm here because I followed this project. I have a reason for my interest; I'm in the situation of being in that building on that property several times a month; sometimes several times a week and I'm sad that it languishes. And I've followed this project on kind of a cursory level. I've heard the compromise that's gone on and appreciate that. One of the things that I think is really important and Jennifer pointed it out, and I think it needs to be restated, aesthetically and economically this has been very well conceived.

Nobody has gone at this with this kind of flip attitude; it's been very well conceived. I think everything that's been asked for has been reasonable and on then on the occasion when it hasn't been perceived to be reasonable by this board, there's been compromise and I want to applaud that.

The canyon effect-I don't see where canyon effect is an issue here because you have elevations well in excess of what they're asking for; 36 feet. You have 80' right here [pointing], or more. You have a greater height to the north, you have greater heights to the south and southwest and they're not asking for more height than already exists. They're just asking for an exception.

The other issue I'd like to go back to in terms of the primary elevations and primary façades; please don't just consider, please act on allowing them to have an exception because as Mr. Flance pointed out and is extremely true, without those entrances, without that appropriate and suddenly pleasing impact on the street level, there is no project. It would completely hamstring them on what they're trying to do. Please do more than consider. Please make that accommodation to them for all the accommodations they've made in their project. I think it's very important and I think it's a very important project.

I've watched Santa Fe grow and change over 40 years. On the occasion I first noticed it was about four years ago, as a kid. I don't see skyscrapers here, on any level. I just see responsible growth, promotion of Santa Fe economically and for its character's its very appropriate. Thank you.

Mr. Nye-

John Nye, #66 Paseo Encantado NE, Santa Fe 87506. Without repeating what's been said, I was with a group that looked at this property a few years back and we could not make it work. That was the Wyndham group, Wyndham Hotels. There was no way we could see where we could financially make this project come to fruition. It is critical. Sometimes just a few units, can make the difference in your bottom line as to whether you can make something like this work.

And I think the other point that I just wanted to bring up is that we're very close to this project, and we don't see- excuse me, this property, and I don't believe we see what an eyesore we have at best. This property, at my [inaudible] and people that I've brought into this city, look at this property and they wonder what's going on downtown Santa Fe. We've got an abandoned building; we've got a building that is very open to vandalism and fire, more so than if there was someone in it. This, I think, this is something that we don't consider and I would like to at least bring it up at this point.

From a financial standpoint these people have done a wonderful job. A few units can be very critical as to whether something will work or not.

Chair Woods-

Thank you John. Does anyone else wish to speak?

Ms. Hogan

My name is Nancy Hogan, 1861 S. Niagara Way, Denver Colorado. So, I'm coming with an objective viewpoint, of course, but (inaudible comment and laughter) so objectively and as an out-of-towner, I'm having difficulty with discussing what are the big problems with this project because I happen to think it's fantastic. What we're talking about is an area that I always thought, "this is really sad for Santa Fe" because I know Santa Fe. That block is just an eyesore and I thought, you know, for years, somebody's gonna have to do something with that eventually because it doesn't fit.

And when you talk about height, you know the hospital building that we're working with is high and if you start building low, scale has a lot to do with it. So, I mean, you know, on that (indecipherable) anyway, there's a million details that are required. I guess a special project, but I think this process that you're going through- I don't know why these people don't quit, because it, it is degrading. So I want you to know, I think it is.

Mr. Sommer- Madam Chair, I would just want to make one more comment and that is just this; the comment that you made about the importance of the term primary I thought was right on and apropos. If you and I have ever agreed on anything before, you might be able to point it out, I don't know.

Ms. Laduskey My name is Chris Laduskey. My work address is 1012 Marquez Place, 304A, Santa Fe 87505. In following this project I saw the full presentation with boards and I congratulate the entire Drury team. They've really done an exceptional job in the design and transforming that pad. But I look at this project threefold. I look at it as a long time citizen of Santa Fe and that corner is completely nondescript and the plan that's being put together brings vibrancy both from an aesthetic and financial and adding to the welfare of the entire city.

I also look at it as a design professional. I currently am involved with the design of hotels and certainly the number of rooms is key when you're looking at doing a business plan. So, I think that they've been so astute in terms of the way that they have allocated space as well as height. And to your point, the building already existing is quite tall and so they're making the best of use.

And thirdly, I am a parishioner at the Cathedral and the part next to the cathedral is a wonderful space and both locals and visitors alike spend time in that park. And how wonderful it is to be able to extend the promenade that they have and turn it into a much bigger experience for all of us to enjoy.

On a final note I think that Mr. Meem would be very proud with the transformation that they're suggesting.

Chair Woods- Does anyone else wish to speak?

