



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 8-24-09 TIME 8:45

SERVED BY [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 1, 2009 – 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2ND FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 1, 2009 – 6:00 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- 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

1. 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 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 that are between 20'9" and 36' tall along with site improvements. (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 September 1, 2009 Historic Design Review Board Field Trip, please notify the Historic Preservation by 9:00 am on Tuesday September 1, 2009.

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

September 1, 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 City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair
Mr. Dan Featheringill
Dr. John Kantner
Ms. Christine Mather
Ms. Karen Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Deborah Shapiro

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor
Ms Kelley Brennan, Asst. City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Board accepted the Agenda as published.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

E. FINDING OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H 09-052. 201 W. Marcy Street

Ms. Walker added a clarification at the end of the conclusions of law. Non-event banners for when there are no events needed to be explained.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the Findings of Fact for Case #H 09-052 as clarified. Ms. Rios seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Case #H 09-048. 217/217A Closson Street

Ms. Walker requested that under Finding #4 where it said, "the applicant's testimony provided additional documentation which was lacking in City files that the building had...." it was just verbal statement so the Board had absolutely no proof.

She said that under #8 at the end of the sentence it said, "No permit is to issue until new exhibits satisfactory to the Board." She asked if those new exhibits were coming to the Board or staff.

Mr. Rasch explained that it was boilerplate language they always put on all findings. What was incorrect there was the "and" which they would have to delete that phrase because the Board did not ask for new exhibits.

Ms. Walker moved to approve the findings of fact and conclusions of law for Case #H 09-048 as amended. Mr. Featheringill seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rasch invited everyone to Viva Santa this weekend. The HDRB developed an exhibit for it. He showed some slides on Santa Fe Style including historic vernacular and went through several developmental changes up to Santa Fe today and what the future could look like. The exhibit will be in Ft. Marcy Park.

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. **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 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 that are between 20' 9" and 36' tall along with site improvements. (David Rasch)

At the request of the applicant, this case is transcribed verbatim.

CHAIR SHARON WOODS: So are we ready for a staff report, David?

MR. DAVID RASCH: Yes, Madam Chair. We are basically picking up where we left off with the staff packet and the report that you had. We have gone through the restoration of Marian Hall; the remodeling of the Hospital Building and the free-standing building on the street frontage on Paseo. Now, the application has asked for a clarification vote on that because as you recall, that building is made up of two separate buildings: the garage and the gallery. But when we looked at the minutes, your motion only mentioned the garage. And we wanted a clarifying action to say that you recognize it is two buildings rather than the garage; it is the garage and the gallery.

And then after we do that, we will look at the rest of the design that you haven't reviewed closely, which is the boiler plant and the three new buildings. These are all interior, non-street frontage buildings. These buildings. And then we have some overall site planning issues and then some cleanup of previous actions.

MS. WOODS: And I assume, and if the applicant is agreeable, we can follow the applicant's agenda and then vote after each item. It seems to keep it moving along very efficiently. Okay.

So is there any questions for staff?

Steve, do you want to start with your first item on the agenda? And before you start, could you please clarify for us what we are following today because I have all these things in front of me. And what page we should be on as we follow it.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. The first thing we would like to do is clarify the approval of the gallery. We have discussed the gallery. We are on page....

CHAIR WOODS: Oh wait. You know what? We didn't swear you in. I'm sorry. Carl's making like he's speaking sign language to me and I'm trying to interpret what it is and I just got it. You know. And if you guys...

MR. CARL BOAZ: Do you want them sworn in together?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes. Please, everybody sworn at once. It's just faster.

MR. BOAZ: Please raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

DRURY TEAM: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay, Steve, we are all set.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Madam Chair, you see the boards in front of you. Those are the elevations of the gallery and the garage. We had extensive discussions of both buildings. They are two separate buildings. The garage was approved by the Board at the last meeting. We could not find in the minutes reference to the gallery, although the components of the gallery were thoroughly discussed and seemed to have been approved. So we are asking of simple confirmation that the gallery is approved by the Board and then we will move on to the next item on the agenda.

CHAIR WOODS: Would the Board like Mr. Flance to review the gallery design or do you feel confident that we went over it when we did the garage at the last meeting. What are your wishes?

MR. DAN FEATHERINGILL: I'm fine with it.

MS. CECILIA RIOS: I feel pretty confident. I think a lot of the issues were addressed.

CHAIR WOODS: Does anyone from the public wish to speak about the gallery before we vote? [none]

So if we could have a motion, and I would say that it... clarifying that the design of the gallery was approved as part of the garage in the prior meeting.

MS. WALKER: I moved the last two motions. I'm through.

CHAIR WOODS: For the night? So you want to go home and watch the tennis match?

MS. RIOS: I'll make a motion. I would move that the gallery be approved as presented at the last meeting. This is as presented along with garage approval. And I refer to that approval.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MS. CHRISTINE MATHER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Discussion? All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed? [none]

Okay. So then, do you need to do any kind of staff or just have Steve take it on the boiler plant and restaurant?

MR. RASCH: I'll just read a little. And I don't have page numbers but it is the heading ... It should be the heading that says Boiler Plant.

CHAIR WOODS: What page?

MR. FLANCE: Page 24A in your original packet. Page 24A of the packet that was originally submitted to you kind of have the date right in front of me again.

CHAIR WOODS: But we also have it on SD 7 in the new packet. Can we refer to that?

MR. FLANCE: The answer is a yes, of course

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. FLANCE: Fine. Let's just use this one.

MR. RASCH: SD-7 looks the best. Yeah. In the new packet.

Madam Chair and Board members, the central boiler plant is located south and behind the hospital, know as central boiler plant, constructed with concrete and brick in 1904 and to serve Marian Hall.

At an unknown date, the historic landing and stair on the north elevation were removed. Also the original arched double doors on the north elevation were altered to rectangular openings.

In the 1950's 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 a pitched roof with a flat roof and adding Territorial detailing to match the architectural detailing of the new hospital.

The building retains its historic materials including wood double-hung windows on the 1904 portion and the non-original additions are now considered part of its historic character. 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 elevations were determined to be primary on May 28th of this year. Following this layout, the north is number one; One is 1910 north; Two is 1910 west and Three - 1950 east. There are three primary elevations. These embody all the unique architectural details and establish a record of historic changes to the building.

And then I go through and I talk about those changes, one through five, that they are going to be doing.

One, the historic balcony opening on the north elevation will be restored with installation of transom windows and doors, post, landing and stairs will be re-established with a change of orientation on the stairs

from north to west due to fire land restrictions, and mimicking the historic stairs on the west elevation.

Detail drawings of the rail design, materials and colors are attached.

Non-historic alterations to wall openings on the north elevation will be remodeled. The historic window opening on the east side will be retained in the same location. The non-historic door infill at the center will be retained. The non-historic alteration to the window opening at the west side with a mechanical grill will be infilled with brick wall rather than be restored to the original opening.

On elevation number two, the west non-historic CMU block addition at the northwest corner will be removed. A new railing at the landing on the west elevation is proposed to match the new railing on the stair of the north. The railing does not re-establish an historic rail at this location but is required to meet current building codes.

On elevation three- that's the primary elevation that Meem built - a new door and window openings are proposed for the north end of the east elevation. An exception was approved on June 30th to create new openings where they don't exist. The windows mimic non-conforming style of existing windows on the building.

On elevation four - that's the non-primary one between the north and the east- new door openings are proposed on the north elevation of the Meem addition. These meet the 30" glazing rule and the three foot corner rule. And on the rear elevation, the garage doors on the south will be reconfigured and it will retain the back of house loading facility. Several window and door openings will be infilled with wall and the vehicle door will be enlarged. Existing wall and new wall infills will be repainted. The proposed paint color is attached.

CHAIR WOODS: So David, I have a question on this ... I'm sorry that I am repeating. If we went through each elevation and actually said what are historic windows.... because we have so many different

fenestrated patterns going on and I know, in one case, the applicant was trying to stay within the thirty inch rule. But some times it is not applicable. If you could If you want to put them up here or refer to them in our packet.

MR. RASCH: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: And you go down each one so the Board understands what are the historic windows.

MR. RASCH: Okay. On the first elevation, the north elevation, we do have these historic windows on the upper floor. They are large double-hung windows.

CHAIR WOODS: They are 2over 2's.

MR. RASCH: Two over two's. Those are probably the oldest historic windows on the building. We have similar windows on the west elevation. Two over two's, large historic windows. So that's the 1910 portion of the building with historic windows.

Then from the 50's we have on the east elevation the typical large, non-divided light steel windows like the Meem hospital windows. They will match that. There's also some on the north elevation, which is non-primary. But those are historic windows. You did allow changing some of those on a non-primary elevation replacing windows on the east elevation but that was already approved.. So we've got historic, early twentieth century wood double hung windows and we've got historic steel casement windows.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay, well how about on the north elevation.... Okay, I've got it. So we are keeping those two. Alright. Thank you. Steve? Are there questions for David?

MS. RIOS : I have a really quick one. So basically, with this building, the footprint remains the same as the historic?

MR. RASCH: Essentially yes. What you are going to be looking at in detail is this new needed stair

access that's on the north end on the west. Now you could say that increases the footprint but it doesn't have a roof and it is required for accessibility. It is basically a simple thing.

MR. FLANCE: That stairwell will be filled in underneath with brick so basically, it becomes an extension of the building itself.

CHAIR WOODS: doing it with brick?

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Do you have anything to add, Steve?

MR. FLANCE: No. I thought that was a very good summary.

CHAIR WOODS: Does the Board have questions for Mr. Flance? [none]

MR. FLANCE: Could I just say one thing. If you look ... and this will be true on all of the elements that we're looking at tonight... If you look at your new packet and look at the upper right hand corner you will see something that we've referred to as keyed notes.

Those are changes that we have made to each of these buildings or façades as we get to them, at the request of the Board at the last meeting or at the last two meetings. So that you can... actually go down that list. Like the railing that David was referring to is shown on that list where the new masonry wall with paint finishes is shown on that list. So it is clear to the Board where we have made the changes you've requested.

CHAIR WOODS: Karen?

MS. WALKER: - David just mentioned that the stairs would be filled in with brick. Did you have a color of paint in mind?

MR. FLANCE: Uh, Mark, you want to show them the color board?

MS. WALKER: I mean, anything but purple. We just want to...

CHAIR WOODS: Do we... Well do we want to do colors as part of each thing now or do we want to do colors all together at the end, if they have their color boards?.

MS. WALKER: I thought while we were on the picture we could do it. But if you prefer coming back...

CHAIR WOODS: Well, my only reason for doing them all at the end is so then you can see them all together. If we take them piecemeal then we are not really seeing the project as a whole.

MR. FLANCE: W will cover that at the end. I mean we are prepared to. So...

CHAIR WOODS: Cee?

MS. RIOS: Steve, you may already have answered this question at a previous meeting. However, I will ask it again. You are retaining all historic windows on this boiler plant building. Correct?

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

MS. RIOS: Okay. And would you also describe the railing to us?

MR. FLANCE: Mark, you want to describe the railing?

MR. HOGAN: Madam Chair, members of the Board, the railing we are describing here is similar to other balustrades throughout the project which are based on the balustrades that are existing on the upper balconies of the hospital. In places, we have simplified them and reduced them a little bit in scale so that they didn't read as heavy. And we also wanted them to have their own character so they would not be exact duplications.

So we have that treatment down the stair and in similar fashion on the west side which does not show clearly here in this elevation. We just had to elevate that rail a little bit to get it up to the height required for code. So we are using that same design. It's going to sit on top of the masonry and have [inaudible].

MR. FLANCE: What's the material, Mark?

MR. HOGAN: It's painted wood.

MS. RIOS: And the paint color is...?

MR. HOGAN: The paint color is a cream white which we'll cover when we address that; when we cover all the color schemes.

MS. RIOS: Okay. And Mark, on the south elevation the us... what appears to be like a garage door, can you describe that for us?

MR. HOGAN: It is a garage door. That is our back of house entry. So it is large enough for tractor trailers to pull in to and...drop off. It'll be painted with the same color that we will be painting the other trim. Just an off-white.

MS. RIOS: And you have no appurtenances on this building; anything that...

MR. FLANCE: Three smoke stacks.

MS. RIOS: There are smoke stacks. Yeah.

MR. HOGAN: We are retaining the smoke stacks.

MS. RIOS: Okay. Um... that's it.

CHAIR WOODS: What is the size of that garage door? The height and the width? And how much is it increased from the original garage door that is there?

MR. HOGAN: I don't know. I don't have the exact dimensions but this illustration shows the existing garage door and this one shows the revised. I think it is fourteen feet in height and twenty feet in width.

CHAIR WOODS: Is it necessary for that door to be that high, Mark? That's a really high door.

MR. HOGAN: It actually is because we have to have the... given the limited space for a loading dock, the truck can't really pull up to the back of that. So it has to go into the building. So we made it as low as we could and still clear the [inaudible].

CHAIR WOODS: Would you be open if the Board so wishes is that rather than paint that door...I'm

assuming it is a metal door...

MR. HOGAN: Yes it is.

CHAIR WOODS: Rather than paint it the color of trim which would stick out, but possibly the color of the stucco so it would help it to go away more?

MR. HOGAN: We could do that.

MS. WALKER: I think that is a great idea.

MR. HOGAN: We would be amenable to that.

MS. WALKER: Is it that wide, Mark, to allow for two trucks at once?

MR. HOGAN: There is maneuvering distances required and then also this wide mouth so they can get parked and still have access to the dumpster to remove trash.

CHAIR WOODS: Will you show us where that door is on the site plan so the Board can know if there is any visibility?

MR. HOGAN: It is right here. And I can also show it to you on the model. It's in this area here so this is our limited back of house area for the whole project. We have it screened on all sides as well as a gate that closes when trucks are not coming in or out so that you don't have any view into that on the streetscape back here.

CHAIR WOODS: And what does this gate look like?

MR. HOGAN: this is a picture of that area. These are the gates that we are showing there. And these two... Actually, this is an earlier rendering so we didn't really have colors coordinated for this portion right now. So we have more areas of painted and stained wood and we probably would use the stained wood on those gates still. It would also help them recede.

CHAIR WOODS: And the size of the gates?

MR. HOGAN: There's two gates and ... let's see. I think they are about ten feet each because we have a twenty foot opening.

CHAIR WOODS: And the height?

MR. HOGAN: The height I think is at six feet.

CHAIR WOODS: I get nervous when you say I think.

MR. HOGAN: Well, there are just so many facts that... in this project...

CHAIR WOODS: Just so... I mean, so it's not eight feet. If you're telling us six feet then...

CHAIR WOODS: Mark, my concern would be... This is sort of an ongoing concern I've had on different façades. It is the introduction of new fenestration patterns when there is already so many. If you look on the north elevation. You have, on the new one... you are putting in to far left... You are putting in windows to match the existing Meem windows from the Fifties. Then you have a French door in there with the horizontal ... one, two, three, four, five horizontal lights for each door. Then we have the old windows from the Twenties- the two over twos. But then we get into an totally different French door and it looks like two over fives of much smaller panes but then bigger transoms. And, uh... It seems to me with the two options you already have, would it make... Do you think it would make sense... and I don't know if the Board feels... to make more...pick one as opposed to introducing a third?

MR. HOGAN: I'll attempt to answer that. The.. this door here... which mentioned the French door - that actually... This illustration precedes... We didn't revise that one since the last Board meeting. Then we did try to unify and simplify the doors throughout the project so when we are pointing to the south elevation on the hospital building for instance, later on, we will show you how we took out divisions in the glass. So we will do the same here. Our objective was, on the Fifties portion of the building to keep the window style and the door styles consistent with the fifties style.

So that would explain these windows here. This window here and the transom above...

CHAIR WOODS: Is that a window or a door?

MR. HOGAN: Doors.

They are actually very similar to what was there originally.

Windows - there was an arched window there originally and we tried looking to see whether or not we could bring that arch and that arched transom back. But without the pitched roof, it really looked like an odd element added in. So that's when we went to just two transom windows over and just kept the division simple up the middle. So... We are amenable to any suggestions that the Board might have. But we tried to keep it in scale and proportion with the double hungs on either side of it.

CHAIR WOODS: But it's not in scale and proportion to the double hungs on either side of it. It's two over... five over two for each door so that's ten panels when the big windows on either side are four panels. And then plus the transom lights. So that's what I'm confused about.

MR. HOGAN: These, I think, are in the end six panels each here. And then we just have the glazed... We could make the door single panel but that seemed out of character. We could go down to four.

CHAIR WOODS: I was just concerned. I was just... I don't know if the Board has any comments on that or if you are okay with it.

MR. FLANCE: I think the question is can we take the French doors and create the same pattern of panels that you have on the two existing windows on either side of the door. It is a simple question. Can we or can't we?

CHAIR WOODS: Well and I don't even know if that's the Board wishes, Steve. Let's see what the Board...

MR. FLANCE: But I'm trying to get you an answer: can it be done or can't it be done?

MR. HOGAN: It can be done if... I mean when you on the glass door, if you divide it down the middle...

MR. FLANCE: Yeah.

MR. HOGAN: If we don't to the divides, we can make it closer than what we are showing. We can do whatever the Board would like on it. We're just trying to make it consistent with historical portion.

MR. RASCH: And Madam Chair...

CHAIR WOODS: Yes.

MR. RASCH: Those doors aren't under a portal so each window should meet the 30" rule. But even with Territorial long narrow rectangle would work.

CHAIR WOODS: But I think we've also... the Board has kind of decided that, in the last meeting, they'd rather not force them to the 30" rule but if it forces them to do another fenestration pattern when there are so many. But I just wanted to get some feedback rom the Board on this.

MS. WALKER: There are a hodge podge of different fenestrations on that elevations. If they could do it then I think it would be better.

MR. HOGAN: And, Madam Chair, if I could... I saw what was in this packet which is actually different than what we have on the board here. And so we have actually reduced the number of divisions on those doors in this illustration from what you saw in this packet.

CHAIR WOODS: But Steve, we need to know what we are voting on. If we are voting on what's in our packet or are we voting on what is up there?

MR. FLANCE: Could I have a moment with my architect?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes. Okay.

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes.

MR. FLANCE: Umm.

CHAIR WOODS: I'm listening, Steve.

MR. FLANCE: We have had a high level discussion and we all agree that we will follow the Board's direction on how we arrange the division of light in those doors and in those transoms. So if you'd like them to reflect the windows on either side of the door, we'd be happy to do that.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there anything else though, Steve that's different in our packet than what's up there that you are presenting. So there's real clarification. We are spending so much time; let's all be on the same page.

MR. FLANCE: My understanding, Madam Chair, is that the packet you received is the latest in the... of the architectural design for the project and we should be referring to that packet exclusively at this point. So your observation is correct. And we are amenable to changing the French doors so that they reflect the openings that are on the two windows that I'll just call the side lights to the French doors.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Anyone else from the Board have a question?

MS. RIOS: Steve, what is the use of this building?

MR. FLANCE: The use... Well, the primarily use of this building it to use as a restaurant. And you can see on elevation... on the north elevation, if you look on the left side you'll see the entrance. The stairway is coming up to the restaurant which will both be inside the building. That stairway will also allow during good weather for us to bring people out on the promenade that comes through the property and have some outdoor dining. The secondary use of the building is for shipping and receiving which was what Mark was pointing out in terms of the garage door area. And that will be the receiving area for the restaurant and probably other elements of the hotel.

MS. RIOS: Thank you. I'm watching Madam Chair over here kind of drawing a couple of options in reference to the door. And I wondered if she wouldn't mind sharing that?

CHAIR WOODS: No. I did just exactly what you said; just two over two on the doors. I just wanted to see how it would look since I had it in front of me. And I was kind of intrigued with the idea of the original arch that was there. Do you have any pictures of it? It is kind of an intriguing element for that façade.

MR. FLANCE: Yeah, we have an old picture but I don't know if it shows the arch. Is it on there?

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible].

CHAIR WOODS: My other concern is I think now that the City makes you put any door under a portal. So are we going to approve this and the City is going to come back and say you have to protect the door?

MR. HOGAN: I hadn't hear that.

CHAIR WOODS: When you look at this arch, it's very neat. I think it might be worth considering, when you look on the old building. It has the vertical mullion. So is that something...

MR. FLANCE: We'd be happy to consider that.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Is there anybody from the public who wishes to speak concerning the boiler plant? And I can't see people behind the board so if you want to speak, raise your hand and let me see you. Okay. So some of the issues we talked about.... I'm sorry. Go ahead John.

DR. JOHN KANTNER: Just a quick point of clarification because I noticed there is a difference in these designs. On the east elevation... in the center of the east elevation, there is an original door which has sidelights next to it. Is that being retained because the original design looked like that was being replaced?

MR. FLANCE: That is being retained.

DR. KANTNER: On the east elevation, right?

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

DR. KANTNER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else? Dan?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Just a couple of clarifications on new doors and windows that are going in. Why are the ones on the north elevation, the two on the left side. They are different sizes and shapes than what is just to the right of them. If you are cutting holes anyway, could we get some continuity in there? Or do they have to be a certain size?

MR. FLANCE: Could you say that again?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: On the north elevation there is two doors being capped in... or two windows. I don't know which they are... on the left side of the elevation. And they don't meet the size of anything else on that elevation and since you are cutting holes in the wall anyway to put them in, could they be made at similar size and type of window to the ones, say, just to the right of them?

MR. HOGAN: We can make them any size that the Board determines is best. But the logic on this was that the sill on... The header on these windows match. And the sill matches the ones on the corner. And that was really more of a consideration for the interior space. This window is an existing window and has a higher sill so there was a discussion about raising it up to there. But since the angle of the... This corner is what presents the entry to our main entry to the building. We wanted to have that symmetrical on the corner.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. Then how about the window right two or three below it? It looks like it's a foot to two feet higher than the header of the door next to it.

MR. HOGAN: Again it matches the head heights of the doors on the corner which matches the head heights of the other openings on the east elevation.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Those are being cut in also so they are matching something you are creating.

MR. HOGAN: These are existing. And this is new, being cut in.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Right. But...

MR. FLANCE: Mark, again, I don't think you are looking at the right drawing. It's right here.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yeah.

MR. HOGAN: Right.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: So if they're matching the windows, they are not drawn to match in our drawings.. I'm not looking at that. I'm looking at the drawings we have here. Which is the new one.

MR. FLANCE: Good question. Let's... I understand the question. Let's try to get to just a very clear answer. Should or could, architecturally, given the requirements of those windows externally and internally, could those windows be drawn or be sized to match the adjacent windows? That is the question.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Right. On the east elevation, the top window all the way on the right doesn't match the windows on the left as drawn. It looks like you have some type of window box at the bottom; the existing windows.

MR. HOGAN: Oh.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: And so if so, should that carry around to the window on the north elevation?

MR. HOGAN: It should.

CHAIR WOODS: Then... So I think we have to pick one and then go from there. Because I think if you look on the east elevation, the windows on the top two stories part of the building and you're in both the existing and the proposed, that middle window on the second story has one...That seems to be... That is a historic window that you are retaining. Right?

MR. HOGAN: Right. That window right there?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes. Does it make sense then to just take that one window, like I'm saying, and repeat it as the new window on ... Steve, we can't hear when you are doing that. The new window on the east elevation. Then, as you wrap on to the north elevation to repeat it again. So its not... I think Dan's point is really well taken.

MR. HOGAN: I do too. And that is on the east elevation. That is the intention. We, for whatever reason, they dropped off the sill here which is why they look different but the intention was that's the same window, literally. Because it would be taken from a salvaged window. Then the one on the comer...

CHAIR WOODS: No, it's not the same window, Mark. it is a five light stack on the middle window that is a historic window. And it's a 4 light stack on the new one that you put on the second story in that corner. So I think that's what Dan is trying to say is... Look on your... And again... Steve, we've got to get everybody on the same page here. We are looking at this or we're looking at that. And we might have to take those down. If we look on the supplement that we got in our packet this week on page SD-7, you go to the east elevation, second story, middle window. It's not the same as... it's not just the sill... As the window directly to the right of it. And what Dan's trying to establish is, can we take that one and repeat that one, that pattern going across the east and around to the north?

We all have to be on the same page. They are very different windows. One is a four light and one is a five light.

MR. HOGAN: The intention is ... Yes, we can make them the same. And the intention was that this window be exactly the same as that window. So that is not characterized in this packet of information but that is our intention.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Then...

MR. FLANCE: The answer ... Mark, if you don't mind. Can I have the [inaudible]. The answer is yes.

We will make them the same.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. And then, to continue around to the north elevation, then the window adjacent to the corner will not be a two over four but it will be a two over five. And then the lights match to the existing window to the right of it which is a two over four but not as tall. Correct?

MR. FLANCE: That is correct.

And that can be a condition of your approval of the building.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Then to be... to continue...

MR. FLANCE: I'm trying to move it along.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yeah, I know. I just want to make sure that we have a window on the lower on the east side. Is that supposed to match the ones all the way to the left on the east side... that are behind the bushes in your drawings... You need to go back to the drawings in Steve's packet?

MR. FLANCE: The windows that are shown on the left on the east side are existing.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Are existing. So is that new window at the bottom right hand corner of the east elevations supposed to match those?

MR. RASCH: And it's a door, not a window. Those are windows.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Well right. That's what I'm kind of asking because I'm not even sure what that is.

MR. FLANCE: Mark, right here.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Is it a window or is it a door?

MR. HOGAN: That's a window.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. And it is designed to match the other two windows.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. And so then the one around the corner on the north side should match

that except narrower.

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

MR. HOGAN: Correct.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there anyone else?

Okay. Here's what I would ... Let's just review quickly. And Dan, I think you have the best understanding right now. So I'm going to ask you to make this motion. But let's go over a few of the things that we've talked about.

That the garage door be painted same as the wall.

That the possibility of an arch over the entry doors and to go to two over lights on each door as well as Dan's clarification on the windows. I think because of all the confusion we might want to add that it comes back to ... either comes back to us or to staff with one of us on the board member... and I would suggest maybe either Dan or me just because... to just check it to make sure that we really do see this... either these elevations.

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes.

MR. FLANCE: We are in agreement with all the changes. The arch over the entry door we need to check and see if it will work.

CHAIR WOODS: Right. That one you will be looking into.

MR. FLANCE: Right. But if we can accomplish that, we would do that. I would ask you that we be allowed to come back to the staff with input from one of the board members.

CHAIR WOODS: That's what we just said so...

MR. FLANCE: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Dan, do you want to take this one?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. I would like to make a motion on the boiler building: The garage door will be painted to match the stucco. The north elevation, the French doors will be two over two with single light transom over each; arched if possible. The windows on the left corner of the north elevation will match the two over five pattern of the window on the east elevation, and the two over five elevation... yeah, both windows are two over five on the east elevations. Now I need to go to the east elevation and say those windows are to match the corresponding windows to the south of each window being installed.

How is that?

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MS. RIOS: I will second and I will add that there will be no visibility of any roof top appurtenances and the two gates that are six feet high and ten feet wide be stained rather than painted and that the railing on the north elevation that...

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Go ahead.

MS. RIOS: That the... and if anybody disagrees, do it on the discussion and I'll entertain that... That the railing be painted ... I believe the applicant said that that would be painted a cream color and that all of this be brought back to staff and at least one person of the Board. And that the drawings also reflect what is being approved. Is that okay with you?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: That's okay with one thing; the gates - they still weren't sure if they were wood. So if they are metal, they would be painted the same as the stucco?

MS. RIOS: I thought I heard them say it would be wood.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Well, I heard indecision.

CHAIR WOODS: No. He said the gates were wood....

MR. FEATHERINGILL: They are wood. Okay

CHAIR WOODS: And the garage door was steel.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. So okay; they are. I heard... I missed that so...

CHAIR WOODS: Any other discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed? Thank you.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, in relation to the remodeling going on at the boiler plant which you just acted on, I wanted to add this one paragraph and make sure we were all clear.

The Maintenance Buildings - the additions on the west elevation of the Boiler Plan are known as the Maintenance Buildings. They are described in the HCPI as Blocks A, B and C.

The two-story Block A portion was constructed with poured concrete between 1930 and 1951 and it retains the historic character of projecting flat roof and wooden windows.

One-story Blocks B and C were constructed with CMU block and brick coping on the parapets from 1958 through 1960 and 1960 through 1965. These non-historic additions detract from the original massing integrity in form and architectural character. The additions were confirmed as non-historic to the District in 2008 and these additions will be removed. So I want to make sure that the Board and the applicant agrees that we are removing all of these maintenance buildings in this project.

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, could you please respond. As I understand, that was part of a former vote but...

MR. FLANCE: Sorry, I was trying to instruct the architect. Could I just get the last two...

MR. RASCH: That we are removing all the maintenance buildings; block A, B and C.

MR. FLANCE: Yes. That's part of the motion.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. FLANCE: Do we need a special approval for that tonight or has that already been approved?

CHAIR WOODS: I think that has already been approved as part of the motion

Can we move ahead with this then?

MS. WALKER: Did we vote on this?

CHAIR WOODS: Yeah, we did.

MS. WALKER: Oh. How time flies!

MS. WALKER: Steve, I have one question. Why don't you show those cute smoke stacks on your model? I'm just so nervous they are going to disappear.

CHAIR WOODS: They're not.

MR. HOGAN: We had them on the model but they broke off.

MS. WALKER: They broke off.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: The wind got them.

3- New Suite Buildings

CHAIR WOODS: Well - Number three on the agenda. David, may we have a staff report. And can you direct us to the page?

MR. RASCH: Yes. It is on... The color one is on 27A; the black and white is on 27 on...

CHAIR WOODS: Is this in the new packet?

MR. RASCH: No. The old packet.

MR. FLANCE: Let's use the new packet.

CHAIR WOODS: What is it in the new packet?

MR. RASCH: The new packet...

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yes.

MR. FLANCE: New packet- you'd be on page SD-8.

MR. RASCH: Yes, SD-8. And I have a short staff report.

New Building #1 is a 21,209 square foot 3-story building proposed to 36' high where the maximum allowable height is 18' 8" as determined by a radial calculation. A height exception was granted for 36' on May 28th of this year.

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with wall dominated stepped massing with precast concrete wall caps and brick coping. Other architectural features include white-finished window and door surrounds with cornices and pediments, shutters, and balconies. Several accent features include arches over recessed hallways and low pitched roofs over portals.