Ms. Sorokian Andrea Sorokian, business address 1807 2nd St., Suite 17, Santa Fe 87505. I'm speaking mostly as a small business owner here in Santa Fe. I've lived here 17 years and I've been in business for 15. I do floral design and décor. I specialize in weddings and special events and I can't begin to tell you how excited I am about this, both as a business, from a business point of view and as a creative person. And I'm so impressed that both Ryan and Kevin and two other of their Drury Associates took the time to contact me, had me come in and sit down with

them, look at this, look at plans and really ask me for my advice, and asked me what is important and how do we make this work. And the thing there..the thing that struck me, was how dedicated they are to maintaining the integrity of the whole property, of the historic nature of it.

Santa Fe is a huge; I don't know if you know this, a huge destination wedding town, both, also local as well. And it is a huge source of revenue for a lot of the hotels and a lot of the resorts. And I just am very excited about it and when brides come to me, and they're both local and all over the country, they ask me- actually I ask them- what is it you're looking for and they say I'm looking for something that is uniquely Santa Fe. And I don't think it gets more uniquely Santa Fe than this. So, I think it's... I applaud it.

Chair Woods- Is there anyone else who wishes to speak.

[There were no other speakers.]

So what I'm going to ask, this would help me and I hope the rest of the board members; is that we just take two minutes. We still want to vote on this before our time is up, to go up- and any of the public is certainly welcome- so you can point out Steve, the buildings specifically right now that you are asking for so we see them on the... We'll just take two minutes; that'll be great.

[Mr. Flance pointed to the drawing and on the model showed building number 1 and 2 and 3 on which the exceptions were asked for. He answered questions and pointed out the line of sight.]

Chair Woods- Okay, let's go guys. We only have 10 minutes. Okay, Steve you can stand for questions. If we are going to vote tonight, we've got 10 minutes. Who has questions?

Mr. Flance- There's no pressure here.

Chair Woods- Well I let you guys speak for good reason.

So, Karen, go ahead.

Ms. Walker- Is one of those the elevation that shows (indecipherable)? Could you point that out for us please?

Mr. Flance- Yes, it's this one right here. [points] Mark why don't you come up here and show them the portion of the building that was removed was not any two-story elevation.

Ms. Walker- So we don't have a drawing? You're just gonna show us?

Mr. Flance- This is a drawing.

Mark Hogan- I need to be sworn in.

Mr. Flance- You did get sworn in.

Mr. Hogan- Oh, I did get sworn in.

Mr. Flance- Mark come up and please show them where we have removed a third story that is now a second-story, two-story.

Mr. Hogan- This is the ground floor plan, second floor plan, third floor plan [pointed]. The third floor extended over this portion to this area here and the area in this section was removed at the request of the BCD. The one element that could not be removed was the stair tower, that's what we thought pertinent. That provides the exiting, the second exit from this floor. So that is represented in elevation by this mass here.

This is a ramada element that is shown here [pointed] well step back from there so there is no perception of the canyon effect. That provides cover to get to, or some shade, the rooftop area because we have to have access out there for pedestrians, to people on the roof.

Mr. Flance- This is where the third story was and has been removed and what is shown is a ramada which is an open ramada to provide some shade or protection moving to the stair tower, which is here [pointed].

Chair Woods- So the ramada then is an exception as well, not just the third floor. The ramada's got to be an exception as well because you got the height of the ramada.

Mr. Flance- Okay, so the ramada needs an exception as well, which we'll have to come back with.

Chair Woods- Okay so we're not voting on the ramada then, were only voting on that there's...

Mr. Hogan- We have it posted. You can, you can vote on that. Does that clarify Is everybody satisfied?

Chair Woods- Is there any other questions?

Ms. Rios - Steve, all of these buildings one, two and three and also the old hospital, all of those buildings here in Marian Hall; it's all hotel rooms, correct?

Mr. Flance- Yes, hotel rooms and suites. So they're like, yeah, they range from a suited hotel room like you might find at Marriott Courtyard.

Ms. Rios.- Okay let's take for instance, building number one, you have 21,000+ square feet. And you are wanting a third story on that. How many buildings.. how many rooms would you be accommodating on that third story?

Mr. Flance- On the third story, in building one? Could somebody...

Mr. Hogan- As revised by the BCD?

Ms. Rios- Yes. No, that's not the one that's revised...

Mr. Hogan- Yes, building one is revised. So as it stands there's three suites remaining on the third floor.

Ms. Rios- Okay Mark, so you have three on the third floor?

Mr. Hogan- I'm sorry I'm going to correct myself on that. There's five suites.

Mr. Flance- Six when we're done.

Ms. Rios- So probably ten. Can you tell us how many are on one and two?

Mr. Hogan- On floors one and two, I just put that data in for that information; 11 on the ground floor, 10 on the second floor.

Chair Woods- Any other questions? Anyone else?

[There were no other questions from the other board members]

I have a question. does the tower make or break the project? Does the tower make or break the project?