Two bay windows on the south elevation third floor are not subject to the 3' corner rule because the window projections do not extend four feet or more beyond the adjacent façades and do not constitute new façades.

Lantern-style wall sconce light fixtures are shown on elevations. The applicant has submitted a detailed lighting plan.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any questions for staff?

So, to the best of your knowledge, Steve, is what we are looking at and what's on the board the same.

MR. FLANCE: Yes, to the best of my knowledge. Here we go. On SD 8, if you look in the upper right hand corner, on the keyed notes; we show you the changes that have been made to the building at the

direction of the Board. Those changes are numbered. If you look at the various elevations, they are numbered one thru six. There is only one change on what you have under item 5. The pergola which is essentially a ramada. That was placed on the building to replace a portion of the building. It was moved earlier. It is to be stained wood and not painted wood. Other than that, those are the changes that have been made. And if there are any questions, we would be happy to discuss them with you.

CHAIR WOODS: Does the Board have questions?

MS. WALKER: That was going to be my only question - painting of pergola. But Steve took care of it.

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, I'm concerned because again we seem to have so many things going on. We have a pre-cast wall cap and I don't know if... I think there is some on the original building somewhere. Then we also have brick coping in some places. We have metal roof, which is a little different situation. But I am a little concerned about the mixture of the coping and the pre-cast concrete on the same building but on different elevations.

MR. FLANCE: Mark, do you want to talk about why you introduced those two approaches?

CHAIR WOODS: Is this maybe the first time you've heard about these?

MR. FLANCE: No. I'm letting my architect be an architect.

MR. HOGAN: The strategy was to try to reduce the apparent heights of the building and have a stronger brick cap on first and second floor and just have the concrete copings on the top floor, simplified so they became less prominent and less emphasis on the third floor.

CHAIR WOODS: I respectfully disagree. I think by introducing a new material you are just going to bring more attention to it and you can.... We have no coping detail. So I don't know the coping detail or how many rows of coping you have. But it can always be reduced on the top floor. But it would be my concern to have the introduction of pre-cast concrete on top. Unless it's so well done, it usually just doesn't

look very good.

MR. HOGAN: Well, we'll save that for building #2. We'll have to make it very well done.

CHAIR WOODS: And then...

MR. HOGAN: It's not a critical issue for us.

CHAIR WOODS: Well again, we are not shown any coping detail. So it looks to me on the east elevation on the far right; it looks like a very complex coping detail. And then it gets very linear so I'm not very sure what you are doing with the coping.

MR. HOGAN: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: On the east elevation, on the far right hand corner on the second story.

MS. WALKER: In the new booklet.

CHAIR WOODS: In the new booklet, page SD-8.

MR. HOGAN: This portion here?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes.

MR. HOGAN: Okay. That's brick because the...What you are seeing is the side elevation of these here. The coping is quite developed on those where we have I think about three courses plus some dentil types that go down into the stucco. Our emphasis was on these two tower elements. You are seeing that in side elevation there. The concrete coping... or the simplified concrete coping that we did above is just a rectangular coping... uh - six inches in height. There is no shape to it other than it projects up about half an inch past the surface of the stucco and goes up six inches and returns with a slight slope for drainage. It is a very minimal detail. We do have some color samples that we can show now or later. But the idea was just to simplify it.

CHAIR WOODS: Are you showing coping? When you look at your lines on the top of the railings... if

you go down to the north elevation where the parapet wall comes across for your deck it looks like there is coping on that as well. So you're putting coping on the top of your protective wall out of the deck.

MR. HOGAN: That is brick coping.

CHAIR WOODS: That's brick coping. Also I'm confused by the window again. We seem to be introducing a new thing. On the east elevation on the far right hand corner on the bottom window is colored in dark. And on our sheet where everything else has divided light. So is there something new going on or it was just how it came out in the print?

MR. HOGAN: I think that's just the way it came out in print. It's just a 2 over 2 window.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. And I guess the last thing is I'm having a hard time with the two arches as the kind of very Romanesque arches... possibly maybe an eyebrow arch... but I don't know. It's ... I don't know about the rest of the Board and the arches on the east and the south elevation. I think we talked about that before as well.

MR. HOGAN: This is... Both of those arches represent one of those zaguan entry that takes you into the building. And similarly to the way zaguans were used traditionally. There is one up at Casa Sena. Those have an arched opening and we just wanted to create some architectural emphasis at those points to signify their use as an entry or a zaguan.

CHAIR WOODS: But it is not a zaguan. There is a door there in our print. Is it a true zaguan? Does it go all the way through the building? On our print on the south and east elevation it is showing doors.

MR. HOGAN: We do have doors that are recessed quite a ways back, as you look at the ground floor plan. You will see at the zaguan entrance that the doors are clear back here. So that from the courtyard, it appears as if there are no doors in the recessed zaguan.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. HOGAN: And in the summer, these doors would be open all the time. Just in the winter when we are trying to temper the space, would we have them closed.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Are there any other questions?

MS. RIOS: Mark, are you... excuse me. On the north elevation are you introducing shutters?

MR. HOGAN: We are. At these two locations here.

MS. RIOS: Can you describe those?

MR. HOGAN: They are wood shutters that flank the Territorial style windows. I think at one point there was a ... and I'm hard pressed to say whether that came internally from the Board but there was some discussion about some other elements that just softened it up a little bit. And shutters came up so we just put those on the outside of those tower elements to emphasize that symmetry.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else?

MS. RIOS: I'm just wondering what the Board members think of this detail.

And also, can you describe for us the metal that you are using on that second story?

MR. HOGAN: I'd be happy to. It is a zinc with the standing seam. This is a sample of the zinc and a photo of standing seam similar to what we are proposing.

MS. RIOS: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: So all the trim on the entire building is painted - posts, balustrades, windows - everything is white with the exception of this stained wood pergola.

MR. HOGAN: And the wood on the portal on the wood over this entry.

CHAIR WOODS: So could you identify the elevation you are talking about?

MR. HOGAN: On the north elevation where we are showing the pergola stained, the second story portal - that's stained wood - beams and post, as does the ground floor beams and post. Also over the

woodwork, there's a canopy over the entrance piece and that is also of stained wood.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Anyone else? Anyone from the public.... I'm sorry. Christine.

MS. CHRISTINE MATHER: I have a question going back to the coping detail. In your renderings, both up there and the ones on 27A, the concrete... Is that going to be a concrete colored to look like brick?

MR. HOGAN: It would be a colored concrete not necessarily to emulate the brick but just to be compatible with it. We did not want grey concrete

MS. MATHER: So a reddish tone?

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

MS. MATHER: And that's as shown?

MR. HOGAN: Yes. It is.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else?

Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak concerning Building #1?

So are we going to vote on these.... We have three buildings. Are we going to vote on each one?

What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. MATHER: Regarding Building #1, I would like to make a motion that it be accepted as drawn, as submitted except with the following conditions and exceptions.

That the coping detail be in brick throughout. And that is the only condition that I have.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MS. RIOS: Second. And a couple of amendments to that. That there not be any visible rooftop appurtenances; that the lighting be taken to staff; that...

MS. WALKER: We are approving a lot on tonight, I think that's on our....

MS. RIOS: Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOODS: Yeah.

MS. RIOS: Okay, and I remove that portion of it. **That on the east elevation that the window on the far right be 3 over 3; that all trim be painted white except ...**

CHAIR WOODS: I think it is two over three.

MS. RIOS: No. He indicated it was two over two and then he said it was three over three. What is it Mark?

MR. HOGAN: There are six lights in the window.

MS. RIOS: Okay, it is two over three. **That all trim be painted white except for the following that are going to be stained - the pergola, the ground level beams and posts and the second story portal and that the roof be zinc standing seam.**

MS. WALKER: The pitched roof.

MS. RIOS: Yeah, the pitched roof.

CHAIR WOODS: Karen?

MS. WALKER: I'd like to go back to your point, Christine. I think that the coping details need to be presented to staff at a time that either Sharon or Dan can also be there and look at them.

MS. RIOS: Good point.

MS. MATHER: I accept both of those.

MS. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: anyone else?

We have a motion to approve with lots of conditions. All...

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair...

CHAIR WOODS: I'm in a motion, Steve. Don't interrupt.

All in favor?

All Board Members: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed. [none.]

What's your question?

MR. FLANCE: Well, my question relates to rooftop appurtenances. The pergola, I presume, is not considered a rooftop appurtenance.

CHAIR WOODS: What is?

MR. FLANCE: The pergola or the ramada is not considered a rooftop appurtenance?

CHAIR WOODS: They approved... The pergola was approved.

MR. FLANCE: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: Next.

Building #2

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, Board members, on your bound packet, pages 28 and 28A. And on the new submittal, SD-9. This is Building #2.

Building #2 will be 23,232 square foot 3-story and proposed to 36' high with a tower element at 44' high where the maximum allowable height is 18' 8" as determined by a radial calculation. A height exception was granted on May 28th of this year.

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with wall dominated stepped massing and precast concrete wall caps. Other architectural features include white-finished window and door surrounds with cornices and pediments and balconies. Several accent features include a pitched roof and circular windows in the tower.

An exception was approved on June 30th of this year for an arcade of arches on the north elevation

which is not allowed as a part of the Santa Fe style vocabulary.

Lantern-style wall sconce light fixtures are shown on elevations. The applicant has submitted a detailed lighting plan.

CHAIR WOODS: Any questions? Karen? To Staff? Is that who your question is for?

MS. WALKER: Well either staff or Steve. Looking at the keyed notes, # 3, can you help me find #3 on any of the elevations?

CHAIR WOODS: It's up on top of the tower.

MS. WALKER: Ahhh. Thank you.

MS. MATHER: And was the circular window removed, David?

MR. RASCH: Yes.

MR. FLANCE: Yes. If you look at.... Again, this is the latest submittal that you have. This is what we are going with. If there is some discrepancies with what you see there, look at this last packet. We .. The circular window has been removed. The pergola on the top of the torreon is really drawn from ... The changes that we made on that came from your comments at the last meeting plus looking at some of the pergolas around town that have been built on ... everything from the old State Capital to buildings at St. John's college and fairly typical in Territorial style; St. John's being a Meem building.

[inaudible]

MR. FLANCE: The bell tower- cupola. I was just corrected.

CHAIR WOODS: Is that a...

MR. FLANCE: So the keyed notes again are in upper right corner. These are the changes that have been made pursuant to our previous discussions on this building and we'd be happy to discuss anything else with you.

CHAIR WOODS: Go ahead, Cee.

MS. RIOS: Can you tell us the purpose of the tower and can you describe it fully for us - height, width, all materials?

MR. FLANCE: The purpose of the tower - first of all, it provides access to the roof. It is a stairway access to the roof and provides cover for that access. So it has a function to provide cover from the elements... Access to the roof is required.

Secondly, it is , as you can see, a fairly common design element, either as a bell tower or a lookout at the top of these buildings that you see in lots of Territorial buildings. The dimensions... Can you give us the dimensions quickly?

MR. HOGAN: The dimensions of the tower itself at the top are about 11 by 11. It is about 8' 4" from this area to the underside of the pitched roof. Those are both on your sheet on SD 9.

MR. FLANCE: Let me make a point that under City Code since it is an access to the roof, we have the right to cover it in some way. We felt this was the most appropriate way to handle it.

CHAIR WOODS: You have... I'm confused by that statement. Is it a Code requirement that it be...

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: The Code requires, even when you are out on the roof, you are totally exposed to the elements but at that point, the Code requires...

MR. FLANCE: allows...

CHAIR WOODS: Allows or requires?

MR. FLANCE: Allows. The Code allows a cover over an access way to the roof, whether it is an elevator or a stairway. In this case, we chose to do this cupola. And the roof does have a pitch to it. It is not just a flat roof element, so... it is basically very similar to the cupola that you see on the upper tier in the

CHAIR WOODS: Go ahead, Cee.

MS. RIOS: Can you tell us the purpose of the tower and can you describe it fully for us - height, width, all materials?

MR. FLANCE: The purpose of the tower - first of all, it provides access to the roof. It is a stairway access to the roof and provides cover for that access. So it has a function to provide cover from the elements... Access to the roof is required.

Secondly, it is , as you can see, a fairly common design element, either as a bell tower or a lookout at the top of these buildings that you see in lots of Territorial buildings. The dimensions... Can you give us the dimensions quickly?

MR. HOGAN: The dimensions of the tower itself at the top are about 11 by 11. It is about 8' 4" from this area to the underside of the pitched roof. Those are both on your sheet on SD 9.

MR. FLANCE: Let me make a point that under City Code since it is an access to the roof, we have the right to cover it in some way. We felt this was the most appropriate way to handle it.

CHAIR WOODS: You have... I'm confused by that statement. Is it a Code requirement that it be...

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: The Code requires, even when you are out on the roof, you are totally exposed to the elements but at that point, the Code requires...

MR. FLANCE: allows...

CHAIR WOODS: Allows or requires?

MR. FLANCE: Allows. The Code allows a cover over an access way to the roof, whether it is an elevator or a stairway. In this case, we chose to do this cupola. And the roof does have a pitch to it. It is not just a flat roof element, so... it is basically very similar to the cupola that you see on the upper tier in the

middle which is St. Francis Elementary School, located just down the street.

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, I'm having a hard time seeing the similarity because I think when you look at St. Francis' and then I'm not sure which church that is in the middle and La Fonda. It is a totally different proportion that what you're presenting. This is very much a vertical element and it almost looks like a light house to me. As opposed... it doesn't have the mass that these... that the illustrations that you're showing have. So that's my concern - is the verticality. And the way it was designed with the small windows and the pitched roof top, it keeps adding to that illusion.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Well, let's talk about the purpose to begin with. It has a functional purpose which I have outlined. This is also located in a courtyard that is trying to define the courtyard in a way that a public space might be defined in a traditional way in a complex in Santa Fe, using Territorial style.

The torreon itself... let's leave the windows aside. The torreon itself is simply designed to say this is an important space and place. And it is abutting the arcade that is using archways, again, to show the... define the passage way at the... Mark, if you could just show it on the site plan... I think the courtyard that we are framing here. And that this is an internal element. So this is not something that we are just tacking onto the building. It is a potential gathering place for people at the hotel. Or it could be a place where a small outdoor concert might take place or it might be a place where we might want to do a little crafts show or something like that. But it is defining a compound and it's defining an open space or a plazuela, if you want to think of it like that, within the compound.

And if you could outline it again, I think they can see it and show where the torreon is actually located. The access that leads to this area is through a zaguan which essentially will be open to the public during daylight hours most of the year. And it will certainly be open to guests.

So we are trying to create a gathering place and say this is an important place and we are defining that

space by the torreón and the bell tower or pergola that is located on top of the torreón.

Having said that, we are also trying to keep the height of this element within some reasonable framework here, Madam Chair. That has been an effort we have made all the way through here. If we needed to expand that massing, as you put it, we could look at doing something like that. But we are trying to keep it with scale of the building. The windows... I mean... are rather small windows that I'm looking at. There are two of them. I think that there's a... when you look at this drawing in your packet, you are looking at a flat plane. And this is not a rounded element but basically a flat plane. It is part of a rectangular building that is being constructed. It is not a round torreón. It is a square element.

CHAIR WOODS: Are you through?

MR. FLANCE: Yeah.

CHAIR WOODS: If you would look at your bottom rendering, the size of the windows on that rendering are different and the proportions of the top cupola are different from what is in our packet. The one that is on the bottom rendering, I believe, reads much less like a lighthouse. And I certainly... I don't think anyone on the Board is arguing with your purpose; why you are doing it. The concern is that the architectural elements you have on it are adding to the verticality. That's something you already have and how can we address that? So that is my concern. And again, we have something different in our packet than we have on that bottom rendering.

Christine?

MS. MATHER: Well I have basically the kind of same question. If those two windows could be made larger to match the windows... if you look on the north elevation... to match the 2 over 3 windows on that same side of the building. I think it would mitigate that light house effect and would allow you to bring more light into the stairway. I just wanted to suggest something that...

MR. FLANCE: Okay.

MS. MATHER: Would it be possible and then just add that little...

MR. FLANCE: I'm sure that would be possible.

MS. MATHER: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: How high is the... when you are looking at the actual... when you are standing in there, where the floor level is at the top of the tower, how high is the roof above?

MR. HOGAN: At the floor of the tower?

CHAIR WOODS: Right to the bottom of the roof. The bearing of the roof.

MR. HOGAN: It is three foot four... If the dimension you are looking at [inaudible] on the north elevation. [inaudible]

CHAIR WOODS: Dan?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Just a couple of observations. Well a question, first off. If that is a stair tower, how do you go up the stairs and out into this tower? Do you have like a long ladder that goes up the wall?

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible] a small ladder. [inaudible] you can't do that.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Because you can't go up the stairwell if the head height is too low. What the difference is in the two pictures and the new one we have is the railing. And that makes it look more like a light house. There is a lot of distance between the bottom of the railing and the bottom of ... The ceiling of this space, which if that was less, you know. I'm not sure. It shows like a roof structure - double lines - in the drawing. And then it shows another double line up at the top of the parapet. I'm not sure what that is. If the roof is down where the double line is, then the parapet inside the torreon would be high enough for a railing. You wouldn't need this metal railing and this ceiling could come down that thirty-six inches. And I think that would help.

MR. HOGAN: I think we would be... I think we are fine with that. We are actually trying to make it look less like a light house and that is why we added that railing in. A light house would have the railing around the perimeter so we tried to make it inside and more like something that was familiar And we look to this. And we also, from looking at it from the ground, we actually stretched it out a little bit because we thought that the proportions as you would see them would be too squat. So again, if we need to tune that a little bit...

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Un huh..

MR. HOGAN: ... across the board, we'd be happy to do it. [inaudible].

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I think you understand what I'm talking about. That 8' 4½" comes from a dashed line in your drawing that isn't really your floor, I don't think. It should be down at the two double lines down at the bottom. That would bring it down to 36", make it look less... if I'm hearing the Board correct.

MR. FLANCE: Is that correct? Is that where the floor is?

MR. HOGAN: Well actually...

MR. FLANCE: Look at your drawing; not at the elevation.

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible] at the top. A ladder takes off by itself.[?] There is a half-flight stairs that takes you to a landing...

MR. FLANCE: Right.

MR. HOGAN: That is not the same elevation as is the roof deck...[inaudible]

MR. FLANCE: Right.

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible]

MR. FEATHERINGILL: But couldn't it be the roof deck? Why does it have to go up that other half?

MR. HOGAN: It could be the roof deck.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: So that would reduce the tower by how much, if we go with what Dan is saying...

so we understand?

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible]

MR. RASCH: And what it does, Madam Chair is it would make the adjacent parapet that has the undulation on it the highest point on the building...

CHAIR WOODS: No.

MR. RASCH: ... parapet wise.

CHAIR WOODS: Well, parapet wise it would but it still wouldn't be the highest point on the building.

MR. RASCH: Yeah. That's what it would do. It would ...[inaudible] on the tower.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: That's with the two options, though. If you bring the parapet down on the tower to lower than that, then you're going to have to have the railing. If you leave that parapet up where it is, you can rid of the railing and just bring the roof structure down. And that would be a lot better at mitigating the height, I think.

MR. HOGAN: And we would prefer that also just to make sure there was a distinction between those parapet caps.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Yes, Christine?

MS. MATHER: On that same point, you seem to be using that center photo as your model, basically. If I'm... Correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. HOGAN: That's the closest one.

MS. MATHER: Yeah. And I think that one thing that makes that look more like a New Mexican tower as opposed to a lighthouse is that it's narrower than the base with the overall proportion. And as your drawing shows, your drawing is going out almost to the edges. And I think if you narrowed that look, it might again mitigate the effect of the tower.

CHAIR WOODS: Well, that's interesting for you to say because on four of the five shown, all the walls are canted ...

MS. MATHER: yes.

CHAIR WOODS: I think... and again, it's this verticality and this lighthouse feeling. When you have that mass and that canting, it helps you get away from that verticality. Now I know, on the bottom, you are running into arches. You have some issues and you can't narrow the top any more. But it maybe... You may be able to do it if by doing first what Dan said. By bringing it down slightly and then just a slight cant. Because that's what... The first top three are really canted and the middle one, the only one that's not is the Hilton and the others are older. So it's... It's really an interesting point what the canting does.

MR. HOGAN: This actually has a quarter inch per foot cant from this point down to the base right here so... [inaudible] to emphasize the verticality of the tower. So there is a cant in there. It is a quarter inch per foot.

CHAIR WOODS: And it's maybe four or five times that on most of these other buildings. Yeah, it helps it. but it may need to be a little more...

MR. HOGAN: This one actually comes up at one cant and then at this point even gets steeper. We didn't do a double...

CHAIR WOODS: Well, and that's the same on La Fonda as well.

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else?

MS. RIOS: Mark, on the torreon you are proposing, are you proposing another little window on the top? I don't know what I'm seeing here. Point to the rendition, John. Yeah, that. What is that?

MR. HOGAN: These have been taken out. This rendering was done two meetings or several meetings back so we have taken those windows out as you can see in your packet.

MS. RIOS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Could you also explain what is brick and what is precast coping on each elevation?.

MR. HOGAN: Okay. Again, we tried to use a change in the coping to show emphasis, particularly on this building where the entry is deep set into the pocket here that helps create this outdoor court. So we wanted to emphasize that architecturally. And we've done that not only by employing the arches. But we also have cast balcony pieces that are in cast concrete and then we have some cast coping at the top here and this one actually has some shape to it. And then we just put flat cast copings on these sides. So...the whole intent is to focus on that [inaudible] area and those are the details that we use to sort of create that symmetry there.

CHAIR WOODS: So is there any brick coping or the entire parapet is cast concrete coping?

MR. HOGAN: No. All the rest of the parapets from here back are brick.

CHAIR WOODS: And are you thinking... If you are using a cast concrete for the balconies, what color are those?

MR. HOGAN: Those are going to be a colored concrete, light in character. They were actually at some painted, but we wanted a color similar to the cream color that we are using here on the door and window surrounds.

CHAIR WOODS: So how about the coping on top? If it's cream color on the balconies, what were you

thinking on the top?

MR. HOGAN: Red.

CHAIR WOODS: So you have the cream color cast on part of the building and red brick on the other part?

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

Does anyone from the public wish to speak concerning this project?

[No public comment.]

You are being very quiet back there.

MS. RIOS: Madam Chair, are we addressing color on this as well? We are, right?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes.

MS. RIOS: So I'll ask Mark. What's the trim color on the doors and windows?

MR. HOGAN: Same cream. That's actually throughout the building. It is one relatively constant part of the vocabulary.

CHAIR WOODS: So David, do you get.. There's only historic precedent [inaudible] my preference on the other buildings in this complex or that would have both brick and cast concrete? Is there any precedent of that?

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, I would say no to that, in general. The only time you'll see mixtures really is when you have a brick coping and then if you have a shed roof you'll see a flashing. But I've never really seen a concrete and a brick coping.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a precedent for that that you guys can talk about in coming up with this?

MR. HOGAN: Well, one on the original Devargas Hotel is what we used to sort of ... typology for that

and that was more for the cast copings. Those were of course, down in hewn stone. That's the area we were using sort of to model that. I am not aware if there are any other portions that have a brick upper levels on that building.

CHAIR WOODS: Are you saying it does have a mixture? Does it...

MR. HOGAN: Brian actually pointed out to me that there's places on the hospital building itself where there's brick coping with cast concrete on top of that.

CHAIR WOODS: Do you have any photos of that so the Board can have a better idea of what we are looking at.

MR. HOGAN: I'm getting hints from my team on this is not something we are willing to fall on the sword for. So if... We like the element in terms of emphasizing the courtyard but if it is something the Board is having a hard time with we...

CHAIR WOODS: Well I think what we are trying to do is see what it looks like. Cause on one building you at first proposed... and, you know, I'm trying to understand on how you are clear with this. On one building you proposed brick with a colored red coping. On this building you have brick coping but then a cast concrete that looks more like stone. So in your historic pictures ... and then you said T L said that there was a mixture in places on the old building. Do you have that picture so the Board can look and have a better understanding? Cause when I try to redesign it, I think it is an element... I'm having a hard time seeing it. You know, and that's...

MR. HOGAN: While they are looking through the pictures in the packet, the only other thing I can say that helps to visualize this is when you see the model, when you are in three dimensions, you see that this whole courtyard takes on an element of itself and then the building sort of trails off to the side here. Again, just to focus on bringing the attention to the middle and have a simple coping of brick just blending sort of

with the other buildings on either side of the courtyard.

CHAIR WOODS: Does the Board want to break for a couple of minutes and just see the model to get a better idea?

MS. WALKER: I wanted to mention something to Mark that Dan just pointed out concerning the tower. The east elevation and the west elevation is what he is trying to get you to contemplate. And its contradictory to the north elevation and the south elevation.

MR. HOGAN: The east elevation and west elevations - the shape of the tower did not get updated and that is our error... similar to the south and the north...

MS. WALKER: But...

MR. HOGAN: So you are suggesting that the east and west one is more in scale to what you're looking for... Yep.

[Someone made an inaudible comment].

MR. HOGAN: Yeah, and as I mentioned, I stretched that out so it shows the contrast between the format...

CHAIR WOODS: Yes? David?

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, Board members, if you go to the spiral bound packet where the applicant went through each façade mentioning details, and I'm looking specifically at their Image #12.

CHAIR WOODS: Are we doing page twelve, David?

MR. RASCH: No, it's in their Image #12.

CHAIR WOODS: But which book are we on?

MR. RASCH: It's the spiral bound and it is near the back...

CHAIR WOODS: Wait. The big one that we got several months ago or the new one today?

MR. RASCH: The big one several months ago.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. RASCH: What you're going to see on the old hospital that's kind of all over, is you are going to see brick concrete sills but on top of the parapet there may be brick cap... I mean a concrete cap on top of the...

CHAIR WOODS: What page are we looking at, Dave?

MR. RASCH: It's twelve of his... It's façade #5.

[several people talking at once]

MR. RASCH: It's at the end of Gayla's report near the end.

MS. WALKER: In the back, page twelve. Way in the back, page twelve. Way in the back.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: [with mike off] Are all these brick tops ...[inaudible]

MR. FLANCE: I can't hear him. ... These over here. Here it is over here. Here it is right here.

CHAIR WOODS: You know, David, I'm not sure if that is concrete or if that's flashing. I think that...

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible]... as well that window band at the sill of the windows below is...

CHAIR WOODS: No. I understand the sill of the windows. Uh...

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair, can I show you a photograph?

CHAIR WOODS: No thank you. We found it.

MR. FLANCE: I found another.

CHAIR WOODS: You have another one? Sure.

CHAIR WOODS: I understand, Steve, the concrete over the brick. I don't think that's what's being introduced, though. We are having concrete on one façade and brick on the other. So it's very different. And the concrete we are introducing is made, as I understand it, to look like cast stone or it's cast concrete

made to look like stone. So why don't we take like a two-minute break and just look at their point of where it is in this courtyard? Okay?

MR. FLANCE: Okay.

[The Board took a break at 7:01 to look at the courtyard on the model to 7:05.]

CHAIR WOODS: We've already asked the public. Does anyone on the Board have any further questions?

MS. RIOS: I'm ready to make a motion, Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. RIOS: Regarding Building #2, I move for approval with the following conditions. That all coping on the building be brick and that the windows on the torreon should increase in size to 2 over 3. That there be no visible rooftop appurtenances. That trim color be cream and I'm going to yield to Mr. Featheringill regarding the torreon and tower specifications.

CHAIR WOODS: Let's get a second.

MS. WALKER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Dan?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I think the easiest would be to follow the proposed east and west elevations in the design as opposed to the north and south. And just a clarification. You say to go to two over three on both windows on the torreon, the stairs.

MS. RIOS: Yes.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yeah, the six light. And just that they may offset one side to the other a little bit because of the stairs going up. Right? Is that the way you have them drawn?

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible]

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay. Very good.

MR. HOGAN: We located them at the landings.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there... So we have a motion and a second and are you acceptable to his ...

MS. RIOS: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed? [none]

Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: It's not getting any easier, Steve.

Building #3

MR. RASCH: Okay. Now we are going to go to Building #3. Page 29 and 29A in your old packet. Is it in the new packet?

MR. FLANCE: It's on SD 10.

MR. RASCH: SD-10? Yes. SD-10. So those are all the images.

New Building #3 will be 7,486 square feet, two story, proposed to twenty-seven feet high where the maximum allowable height is eighteen eight. A height exception was granted for twenty-seven feet on May 28th.

The building is designed in the Territorial Revival style with wall dominated massing in a U shaped floor plan. A low angled, standing seam metal hipped roof is proposed to reflect the similar rooflines of

Marian Hall. An exception was approved on June 30th of this year to construct a pitch.

Other architectural features include window and door surrounds with cornices and pediments, wooden balustrade portals on the north and east elevations, similar balustrades on balconies on the south and west elevations, and a stuccoed yardwall to a maximum height of 3' at the northwest corner with a 3' high iron fence installed on the top.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any questions for staff?

MS. WALKER: I have a question. On the proposed north elevation at the left, second floor, is there a window missing or was it intended not to be symmetrical?

CHAIR WOODS: I think you should ask the applicant that.

MS. WALKER: Applicant? Steve?

MR. FLANCE: I'll leave that to the architect. Second floor, north elevation.

MS. WALKER: North elevation.

MR. FLANCE: No window.

MS. WALKER: There's a window missing unless you have some reason for it not being symmetrical.

MR. HOGAN: The window is missing, actually. And my apologies again. They... It shows in plan on that level but it was just not reflected in the elevation.

MS. WALKER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: That was a good catch.

MS. WALKER: Thank you.

MS. RIOS: I have a question.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Cee?

MS. RIOS: Staff's report indicated that you have a three foot wall and then on top of that you have a

three foot fence. That's the metal fence?

MR. FLANCE: Wrought iron metal.

MS. RIOS: The wrought iron?

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

MS. RIOS: So we have.... It doesn't appear... On the elevations, it doesn't appear to be six feet, to me.

So that is a total of six feet?

MR. FLANCE: That is what is intended. If you look on the west elevation...

MS. RIOS: Yes.

MR. FLANCE: This is a fence that is separating the grounds of the hotel from what will be the gardens of... the archdiocese and the Lamy gardens. Under the Hunt property, those areas are proposed for redevelopment. [two people speaking at once] on the archdiocese property.

MR. RASCH: That's at the north end of that west elevation that the retaining wall or wall is three feet high with the three-foot iron fence on top of it. As you go to the south elevation it decreases in height.

MS. RIOS: Oh. Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: So your property is higher than the archdiocese property? Or it's retaining it? And that's why you need the wall and the iron railing on top?

MR. FLANCE: Uhh.

CHAIR WOODS: Or is it...

MR. FLANCE: I think it is...

CHAIR WOODS: The reason for the question is... Let's say the archdiocese was level with your building.

MR. FLANCE: Right.

CHAIR WOODS: If you had a three foot stucco wall and then a three foot iron wall it would look one way. If it's ...

MR. FLANCE: Well, let me...

CHAIR WOODS: If one is higher than the other and it's retaining, it looks much different so...

MR. FLANCE: So is it retaining or is it just...

MR. HOGAN: It is a retaining wall.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. So the masonry part is completely retaining it?

MR. HOGAN: Right.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Got it.

Is there anyone else? Yes, Christine?

MS. MATHER: Looking at both 29A and then actual, page 10 in your... on the east elevation it seems to indicate - correct me if I'm wrong - that in the center part of the building there is a different stucco color or is that my imagination.

MR. HOGAN: It's ... It's not your imagination but it's not a different stucco color either. It was just a rendering device to try to show the change in plane when you are looking at a two dimensional drawing.

MS. MATHER: A depth. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: On the railing... On the wood railing, is it painted a trim color and what is that color?

MR. HOGAN: It is painted and it is the same cream color we are using on the trim throughout the rest of the project.

CHAIR WOODS: And the iron railing is?

MR. HOGAN: Black wrought iron.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

Yes, Karen?

MS. WALKER: Another question on that north elevation - why, as we are looking at it, are the two windows on the right centered and the window on the left and the missing window are behind a post?

CHAIR WOODS: It is because it extends further.

MS. WALKER: Oh, I see. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: And that makes it wrap around which is really a nice detail.

MS. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else?

MS. RIOS: What is the roofing material over the entry way?

MR. HOGAN: It's standing seam.

MS. RIOS: That's also standing seam?

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: And it's true standing seam. It's not...

MR. HOGAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak concerning this project?

[There were no speakers from the public.]

CHAIR WOODS: What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. WALKER: I move that we approve Building #3 if they will add back in that second level window.

CHAIR WOODS: Do I hear a second?

DR. KANTNER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Any discussion?

MS. RIOS: Thank you. I just... I don't know who seconded it. Oh. I just want to clarify that the roofing

material be true standing seam and that the railing is going to be painted cream, that there not be any roof top ... visible rooftop appurtenances and that the fence be black wrought iron.

CHAIR WOODS: Is that all?

MS. WALKER: Very friendly.

CHAIR WOODS: All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed? [none].

Thank you. Next?

4. Outstanding items

a - Marian Hall Canopy Redesign - SD 5.1

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, now we are going to look at other site improvements... no, first we are going to go back to some redesign issues, if we follow the outline. We are going to look at the Canopy redesign for Marian Hall and then the slight elevation changes on the south and the west of the Hospital building.

CHAIR WOODS: And what page? Can you direct us to those?

MR. RASCH: Those are all in the new packet. For Marian Hall is the canopy... uhh...

MR. FLANCE: It is toward the front of the packet.

MR. RASCH: Okay.

MR. FLANCE: SD 5.1.

MR. RASCH: This is addressing some concerns the Board had on that canopy entrance on the significant Marian Hall Building on the east elevation.

CHAIR WOODS: David, can you clarify what's new and what's old on that? To remind us?

MR. RASCH: Yes, Madam Chair. We had some discussions about the canopy which was built in a way that it looked more temporary and tent-like. And you can see especially on the detail on the bottom how that canopy now mimics the architectural style of the brick building and has more substance on the upright pilasters and then a rather heavy tabature for the top. So that's all a new design.

1:46:-3

MS. MATHER: if you look on page 23 of the old...

CHAIR WOODS: Right. No I remember the 10th. So when you're looking, David, at this...Is the window above the entry a new window?

MR. RASCH: Yes. And by the way, all the new windows in Marian Hall have been replaced by the state but we are retaining that window pattern.

CHAIR WOODS: so this is part of the original window pattern before you close?

MR. HOGAN: that's correct.

MR. RASCH: I think so.

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, go ahead.

I'm sorry. Any other questions for staff?

Steve?

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Well, after the last discussion we had of this canopy, there didn't seem to be... not only wasn't there any consensus but there didn't seem to be a great embracing of what we were proposing. So we went back to a very simple portal, flat roofed entry, trying to create a what really is a Territorial element in this Craftsman building. So what you see is essentially a wood structure with brick columns that supporting the structure. And we'd like to be able to cover the structure with some reinforced

glass that would allow light and protection from weather but would allow light to come down through the rafters of the portal. It's almost like a ramada with a ... a glassed roof on it, if you will.

MS. WALKER: Do you have a sample of that glass?

MR. FLANCE: No. I don't have a sample. It can be either... There are two things we were thinking of. One is an opaque type of just glass cover. The second would be some kind of steel reinforced glass. You want to talk about that?

MR. HOGAN: It's wired glass which, given the fact it is on a horizontal surface over a occupied space we are required to have the wire in there so it won't drop shards on people. The... We were looking at whether it was a clear or a frosted glass. We wanted something that was not visible from the side but when you were underneath it you've got the light, given it is the north side of the building. So the wire is in there just as a function of the support and the glass is there just to let the light in and keep the rain out.

MS. WALKER: So the only question is clear or opaque?

MR. HOGAN: opaque is not the right word.

MS. WALKER: translucent.

MR. HOGAN: Right. Translucent.

CHAIR WOODS: And I would assume you are not aware of this glass from the street. It is only if you area standing under it.

MR. FLANCE: That's correct.

CHAIR WOODS: Whether it is wood or steel, it has an edge to it.

MR. FLANCE: That's correct.

MR. HOGAN: I think it probably would be wood.

CHAIR WOODS: Oh. Okay. Christine?

MS. MATHER: I assume that this new design is also not attached to the building.

MR. HOGAN: That's correct.

MS. MATHER: I also want to tell you, I really like the new design. I think it helped to give it a little bit more mass to match parts of the original.

MR. FLANCE: And I think the brick matches the building and the design is really trying to articulate a Territorial style also. So, thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other questions?

MS. RIOS: I just wondered if you had a preference as to the translucent or the clear glass.

MR. HOGAN: I guess my personal preference is for the clear just because it gives you the opportunity to look up through what some are some of the details on the building. That would be my prejudice on that.

CHAIR WOODS: I'm still worried a little bit with the window above window #3. And it is a pretty window but then... I'm guess I'm reacting like you did when it was said all these windows were replaced and what was there. It does... It is reading a little bit like an anomaly on the west of the façade of the building. I don't know what we could...

MR. RASCH: Yeah. I know. It is true that they are suggesting a restoration of the original light pattern that this building had. And when the state occupied the building they removed all the historic windows and replaced them with this one over ones. So what they are proposing is to restore that light pattern only on this area

CHAIR WOODS: But you know this is the restored light pattern? Do you know that for sure?

MR. RASCH: Yes. From historic photographs.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MS. WALKER: Would it look better if it didn't come all the way down to the top of the portal?

CHAIR WOODS: No. I think the way they...

MS. WALKER: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other questions?

Anyone from the public wish to speak about these Marian Hall revisions? Anyone wish to speak? I do think this is a huge improvement. I really do think this is considerably better... I'm sorry. A huge improvement.

What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. MATHER: I would like to make a motion that we approve the redesign of entry portal on Marian Hall as submitted and. That glass ceiling be clear.

MS. WALKER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Any discussion? All in favor...

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MS. RIOS: I'm sorry. Discussion. That it not be attached to the building.

MS. MATHER: I agree.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you. Motion passes.

David, next please.

4 b - south end of old hospital - SD 2.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, next we are going to look at some west and south elevation changes on the old hospital. And that is the first five pages of your new packet. And it is mostly revolving around the entrance at the south end of the building and also that element on the west end where we looked at some window alterations.

CHAIR WOODS: Mark, did you want to point this out?

MR. FLANCE: It is page SD-2.

CHAIR WOODS: Do one of you want to point these out for us?

MR. HOGAN: Sure, I'd be happy to. These drawings were submitted really to show the details that we cleaned up vertically.... I mean verbally at the last meeting. And we just wanted to have the drawings reflect our understanding of the adjustment. So one of the things is that we modified the door and window light patterns to be more consistent. We allowed larger panes instead of the multiple brick broken up panes that we had before. We ... That's all on SD-2.

And on SD-3, we did the same with making the door openings and lights above more consistent as well as address the west elevation of the addition that is labeled as such on the end. There was some comments from the Board that were very helpful in terms of providing a little direction; making that façade and façade of the addition a little more interesting.

So these drawings represent those changes.

MR. FLANCE: Let me... If we can go back to SD-2, Madam Chair. If you look in the right hand corner you will see 16 items that were changed as a result of the input from this Board and the discussions with this Board that include what Mark just referred to. But there are a whole range of things that we have adjusted or modified on this particular façade that are summarized in that keyed area.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you. So does anyone have questions?

Does anyone from the public wish to speak concerning the changes and clarification to proposed hospital building? [none.]

What are.... Mr. Herdman - are you going to... Think how we feel. And you're getting paid, and we're not. [general laughter].

What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. WALKER: I have one question. I cannot find 9 new mechanical equipment screen wall....

CHAIR WOODS: Oh, I found it.

MR. HOGAN: It is so well concealed.

CHAIR WOODS: It is on the bottom façade, middle, on the top.

MS. WALKER: Oh. Okay.

MS. RIOS: Madam Chair, I move for approval regarding the proposed changes to the hospital building as submitted this evening. I think we have approved the building.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MS. MATHER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Any discussion?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Is the pergola going to be stained or painted on this building?

MR. HOGAN: It is to be painted.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: It is painted.

CHAIR WOODS: So we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All against? [none]

Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you very much. This is a huge improvement. And I know you worked many times on the [inaudible]. It is really looking much, much better.

MR. FLANCE: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: No. I think the way they...

MS. WALKER: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other questions?

Anyone from the public wish to speak about these Marian Hall revisions? Anyone wish to speak? I do think this is a huge improvement. I really do think this is considerably better... I'm sorry. A huge improvement.

What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. MATHER: I would like to make a motion that we approve the redesign of entry portal on Marian Hall as submitted and. That glass ceiling be clear.

MS. WALKER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Any discussion? All in favor...

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MS. RIOS: I'm sorry. Discussion. That it not be attached to the building.

MS. MATHER: I agree.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you. Motion passes.

David, next please.

4 b - south end of old hospital - SD 2.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, next we are going to look at some west and south elevation changes on the old hospital. And that is the first five pages of your new packet. And it is mostly revolving around the entrance at the south end of the building and also that element on the west end where we looked at some window alterations.

CHAIR WOODS: Mark, did you want to point this out?

MR. FLANCE: It is page SD-2.

CHAIR WOODS: Do one of you want to point these out for us?

MR. HOGAN: Sure, I'd be happy to. These drawings were submitted really to show the details that we cleaned up vertically.... I mean verbally at the last meeting. And we just wanted to have the drawings reflect our understanding of the adjustment. So one of the things is that we modified the door and window light patterns to be more consistent. We allowed larger panes instead of the multiple brick broken up panes that we had before. We ... That's all on SD-2.

And on SD-3, we did the same with making the door openings and lights above more consistent as well as address the west elevation of the addition that is labeled as such on the end. There was some comments from the Board that were very helpful in terms of providing a little direction; making that façade and façade of the addition a little more interesting.

So these drawings represent those changes.

MR. FLANCE: Let me... If we can go back to SD-2, Madam Chair. If you look in the right hand corner you will see 16 items that were changed as a result of the input from this Board and the discussions with this Board that include what Mark just referred to. But there are a whole range of things that we have adjusted or modified on this particular façade that are summarized in that keyed area.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you. So does anyone have questions?

Does anyone from the public wish to speak concerning the changes and clarification to proposed hospital building? [none.]

What are.... Mr. Herdman - are you going to... Think how we feel. And you're getting paid, and we're not. [general laughter].

What are the wishes of the Board?

MS. WALKER: I have one question. I cannot find 9 new mechanical equipment screen wall....

CHAIR WOODS: Oh, I found it.

MR. HOGAN: It is so well concealed.

CHAIR WOODS: It is on the bottom façade, middle, on the top.

MS. WALKER: Oh. Okay.

MS. RIOS: Madam Chair, I move for approval regarding the proposed changes to the hospital building as submitted this evening. I think we have approved the building.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MS. MATHER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Any discussion?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Is the pergola going to be stained or painted on this building?

MR. HOGAN: It is to be painted.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: It is painted.

CHAIR WOODS: So we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All against? [none]

Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Thank you very much. This is a huge improvement. And I know you worked many times on the [inaudible]. It is really looking much, much better.

MR. FLANCE: Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Next , David.

MR. RASCH: Yes, Madam Chair. Now we are going to work on other site improvements and it is the last section of the staff report. You are going to see a lighting plan and look at the color board as set up in front of the staff table here.

MS. WALKER: Did we do the west elevation?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes. That was on the next page - the SD-3 one.

MS. WALKER: Okay. I see.

MR. FLANCE: The motion included both elevations.

MS. WALKER: Okay.

5 - Colors, Materials and Lighting

MR. RASCH: So multiple yard walls, curbs and ramps will be removed including the retaining wall along Palace Avenue on the northeast corner of the lot.

CHAIR WOODS: David, you want to tell us where you are so we can find something visually or...

MR. RASCH: I'm just going to be working off the...

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a site plan that we should be looking at?

MR. FLANCE: Is this the original packet or the new packet?

+++ 01:57:37

MR. RASCH: this is the original but in the new packet, do we have a site plan?

MR. FLANCE: oh. No we don't have it in there. The lighting plan is as close as we get.

MR. RASCH: that is probably the one we want to work off of. The lighting plan.

MR. FLANCE: the lighting plan is SD 1. And then, Madam Chair, if I may? SD-1 and then please tab

SD- 11 which has the cut sheets of the different sconces and lighting fixtures that we are proposing for the project. So those are the two there to be looking at. SD-1 and SD-11.

CHAIR WOODS: Go ahead David.

MR. RASCH: they are going to remove a lot of existing yard walls , curbs and ramps. And the retaining wall on Palace Avenue. Then a curb cut on Palace Avenue that reestablishes and historic curb cut will allow access to the main entrance of Marian Hall off from the street. The stuccoed retaining walls and yard walls will be constructed along the streetscape corner of Paseo and Palace to a maximum height of the 3 feet. And iron fence at 3 feet high will surmount the interior yard walls a lot like what we saw in new building number three. Arched iron gates will be installed at the corner with flanking 6 foot high pilasters surmounted with spherical ornaments. And I think we have a detail of that in the original packet. A similar stuccoed yard wall with iron fence will be constructed closer to the old hospital building at elevation one. A stuccoed yard wall at 2 feet high will be constructed in front of the new Southwest addition of the hospital. It will be surmounted by a 3 foot high iron fence, iron pedestrian gates with access will access multiple courtyards. And then the landscaping plan is shown, and we are going to look at a detailed lighting plan has well.

CHAIR WOODS: Mr. Flance? Does anyone have any questions for David?

MS. WALKER: I don't know who the question is for but David, the blue square type G pathway lighter. None of these things has a G. Oh yes they do. I'm sorry. I didn't open it far enough. There's the one that I like.

CHAIR WOODS: I guess, Steve, my concern is I don't know what we can look at to see where we are talking about; what kind of walls. And where these walls are. My biggest concern being on the perimeter of the property as too how high they are. Are we talking about 3 foot stuccoed walls? Or whether there is a 3

foot gate? 3 foot iron walls and where ... I think we need to have a much ... some visual to look at .

MR. FLANCE: The board that you saw just put up far right shows the entry wall and the iron fence that will surround what we are calling the wedding garden or the corner... that's the most visible corner; it's the corner of Palace and Paseo de Peralta. And Mark, you can point out the details on that wall.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair and Board members, page 9 of your spiral bound packet you're going to see that iron wall or iron fence and you're also going to see the arched gates with the pilasters. On this streetscape views it looks like this and is on page 9 of your spiral bound packet.

CHAIR WOODS: well, you had said that it's a stuccoed wall 3 feet high and can iron fence 3 feet high. But if that's the case, that would make the man leaning on defense, holding the dog 9' tall. So I think, again, I'm just concerned on the heights here as we go around the parameter. Because that's what we are going to see first.

MR. HOGAN: Perhaps... let me perhaps clarify the intent and the precedent for it and that might help the Board to see what we're planning on. It starts really from the stone wall and iron fence that runs along Cathedral Park which was the original and closure for the whole hospital property. That continues up past Marian Hall and then there's the gap until you get to this point here...

CHAIR WOODS: okay, stop. As you are doing that, tell us how tall the walls are and what they are made of. Because if you go around the whole thing like that that it's a wall, we'll get lost.

MR. HOGAN: Okay. So first, I'm just saying these are all existing walls. And what happens is the stone berries in height with the grade, and then the iron fence goes up from the top of that. So we are considering continuing that pattern language ...

CHAIR WOODS: So you are keeping the existing wall on Palace. Is that what you are saying? Or are you replacing it?

MR. HOGAN: we are putting a new wall along palace here that will be varied in grade. There is a retaining wall component to that. And that's the stucco wall and that Varies in height. At this and it is the highest and I think it is about 6 feet at that point. It's set back from the face of the building. And we have plantings in front of it to try to mitigate that. But we wanted to have a consistent batem line at the bottom of the fence, the iron fence. So as you go E. On Palace Avenue, the masonry part of the wall goes from six feet down to about 6 inches. Because that takes up the difference in the grade. And then from... on top of that, since the wrought iron fence that's three feet.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MS. WALKER: So as you get closer to Paseo then the total combination is like three and a half feet or something.

MR. HOGAN: That's correct. If you,,, you can see here on the corner elevation or you are looking down Palace Ave., there is much more high to the retaining here but as you come up it becomes very minimal. And as you turn the corner it is about 12 inches or so.

CHAIR WOODS: So you are saying that on Palace the stucco is retaining and the ground is higher inside the property.

MR. HOGAN: that's correct.

CHAIR WOODS: And then... But what... In your rendering, as you walk in, there is no steps.

MR. HOGAN: That's right. Because at the corner, It slopes up to meet our grade and then we can continue in. It's going down Palace Avenue that we start to lose grade.

CHAIR WOODS: okay. Good. I mean I understand it so far.

MR. HOGAN: And that's essentially the theme as it rounds the corner and comes into... So that part we discussed is from here to here. And then from this section, to the edge of the existing hospital building it

does the same only it is much less in magnitude. It is probably twelve inches of wall and three feet of iron fence and that goes to the corner of the hospital building and stops. And that's it.

CHAIR WOODS: Those are all the walls around the entire... Is that all we are talking about or...?

MR. RASCH: [inaudible, microphone not on] the south elevation.

MR. HOGAN: Yes, that's true. On this elevation here... we do have a perspective of that. That's the... We have the same motif , retaining wall with stucco and then iron on the top.

Let me just refer you in Plan. That's this section along here. And what we have is the same thing. We've got change in grade so the wall height is a little higher at the west end and I should go toward the building, it narrows down and we have the iron fence on top of that. There are also gates articulated in the iron fencing. Whether or not they will actually be operable or not depends on the hotel's operations group, but there will be gates on there that will visually break up that expanse of wrought iron..

MR. RASCH: And then also, on the north elevation of that west wing of the hospital. I think the same thing is over there where you are showing all of those trees in the front yard on Palace. Elevation one. Go over to the left. Elevation one. Right there.

MR. HOGAN: Oh yeah. The same sort of treatment along the face of the building. And it's harder to see at this distance but it's just a Screening that goes in front of those windows. There's about a 5 foot ... they extend out from the wall about five feet and then there is ... the wall of the building. And then there is the stucco wall with the iron fence on it. People in... the guests in the rooms there have a little foil between their room and the turn around.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. HOGAN: Make sense? He is referring to this line here... this line here shows that line of fencing.

CHAIR WOODS: So those are all the walls. Now we can move on to colors. Yes? Colors.

MR. HOGAN: Do you want to do anything on the walls or?

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any questions on the walls?

MS. MATHER: So we want to make a motion?

CHAIR WOODS: Well, I think we... Do we want to do a motion for walls separate? No? I think we can do it all as one motion. And then we will also ask for public input at one time. Is that alright?

MR. HOGAN: So I think maybe the most efficient thing to do is we will just go building by building. We can either move the projector out and leave these all in place so you will see them all together or we can pull up the board that goes with each building. It's up to the Board.

MS. WALKER: Why don't you just move the projector instead of moving the boards?

CHAIR WOODS: ... so are we going to take this ... are we going to start with Marian Hall, then the old hospital and going the way we've been doing it?

MR. HOGAN: Marian Hall would be the exception. And the reason we don't have any colors for Marian Hall is because we have yet to see how much of the original brick we can expose, what color that is, as well as to do paint sample testing. So Marian Hall is really going to be more of a restoration to what was. And so we are not presenting anything to the Board on that tonight until we actually get the research underway and find that out.

CHAIR WOODS: How about the old hospital, then?

MR. HOGAN: The old hospital building...

CHAIR WOODS: Could you bring the... maybe.. We want to make sure you guys can see it too. You have to move around. Could you ... yeah, put it up on the easel and then explain it.

MR. FLANCE: While we are doing that, we want you... There are a couple of things we'd like to have you focus on and give us feedback on. One is that the...we want the colors. While there are some subtle

variations on the colors we want them to be compatible and we want you to feel that they are compatible and that there is a reasonable seamless transition, if you will on the colors we are proposing. And the material that we are using. So when we put something up here and bring it back, perhaps you could take another look at it as it lines up here and see what you think. Cause it feeds into the entire building. I just wanted to make that point. Go ahead.

MR. HOGAN: Okay. This is color palette for the old hospital building. One other brick that we are not showing is this one. This is a sample from one of the breaks that fell off of the existing coping pieces. We brought that in two put it up next to the ones that we were selecting to try and demonstrate that we are looking for something compatible but we are not looking for an exact match. We are as guilty mind to make sure that there is a difference between the old and the new. So this is the brick on the coping. Then we have this color here, This color is the existing building. With all the brick that's not painted pink, we're proposing to take to this color here. And then this is the painted brick on the new additions, which would include the torreons. And then this is the stucco that would be on the new additions here and here.

So again, what we are trying to do as Steve pointed out is come up with compatible colors with subtle differences that still highlight certain features such as the torreons.

This is... I think we discussed the standing seam metal roof. This is the zinc roofing material that is similar to what is existing on the solarium here. And that sort of set up that palette and we are using that in any place that we are showing a metal roof is that same zinc.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any other questions?

MS. RIOS: I have a question of David. David, doesn't the ordinance indicate that you really should not be using different colors in ... I'm pretty sure that it indicates that.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, Board members, you will recall on the retail gallery/garage building, we

approved multiple stucco colors to break up the massing on the two buildings, even though they are attached. I'll read what it says here under Downtown/Eastside Historic Design Standards. "With rare exception, buildings are one story," blah, blah blah. "Exterior walls are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under portals, in which case the overhang... the overhang... in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color or have mural decorations.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any other questions?

MR. RASCH: And in the recent - it doesn't say anything about colors but it does say no less than 80% of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish or stucco simulating adobe. And then it says the balance of the publicly visible façade may be of natural stone, wood, brick, terra cotta or other materials, subject to approval. And the publicly visible façade of any building, and this is in recent Santa Fe, and any other adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided be of one color, which color shall simulate the light earth or dark earth, matte or dull finish and relatively smooth finish. .

So yes. in general, the Code says painted alike and under portals, different.

MS. WALKER: But what about the differentiation that a new addition is to supposed to...

MR. RASCH: That's a good point. Where new additions need to be distinguishable and this Board has set a precedent where with an addition on an existing building you may slightly change the stucco color or change the stucco texture. And I would definitely say that you need to vote that way if you want to. And you need to be careful when someone comes if for a restucco, they don't just do it all in one color or texture. But that is following the Secretary of the Interior Standards. And I would say, Board members, that the colors they are choosing are similar enough that I don't think it violates that part of the Code. They seem to be alike, to me.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other questions? Let's go to the next panel. If you can just leave it in front and lean it on there, Mark, so we can see them altogether.

MR. HOGAN: this is the color palette for the Gallery Building. We have changed your bricks. We changed the brick color on the coping. We went with a slightly darker stucco. This is the portion of the building we are talking about. Here. And to here. And so it is a slightly darker stucco. We have introduced the wood for the portals and the pergola and then the cream color for the window trim and balustrades.

Yeah. So these two go rather closely together so you can see cause we transitioned from this stucco to the stucco of the garage, which is this color here.

CHAIR WOODS: We can't see it cause the model is back.... Thank you. If you can just hold it next to it so we can see the...

MR. HOGAN: So smaller areas, we went with the slightly darker color; larger areas... this is actually the same color that's used on the additions for the hospital. Then we've got to painted brick portions here. This is at the torreon at this point. And then to cream color for the window surrounds.

CHAIR WOODS: any questions? Okay.

MR. HOGAN: This is the boiler building.

CHAIR WOODS: again, if there's any way we can leave them all out because we can't see them over on the side. Okay.

MR. HOGAN: this is the existing brick. Then we have two different colors of painted brick, that representing the end than the lighter when representing the new addition that Meem did later on. So we've got the Meem addition, the earlier version and then the color of the trim and balustrades.

MS. WALKER: and which of the two, not the balustrade but the other two will the carotid store be now?

MR. HOGAN: For the garage door now, I guess you could take your pick. It would be obviously one of these two and probably this one is a portion of the Meem building wrapping around. So if we are trying to make it go away, I would stick with that one.

MS. WALKER: I think so. Yeah.

MR. HOGAN: okay?

All right. Building #1 Same brick as the parapet on the gallery and the garage. Stucco color, we have the wood trim... I mean on the wood from the pergola and the portals. And the cream color for the balustrades and window trims. Again, this is a better picture if you couldn't see it before, of our standing seam roof. Okay?

We'll go to Building #2. Building 2 and Building 3 have the same color stucco. It's a little bit darker... a little bit lighter than the stucco on building one. This is the coping color of the brick there and the cream that surrounds that. There's really only two colors really for materials on building two.

Finally, is Building 3 - same color as #2. We kind of wanted to use that to turn that corner And then the zinc roof and the trim.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there any questions?

MS. MATHER: I have a question about Building #3. Isn't it meant to sort of replace a building that was lost in that area and therefore it would probably be closest and feel to Marian Hall and since you don't know what Marian Hall's going to turn out to be. Are we thinking about holding off or are we just going to go ahead and match it with the other one?

MR. HOGAN: Well, what we wanted to do is put the proposals and the colors out there for all the buildings we are proposing. It is our intention to do some mockups of these areas components as we are moving through the construction phase. And evaluate whether they are doing what we intended for them to

do The color matching with Marian Hall and how the effects building number three could be influenced by that. So what we wanted to do was just make a statement to the board that we would like to gain approvals on these three so we have something on the record. And then if we find any reason to change things, then we would bring it to staff and staff would determine whether or not the board would want to take another look at it. We would like to do that actually from larger mockups that are on this site area so that's where we are coming from.

MS. MATHER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOODS: let's give the public a chance to speak.

Does anyone wish to speak concerning the colors? Okay.

Cee, did you have a question?

MS. RIOS: I have a comment. I don't think it is a good idea for you to be introducing a lot of different colors on one building. I think you should stick with one color to each building. That is my opinion and I think the ordinance upholds this point of view.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other questions? Dan?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I think it's Building #1 in the back- why is the brick a different color when you are creating a courtyard with building 2? You know the darker brick for the gallery building and the parking structure match. And then Building 1 and 2 should maybe match the hospital. Or... It's just a question.

MR. HOGAN: You know it's an interesting question. We are trying to come up with the right amount of variation and the right amount of consistency. So it's a little bit of... The brick we used on Building 1 taps it from the hospital so we didn't want to make it mimic that too closely. It is also probably the closest to a Pueblo style of the Territorial buildings that we are doing. And I'm saying that because of the way we

developed the massing here. So that rougher brick and sort of mottled color seems to be more consistent with that.

We wanted it to read as a separate building from #2 so that it didn't look like they were done at the same time and place.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Okay.

And on the larger buildings, I don't have as much trouble with the different colors.... as much. Okay, the smaller buildings yeah.. a lot of different colors. But the bigger hospital, my opinion is it is probably okay.

MR. FLANCE: Could I make a comment on that?

MS. WALKER: It does break up the mass.

MS. RIOS: I think it is getting too messy.

MS. WALKER: The mass is messy?

MS. RIOS: No. The...

MS. WALKER: I'm teasing you.

MS. RIOS: Yeah. Okay.

DR. KANTNER: We do have... because some of it is painted brick and some of it is stucco so it is actually different textures as well. So it probably would appear to be somewhat different colors anyway. So it might make sense to make it look intentional. I just wanted to agree with Dan on that.

MS. RIOS: If the colors are extremely subtle, I think we might agree with the differences in color... very subtle.

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, go ahead.

MR. FLANCE: You've already made my point.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: We knew where to go.

MS. MATHER: Since we are talking about...

MR. FLANCE: I agree with you anyway.

MS. MATHER: Could we look at the old hospital building colors again. I mean we've seen a lot since then. I think it might be helpful for us to just review those again very quickly.

And again, if you would sort of go through what goes where. What is new additions and what's the old building?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: And can we get the elevation up?

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOODS: Yes sir.

MR. FLANCE: I have just a quote from the code,

CHAIR WOODS: Did Mr. Herdman wake up and actually bring us some code info? That was nice of him,

[general laughter]

MR. FLANCE: I thought you asked me to be very serious with my presentation this evening.

The Code actually provides for... It uses words like similar. Just to quote one paragraph for additions. And I think this is really applicable to the main hospital. Additions shall have similar materials, architectural treatments and styles, features and details as the existing structure. But shall not duplicate those of the existing structure in a manner that would make them indistinguishable from the existing structure. So you have the legal mandate in the Code to have some variation within an existing structure that I would call, rather different shades of the same color; not really different colors.

CHAIR WOODS: I really disagree, Steve. I don't think it is specifically talking about color. It's talking

about materials; it is talking about window types...

MR. FLANCE: It is talking about all of those things.

CHAIR WOODS: It's talking about all of those things. And the new additions are absolutely different in all of those ways. You definitely have different window patterns. You have different... You have many different things happening on the new additions. So I think it could be argued either way whether that also supports the color. I think when you look at the hospital now and it's all one big pink elephant and it actually, to me, is reading better than if it were different shades of pink.

So I am in agreement with Cecilia. I mean and obviously we all are at different agreements on this.

But I think to have such a dark stucco, I would not do that because I think it is too dark because of the contrast with the white trim. You are introducing stucco and as John said, you've got painted brick. That alone is going to make a difference without having to change the color on top of it. So I would definitely try and match the stucco and the paint color over the brick because it's going to read completely different. And the color's going to read differently just because of the material under it. I think to introduce the dark stucco is not appropriate, in my opinion. I can see where people differ on this. This is again... We always get back to this philosophical difference of how you separate old and new. But I think you have done a very good job of separating old and new and still blending it without necessarily having to go to adding a different color.

MS. WALKER: I agree that one is too dark. The one at the upper left.

CHAIR WOODS: The stucco?

MS. WALKER: The stucco.

MR. HOGAN: Just to add a clarification to that came into consideration on these is looking for color fade. Usually, you know, in the first two years, the colors fade out, particularly with the synthetic stucco

which is what we are proposing.

So we did start it a little bit darker than what we wanted it ultimately to look like. We think that after two years it's going to fade in and some of these differences will also fade and blend a bit. So we are trying to compensate for that and that's why we started off with the darker stucco color than we otherwise might have. As far as variation between the two, you know, this is the existing building and particularly when you see it from the north elevation, there are no new additions here. So there is a lot of the color we are proposing. And this one we expect to fade a bit.

And then when it comes to the torreons, it is just those areas so we are not looking at, you know, a whole lot of busy changes in color; we are looking at just those elements and fairly subtle difference between. That said, we agree with the point that since the torreons are brick, there is going to be a little bit of a texture difference there already anyway, so we really, again, are just trying... It's ... We are dealing with subtleties at this point.

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair, you're hearing our arguments. I think it is a good discussion. But I want you to know we are open to your suggestion. And if the Board is in agreement with you and Ms. Walker and Ms. Rios we are happy to reconsider the shade of the stucco that you are seeing and lighten up the darker stucco. I mean, this is not something that we're hard and fast on. We are trying to suggest a palette but we would welcome your input and advice.

CHAIR WOODS: I think the palette is good. I think you have worked really hard on trying to develop it. I would... and this is completely suggestive, so take it for what it is worth. I would go with a little bit deeper wood tone. That wood tone is a bit contemporary and if you look at older buildings you're going to see a wood tone with a little more black in it. But I'm kind of a nut about color. So that is for whatever it's worth. We have no ordinance to base it on.

The other possible way to do it and I don't know if you are up for this because we are at the end of our long relationship here that has been interesting for all of us. Is to go and do mock ups as its, you know, at the appropriate time. And, if you want, whether it's with staff and one of us or as the board... You know, if it's something you might want to revisit. It might be appropriate at that time. It is hard to make all of these calls on such a huge project. So that's another option.

MR. FLANCE: I think we would welcome doing some... you know where we do a façade or a portion of a façade and do sizable mock ups and let the staff and however many of the board members come out and look at it and work with us on that. We are certainly open to that.

CHAIR WOODS: I appreciate that cause I think as the project is evolving, it is a good thing and we are looking at it probably in the worst lighting in the world.

MR. FLANCE: If we could, if I may, Madam Chair, suggest that the general palette is acceptable, but the actual final colors and shades need to be confirmed with the staff and that we are getting ready to go into... you know, go into covering the building. That would be an appropriate way to handle it.

CHAIR WOODS: Did you want to finish up with your lighting and that's it, right?

MR. FLANCE: Yes, we'd like to do the lighting tonight if we can.

CHAIR WOODS: I'm sorry. Was there any other comment on the colors or questions?

MS. WALKER: No, I'm saving all of mine for the lighting.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

MR. FLANCE: Can I just say one thing on the lighting as we are moving things around here? We are as interested in the comments on the design of the sconces and the fixtures as we are for the location of the lighting. And in some cases, I would like to remind the board that location of lighting is really dictated by code in terms of the candle-power and light that you have to have. Along walk ways or stairways, areas

that are outside areas that would be used both by guests at the hotel and the general public. So in some cases we don't have much flexibility of where we put lighting. But I think the... we have a lot of flexibility in the design of these lighting fixtures and the sconces that we are using. So if we can kind of keep that in mind as you look at page SD 1 and SD 11, I think it will help us get through this discussion

MR. HOGAN: And SD12.

MR. FLANCE: Sorry. And SD 12.

MR. HOGAN: I think it might be best if I just reiterate our intention to have subtle lighting throughout the property as we can. So... our landscape lighting is going to tend to be low to the ground, lighting pathways... We tried to include some fixtures that are indicative. Now whether or not these ... it is a little bit like the paint color. By the time that we get all the way down the road, we'll bring that to staff. But we want a very subtly lit site. We are trying to minimize the number of lights you could see from the ground. So, for instance, where we've got lights on balconies and we have Code requirements for lighting out of doors, our intention is to put lighting behind the beams of the portals and just wash down the surface so you don't see a light fixture up there. These will be very subtle little [inaudible] lights or low voltage lights. Along the ground plane it is the same. We are including a couple of typical fixtures like the pictures we show of the bollard fixtures of the drop off and turn around. There are some lanterns... stand up lanterns that would be found along the promenade. These are color keyed into the site plan and I'm more than happy to go into as much detail as you want but I want to do an overview first.

We also have stepped lighting which is also on our cut sheets and then some satellites for up in the trees. Those are all on SD 12.

On the building lights, we brought in sort of a sample, something that would characterize what we would like to do. And this is something that works in the Territorial style. It has a hand made character. The

lens would be more like a micro-type lense so that you don't see in and see the light bulb there. But that is indicative of the quality that we are looking for. And these are actually made in Pojoaque. And SD 11 shows the variations on a similar type of iron fixture where you've used these lanterns under the archway of Building 2 and then these wall sconces. And they are shown here in a picture, you know, outside the doors. Again, I don't want to go into too much detail and have everyone's eyes glaze over but that is the general intention of the lighting.

We've also got some signage lighting to discuss which will also just be in the landscape lighting ...uhh, the surfaces of the sign.

CHAIR WOODS: Karen?

MS. WALKER: Mark, I'm going to comment on page SD 12 and then excuse myself. The first picture doesn't bother me so much. First of all, the rectangle step light should be of a color to match whatever stucco you've got.

MR. HOGAN: Agreed.

MS. WALKER: And the others look so chintzy for the quality of this project. They look like plastic everywhere. And I would suggest that unless you come up with something else tonight that... this... better quality... come to that group of staff and ...

CHAIR WOODS: What lighting are you talking about, Karen?

MS. WALKER: Everything on page 12. All of them. They all look chintzy. The colors, the everything. But the central one; the rectangular step should match the stucco so it doesn't stick out with the black or something like that.

MR. HOGAN: And please let me clarify too. The colors that are represented in here are from their catalog sheets and don't necessarily represent the colors that we're going to propose for this.

MS. WALKER: Good. Good. A green would go better in many cases.

CHAIR WOODS: Anyone else?

Does anyone from the public wish to... Oh, finally. Are you going to talk now?

MR. BOAZ: Marilyn, do you swear you are going to tell the truth?

MS. MARILYN BANE: Yeah. I do. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Members of the Historic Design Review Board: I want to tell you, it is not easy being the public in this when we have so much less knowledge than you all do. And certainly the presenters do. And we also don't have the packets with us from before to be able to... But in spite of that it I think it has come through very clear. I think this is an awesome project. I think that it's ... it has been a wonderful collaboration with you all. If I ever was impressed by the H Board before, I am far more impressed now than I ever have been. And I think you all have been very collaborative, working with you all and good stuff to start with.

I do, however, have to say something.

CHAIR WOODS: She always does that. She sets you up so you feel really good and then she lets you have it.

MS. BANE: Sharon has been working with the State too long.

No. Actually, no. I have a problem not with the colors so much as the lighting as I do with style on the era lighting. I think it seems much too colonial in feel and that... It's such a minor thing. But since I haven't said anything before this, because I know nothing about it, I thought I would share that part with you. Thank you.

[Ms. Walker excused herself from the meeting at this time.]

CHAIR WOODS: Thanks, Marilyn. Anyone else wish to speak? Any comments from the Board?

So, we're at this point talking about our colors. Yes. And the lighting. So do we have a motion?

MS. RIOS: I make a motion in terms of the building colors.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. We can do one of those.

MS. RIOS: I would move that each building have its own color and that you do not use multi-colors on the buildings.

CHAIR WOODS: I know the... And then, how are you addressing the colors they are presenting?

MS. RIOS: Well, and I believe the applicants indicated that they would do a little mock model with colors and those could be brought back to the Board. I think the colors are fine but you know, I see a lot of multicolored buildings in parts of this town that are not in the historic districts. Frankly, I've been on the Board a long time and I do remember that part of the ordinance that indicates that you differentiate in color underneath portales but not the building itself. And I think you are getting too busy if you do.

CHAIR WOODS: Is there a second?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Now for discussion, I think I would suggest to you that they have presented a lot of things. They presented a metal roof; they presented coping colors, besides the stucco colors that may need to be addressed in the motion.

MS. RIOS: I think the metal roof is fine. And I think that most of the coping colors are pretty good... are fine and perhaps... I think the Chair made a suggestion that the wood be a little darker in your mock up; that you do a portion with a lighter color wood and maybe the darker color and we will get a better idea of what goes best with their building colors.

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOODS: We're in the middle of a motion, Steve. Is there any other discussion on the colors?

MS. MATHER: I have a question for the Chair. Is this motion just on colors . We also discussed all the walls and the iron work. Are we going to include that in this motion? Or should we?

CHAIR WOODS: Good point.

MR. BOAZ: Could you repeat that again?

MS. MATHER: We have also discussed all the walls and the iron work and I want to find out how the Board feels, whether that should be included in this motion.

MS. RIOS: Well, I believe all the iron ... the wrought iron is all going to be black and the walls would have to be compatible with the building they are directly fronting or directly associated with.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: The question is also heights and stuff too. So why don't we just take the colors as one?

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. So right now we have a motion saying that the colors that are presented are good but that we limit it to one color per building. Is that the motion as we understand it?

And there has been a second, right?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other discussion?

All in favor?

MS. RIOS AND MS. MATHER: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed?

MR. FEATHERINGILL AND DR. KANTNER: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: Did you vote?

MS. MATHER: Yes. I voted in favor.

CHAIR WOODS: You are in favor of the motion?

MS. MATHER: Yes.

CHAIR WOODS: [inaudible]. I will vote with my colleagues on the left in favor of the motion that each building be one color. So we have.... And I think because part of it is my understanding is that we are invited to view some mock ups and colors as this happens.

[The motion passed by a 3-2 majority voice vote.]

MR. FLANCE: Yes. And I would like to clarify that the color portion also applies to the fences and the walls that we proposed.

CHAIR WOODS: Right. And I think that is important in this next motion because you started out something about the color will go in front of the building or do we want the perimeter to be consistent as opposed to stopping and starting colors. And what are you proposing? Because you haven't really spoken to the color of the walls?

MR. FLANCE: I think we are open to your suggestion. I think it would be preferable from my... from our standpoint to have one color for the stucco that is forming the base of the retaining wall and one color for the wrought iron fencing that is being placed on top of the retaining wall.

CHAIR WOODS: And of your colors, Steve, because it might be a good time to say... What is that base color, which I would assume would be the color of the hospital? I would assume because that's your biggest building. What of those colors is that main base color?

MR. FLANCE: I look to my architect for his take on that.

MR. HOGAN: Well, we've done a ...

MR. FLANCE: What is your base color?

CHAIR WOODS: Do you guys even buy this or ?

MR. HOGAN: There is some confusion because we have been referring to the walls as in stucco and

really, one of our original intentions was to do those walls' bases as natural stone similar to what you see in Cathedral Park. So there's an expense portion to that and we can't really weigh that right now. But our desire would really be to have the base of those walls be natural stone and not stucco. So I guess when we... What we'd like to do is when we come back and talk about mock ups and colors we would have a decision for you on whether our budget can allow stone because we think it would be a far superior choice of materials.

MS. RIOS: That would be my suggestion.

CHAIR WOODS: That would be great. So we are not going to make a motion on it. No. But we can make a motion on the presentation of the location of the walls and the heights. Yes?

Okay. So do we have a motion for that?

MS. RIOS: Madam Chair, excuse me, but I think in my motion I did include colors of walls. I said they should...

CHAIR WOODS: No but that wasn't in your motion; that was in the discussion.

MS. RIOS: Okay. Because I want to make sure that wasn't in the motion.

CHAIR WOODS: Isn't that true, Carl? It's not in the motion?

MR. BOAZ: That is correct.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Good. Okay. So... Steve, do you have any comment before we make the motion on the heights of the walls?

MR. FLANCE: No.

CHAIR WOODS: heights and locations?

MR. FLANCE: We're good? Okay.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: One...

CHAIR WOODS: Yes?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: We really don't have heights of walls. There are a lot of walls, I'm sure, that are scattered throughout the plan, that really haven't been shown. And I'm concerned about just giving blanket approval. Do we have something that shows walls and heights and what is getting railings and what's... I mean there is a lot of things involved in that. I know there is some underground parking will have some very high walls to allow the cars to go underground and what's going to happen with those? I know they will have to have guard rails on top of those. So I think we need a little bit more definition.

MR. HOGAN: The walls are shown in the elevations. Again it should be areas. Your point about the ramp walls there is a good one. And I don't know that we really came prepared with an answer to that other than that would be compatible with everything else. But we do show elevations of these walls and the fences...

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Yes.

MR. HOGAN: And we show elevations of these walls and the fences and we described the heights and talked about them as well as this one here. We showed this fence in the east elevation. So I think the majority of the walls are shown. We showed the walls that are between here and the wedding... I mean in the rosary garden. So most are described. We don't have a whole lot of walls inside the site that we haven't already addressed.

CHAIR WOODS: So maybe the motion would refer basically, as presented and not to exceed in the combination of iron and stucco six feet.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Well, they already presented something higher than that because there is one place on the wall on Palace right here that is already six feet of wall plus three feet of railing that would make it nine feet.

MR. RASCH: But there's retention.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Well, yeah, it is retention.

CHAIR WOODS: It's retention on the other side.

MR. RASCH: So, in fact, we would be reading it from the street frontage and I didn't do a wall height calculation for what is allowed on that streetscape.

MR. FLANCE: May I suggest, Madam Chair.. Let me interject. First of all, I want to... We have a little bit of a disagreement here. I think that if we can do stone we would like to do stone. But we would like a decision tonight on a color for a stuccoed wall base with a wrought iron fence on top of that base. And then, if we can find a way that we can change in your... and this little committee is amenable to a stone base, then we can present that to you at time. But I'd like to walk out of here tonight with an agreement on what we are doing with the exterior walls of this property in terms of material and in terms of color. In terms of height, I think there is a way to manage that, which is to... First of all, the City won't allow a wall beyond a certain height. A retaining wall, I don't think can exceed ten feet. Our highest retaining wall ... What is our worst case?

MR. HOGAN: [inaudible]

MR. FLANCE: Okay. So our worst case is a six foot retaining wall which would have, if you want to limit the ultimate height of any barrier, you could say no wall-fence combination would exceed eight feet... or nine feet.

MR. RASCH: Madam Chair, if we are talking about step backs, we don't need a maximum yard wall height allowance calculation. If they are going to do a three-foot and then a certain amount of step back - more than a foot or two - then another three foot. Because without a height calculation, we can allow four feet.

CHAIR WOODS: He is not showing that.

MR. FLANCE: But...

CHAIR WOODS: Steve. You know this is... I think the Board has been really cooperative and we certainly appreciate all of your cooperation. I am not willing to go forward at this time with that general of an approval when this is the corner of Paseo and Palace that we are all going to see. And if we are talking the possibility of a nine foot wall, that is a lot of wall, as I understand it. Because you said at one point you are six feet of stucco and three feet of iron. And I think we all need a better idea before we can say Hey, on one of the busiest corners of Santa Fe that everyone is going to drive by, we are going to be looking at a nine-foot wall.

MR. FLANCE: Okay, then let's defer the height issue to a detailed engineering plan that we will submit to your subcommittee. But I would like to walk out of here with materials and color...

CHAIR WOODS: Steve, I'm sure you would. But I also think you haven't come and presented us with enough information at this time for what you can walk out of here with. And I'm probably getting a little tired. So let's all get on the same page here. I appreciate what you want to walk out of here with but I am not going to allow that for us to do a vote until we have the information to make the vote. We understand that you want to do a wall. We understand there is going to be retainage and we don't have heights at this time for this wall. And we cannot defer that to a subcommittee. That has to go to the Board. There is no way that is going to go back when we are talking about heights. So we have to have enough information on the very first thing that people are going to see on this project.

David, do you have a question?

MR. RASCH: Yes, Madam Chair. If you look at SD 14, there is another point that I think needs to get into this argument rather quickly and that is about signage. Now, you are going to see in the upper left

corner of SD 14 a really nice example - elevation and plan view of the main gate on the corner of Paseo and Palace. But you will also see on that free standing yard wall gate, we have a sign. That is not allowed by Code unless there is an exception. Also when you look at the drawing that says Drury Plaza on that little spur wall coming into the driveway off of Paseo. If that is a freestanding yard wall with a sign on it, that also needs an exception. So I think your wall issues and your sign issues need to be discussed together as well.

CHAIR WOODS: But the other problem, Steve, is we do have a lot of drawings. And we are looking at the drawings that were presented. We have rock wall drawings and we also have stucco wall drawings. And then we have some with a stone veneer in places. So, I think we are all a bit tired and confused at this point. We certainly want to work on it with you but we have to have enough information to vote on this. If this is going to come back, we don't have to come back in a special hearing. It can come back in a regular Board meeting. We don't need many more special hearings. We given... We've all given lots of time. And I don't know that at this point... and it is really up to the Board how comfortable you are with making a motion with the information we have.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I could make a motion addressing materials and colors and requiring heights of walls and signage on walls to come back to the regular Board.

MR. FLANCE: That's what I was trying to suggest.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I make a motion to approve the stucco color of the hospital main building itself, for stucco covered walls, retaining and freestanding, black wrought iron, (so we can get into the color of that) I am assuming it is going to be a flat black, and the applicants will bring back an engineering plan showing heights of walls, locations of walls and any peripheral signage

applied to the walls to the Board.

DR. KANTNER: Second.

CHAIR WOODS: I would also request that if it is not within the ordinance on the signage that they come back with a request for an exception.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Right. A proper application is going to be needed to be done.

MS. RIOS: Did you address the stone base?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: Well . Yeah. They have brought the idea of stone. They haven't really presented it. They could at that time, if they get their dollar amounts that they need.

CHAIR WOODS: Any other discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. [Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.]

All opposed? [none]

[The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.]

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. Now we are voting on the lighting. Is there any more discussion on the lights?

MS. RIOS: Well ,with reference to SD 12,I kind of agreed with Karen's comments.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I don't like them. I know that is not a professional comment but they are just not very pleasant and I think you can do a lot better.

MR. FLANCE: Does the full Board want to see it, Madam Chair, or is this something we can work with the committee on?

CHAIR WOODS: Well, technically, we don't really have a committee. Is that not true? Kelley, can we and it's really up to the Board if they want this to come back.

MS. BRENNAN: Since they are coming back, it probably makes more sense to bring the lighting back to the Board. Since it was so broadly expressed that ...

MR. FLANCE: That's fine.

CHAIR WOODS: Are there lights on page SD 11 ... is the lighting shown on page eleven ... Is page eleven of the lighting they have chosen... Is that acceptable? Because I don't think we should just say that we don't like it. I think they would need a little more direction. I mean I find... I think on page eleven, they really tried to look for lights and when you look at that light, things that are... look more handmade.

DR. KANTNER: I think my view would be that that would be acceptable except that I'm not so keen on the rounded sconce. But the squared sconces are a good question - we talked about being suitable. With that somewhat translucent glass, that's perfectly fine with me.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: I agree.

CHAIR WOODS: And so we are asking them possibly... I know that on the step lights, Karen asked that they match the color of the stucco which certainly makes sense.

Marilyn felt the standing lights were too colonial; that the big pole lights were too colonial. As far as the directional landscape light, I don't think anybody is going to ever see that. It's sitting under the trees. I don't know about the lantern bollard. It looks like any lantern bollard. Is there something that...?

MR. FEATHERINGILL: There are other styles. I think they could match something that maybe would match exterior lighting better. I just think that's something they chose very quickly. Is what it looks like.

CHAIR WOODS: So John, is this time for a motion? Is this maybe your turn?

DR. KANTNER: Well I can make a motion. **In reference to the lighting, for the exterior building lighting selection, I move it be approved as presented with the exception of the rounded sconce design which is here in type B, that that be a sconce design that is more rectangular like the other**

ones. And in reference to the exterior... I'm sorry, the landscape lighting that the rectangular step be colored the same as the stucco and that all the other standing lighting be reconsidered and brought back to the Board.

MS. RIOS: second.

CHAIR WOODS: And the landscape lighting?

DR. KANTNER: The landscape lighting is fine.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay.

So we have... any discussion?

All in favor?

ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR WOODS: All opposed? [none]

[The motion passed by unanimous voice vote. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.]

CHAIR WOODS: So are we doing signs now?

MR. RASCH: We don't have an exception response for any wall signs. And I have to post it that way if they do want that.

CHAIR WOODS: So we aren't going to do signs tonight.

MR. FLANCE: It will come back to the Board.

CHAIR WOODS: Okay. So anything else that the applicants have?

MR. FLANCE: Let me just make sure... if you are finished voting on what you are proposing, can I just clarify it for my own understanding.

The building lighting you find to be acceptable insofar as the rectangular sconces are concerned. It's the rounded sconces that you don't want.

DR. KANTNER: Right.

MR. FLANCE: And you liked the idea of some kind of pane covering the lighting. Secondly you did not care for the site lighting shown on page 12 but then I heard someone say that the landscape lighting was okay.

DR. KANTNER: I think we were saying that in the directional lighting, F, G and J are the ones that we find are less than attractive.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. So K is okay?

DR. KANTNER: K was okay. I had intended to say that.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FLANCE: And the signage - we are not prepared and we need to bring that back to the Board, along with the other site lighting that needs to be added and an engineered calculation of the wall heights and composition.

CHAIR WOODS: And, David, do you need them to do... I would assume you would need to do a wall height calculation for some of this.

MR. RASCH: For all the street frontages, I will do that for the Board. Any interior, since it is commercial - we defer to 8' as max. Now anything that is street-facing, typically if there is a grade change on either side of the wall, zoning reads from the highest grade. But the H Code says if this is the street side, you read from the lowest grade. So we are going to be reading from the street side of those elevations.

CHAIR WOODS: Exactly.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: And one quick mention. That entrance to the underground parking. We probably should see some kind of an elevation on that. Especially the kind of guard rail...

MR. FLANCE: Yes.

MR. FEATHERINGILL: ...or buildings you have right there.

MR. FLANCE: That's... May I, Madam Chair? That's a unique wall situation that only occurs in that one location.

CHAIR WOODS: And also, I think, any lighting that we may see in the garage. Because obviously that's big bright commercial lighting but we are going to see it through a lot of openings so that may need to be brought back.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Just give me one second. I wanted to ask you a question. Entry and lighting to garage, right?

MR. FLANCE: - I have an attorney sitting behind me who has not been asleep. He has been sticking me in my you know what for the last three hours. We are concerned that.... First of all let me congratulate the Board for completing a review of a very complex project. And I want to say to all of the Board for all of us; for the Drury Group and from the professional group, the complexity of it and the cooperation we have received from the Board has been absolutely outstanding and it really shows the quality of the Historic Design Review Board, led by you, Madame Chair, and I want to congratulate all of you. And thank you for your patience and your insight. It has helped us produce, I think, a much better project. And we told you at the beginning that we were going to stay here until we could work this through and we really feel that you've more than held up your side of the bargain and given us your time and effort. So thank you very much from that standpoint.

I have an attorney who has been jabbing me with a needle because, and Kelley, I'll just, for me, address this to you. Because of the complexity of the project, to try to produce some kind of findings of fact and conclusions of law. And I don't know how to do that so I'm asking as a question of how we get to that

point.

MR. RASCH: Well, I've been taking notes on every separate action that was made by the Board. The findings of fact and conclusions of law tend to be more general and Code-based but I think there is going to be an exhibit for the actions.

MR. FLANCE: Is that something we produce or something you produce?

MS. BRENNAN: No. We do that.

MR. FLANCE: And you will do that, I presume, in a reasonable time frame?

MS. BRENNAN: No.

MR. RASCH: I think that we have one more hearing and, with the Board's approval, I am going to try to get it on the October 6 agenda, which is devoted solely to Chapter 14 rewrite. But I would like to put this wrap up hearing on that agenda.

MR. FLANCE: And that would address the wall issues and the signage and the issues we didn't resolve this evening.

CHAIR WOODS: Do we have to do the entire thing? I mean, do we have to wait til then? There has been so much. And also Carl has done verbatim minutes that will reflect the motions and his minutes have been great. Do we have to wait til that final thing to have those findings of fact or, based on the votes we have done up to this point, I would say to go for it.

MS. BRENNAN: We absolutely have to wait til the final vote is taken, especially where they may be exceptions. However, I will do them as soon as we have the final vote and I will probably have an opportunity to work on them before that. I have a degree of familiarity and I've done a number before so I don't see that it will be overwhelming.

CHAIR WOODS: Do you have any comments, gentlemen? Are you okay with that?

MR. BRIAN NENNINGER: I was just curious. There is not a mechanism to lump everything that's been agreed to and take things like the lighting and possibly the signage at a later date. Some of this gets developed as the engineering gets developed so a lot of the detail on the lighting may come four or five months from now. We can do something sooner. So I didn't know if that was possible. I'm just asking.

MS. BRENNAN: I was going to say, this is final action of the Board, not the approval of staff and a member of the Board. But it would be the vote after the exceptions at the next meeting.

CHAIR WOODS: But the thing is, Kelley, that... I think what they are saying is a good point. I mean the vast majority of the decisions have been made. I think that... As far as the lighting, I don't think that should swing it at this point because I think that it's the kind of thing that develops as the project goes on. If you are going to ask for exceptions for signage on the wall that's what's going to hold you up. And not having the [??] of the wall. Unless you bring it in as a completely separate permit for walls which is another option on this. If they want to go for a permit on what they've got and the walls are permitted separately with signage.

MS. BRENNAN: I think that when we started this process we did agree not to do signage for each one until we got to the end of the process. And if there is a particular concern, it might be worth knowing what that is. But if you intend to go forward with the signs that you have proposed, you will need exceptions. And the wall height might be an issue that would require....

MR. FLANCE: Madam Chair, may I ask you this question? From Kelley as well. We've all come a long way, as you say. If we could handle everything but ... If we could handle the signage... We've already had a vote on the building lighting, I think. The site lighting is going to be what it is going to be. It's the question of the design of the fixtures that I think I'm hearing the Board say they don't like - what they are looking at on page 12. If we could isolate the lighting and the engineered portion of the wall... We know

what the materials are going to be and handle those as a separate application to you with any exceptions for signage, could we get an overall approval of the rest of the project?

CHAIR WOODS: I mean, there are no more votes. We have voted on each thing. We are done voting. But this is Kelley's call and staff's call because they write it, not me. I can't make this call. I'm sorry. It's really - I have to defer to the City Attorney on this.

MR. FLANCE: I'm just trying to ask the question.

MS. BRENNAN: Once again, I would like to know if there is a compelling reason?

MR. FLANCE: Yes, because we would like to start working on our design... our construction plans for the project. And we want to make certain that we have a project. And in this case, there are three or four outstanding site proven issues that will come out the actual engineering of the project or will be discussed with this subcommittee of the project. So putting it quite clearly on the table, we are trying to move this project along and we would like to do that, knowing we have a project and that what we lack is final engineer... I mean final approval of height of walls, final approval of site lighting, based on the comments we've heard this evening which were pretty clear, final approval of signage and any related exceptions.

MS. BRENNAN: I understand what you are proposing and I guess perhaps it would be more fruitful for me to discuss it with Frank tomorrow.

MR. FLANCE: Okay. Would you be willing to defer to whatever they agree to?

CHAIR WOODS: This is totally out of my jurisdiction. This is the City Attorney.

MR. FLANCE: Okay.

CHAIR WOODS: Absolutely.

Before we adjourn, I want to take this opportunity, and I'm sure on behalf of the whole Board, to thank

the applicant for working so hard with us and for responding to all of the ideas we came up with and our objections. And this has been a new one for me... how about you, Cee? For having people who have worked this long and hard on a project.

MS. RIOS: Well I agree with you. I wanted to thank you. I think we have worked pretty darned well together. And I wanted to thank you for your cooperation. I also wanted to thank you for using local artisans on your light fixtures. This project was pretty darned big. And I also want to thank the Chair because I think the way she conducted the meetings and breaking it up. And whoever had a part in the idea - if it was solely the Chair or staff and chair. I think we moved on that for it being such a big project. That it was broken down into sections where everybody could understand and move slowly enough to go forward with the project.

CHAIR WOODS: I think we have to recognize staff. David has worked really hard on this. This is a complex project and his reports... He has really had an understanding and I appreciate and recognize staff. And I want to thanked the Board. I mean, you have hung in there and been insightful and caring and knowledgeable and cooperative. And so it has been a good process. We wish you the very best. I think you can work with David. I don't think we need to have you at a special meeting. I think you can be on the agenda as soon as you can get on the agenda. And, you know, as soon as you're ready to go, we are happy to hear you as a part of any agenda. There is not that much to discuss anymore.

[This ends the verbatim portion of the meeting.]

I. NEW BUSINESS

None.

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

K. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Approved by:


Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:


Carl Boaz, Stenographer