Mr. Flance- No.

Mr. Hogan- [pointing to a tower]

Chair Woods- The other tower, that tower.

Mr. Hogan- There is a stair access to the roof that is required by code so we chose to make that tower element so that it did not look out of place.

Chair Woods- I think the roof feature makes it even more, possibly, more prominent than it needs to be. It just seems to be really ...

Mr. Flance- You're talking about the bells for the bell tower?

Chair Woods- Yes. And how about the ramadas? The ramadas (indecipherable) the ramadas are not really roofed, so it's not a portal. It's a ramada so it's not roofed.

Mr. Hogan- That was our effort to make those roof decks more usable for hotel guests; so it is not central to the architecture.

Chair Woods- Any other questions? Yes, Dan?

Mr. Featheringill- The parking structure- what is the comparable elevation in height between the parking structure and the buildings 1, 2 and 3. It would be nice if you had a section that led east and west.

Mr. Hogan- Yeah, let's see. I think the...perhaps the easiest thing to do is to look at the model. The parking structure top elevation which incidentally, at the request of (indecipherable), will be raised so that all the cars will be screened. That security screen request for the exception, but the...I don't know what the ... right off the, what the difference in the elevation is. We've got ..

Mr. Flance- 6'6" difference. My statistician just ...

Mr. Hogan – The highest part of the third floor is 6'6 over the highest portion of the parking garage.

Chair Woods- Any other questions?

Mr. Flance – Can I, can I just ...

Chair Woods- Karen has a question.

[Mr. Flance was given the okay to proceed with his question]

Mr. Flance – (indecipherable) would hide that 6'6.

Chair Woods- Karen.

Ms. Walker- You mentioned both 10 feet below Paseo grade (indecipherable)and 15. Would you show us where exactly is ten and where exactly is 15?

Mr. Flance- I don't have the topo..[Staff gave Mr. Flance information] I'm being told that 10 is at the boiler building which is this building here [pointed], so this is Paseo del Peralta so we're 10' difference in elevation at this point [pointed], and by the time we get to this point we're 15 feet.

Chair Woods – I have a very quick question for staff, David. Because this portion is surrounded by such, so many buildings higher than what they're proposing, how did you reach the height calculation which then had them ask for an exception? Really quickly.

Mr. Rasch- Yes, Madam Chair, page 45, if you look at page 45, that's the radial height calculations for interior site buildings and you'll notice some buildings are x'ed out because they are institutional as defined by code and some buildings are in. Marian Hall was included. Our data base which we're required to use says its 40' high. Across on Palace Avenue there's three 12 'high buildings and then down on the Cathedral property, there's two 12' buildings. So we have six buildings in the defined streetscape for any interior new structure and the maximum allowable height came to 18'8".

Now that's part of why I recommended approval of the height exception is that for institutional buildings to be removed when this site is totally surrounded by them, I felt that it was a flaw so it was one of the reasons why I sought to recommend approval.

Chair Woods- Ok, anything else.. we can...you've got three minutes and we have to be out of this building so if you'd like a motion we better get it.

So what the motion, what the applicant is requesting is, we're looking at building 1, for an exception from 13'4" to a height of 36'

Building 2, 13'4" to a height of 36'

Building three, for an exception of 4'4" to a height of 27 and what page are the exceptions on? If due, where were these exceptions? Is page 111, yes?

Mr. Rasch- Page 11.

Ms. Brennan?- 111 on the staff report; all the exceptions are there.

Chair Woods- On which ? -So you would have to cite that. What are the wishes of the board?

[Library announcement of closure in 30 minutes interrupted the discussion.]

Mr. Rasch- They do this interruption every few minutes from now on.

Ms. Brennan - On each of these, it's as the applicant has presented. Karen has asked me to qualify building one, at that height exception has been, part of it has been changed by the applicant as specified by BCD. So it's ... but again it's as shown.

Chair Woods- So, could we please entertain a motion?

Ms. Mather- I'd like to make a motion.

Chair Woods- Christine.

Ms. Mather- I'd like to make a motion that regarding this case of the Drury Project the height exceptions on building one, be accepted and on building two, that the height ofto a height of 36 feet. And on building two, that the height exception be accepted to a height of 36 feet. And on building three that the height exception of 27 feet be accepted based on the applicant's and the findings approved by staff on page, the exceptions on page

Chair Woods- So we have a motion and ...

Mr. Featheringill- Second.

Chair Woods- A second; is there any discussion?

Ms. Walker - I'm planning to vote with you but I want you to know it's only because there are so many tall buildings around. If this were standing alone, I would not agree to it.

Chair Woods- Is there any other discussion? All in favor?

All- Aye.

[The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.]

Chair Woods- All opposed?

It's 8:30. Is there a motion to adjourn?

F. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Walker moved to adjourn. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Approved by;



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer