

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: May 27, 2025

TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director *HL*
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director *MM*
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager *GM*

FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division *LM*

2025-010293-HDRB, 345 Garcia St, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Robert Holleyman and Bill Keller, owners, propose to construct a freestanding 436 sq. ft. guest house with garage and a 481 sq. ft. carport to a height of 10'-0" where the maximum allowable is 15'-5". On the main residence construct a 108 sq. ft. portal, enlarge the existing 382 sq. ft. portal to 621 sq. ft., replace windows and doors, change the size of several non-primary façade windows including converting several into doors, infill windows, construct two exterior fireplaces, alter the layout of the driveway resulting in a realignment of the fence and removal of 2 linear feet of the contributing wall. Three exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii) to infill a window on a primary façade, 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) to enlarge the portal within 10' of the primary façade, and 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for removing part of the contributing wall.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

District Standards & yard wall
& fence standards.

Historic Inventory Form

Zoning Review Sheet

Other: Height Calculation

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

Proposal Letter

Site Plan/Floor Plan

Elevations

Photographs

Other: Exception Criteria

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff's analysis of the proposed project identified 3 exceptions to the design standards of the Historic District overlay. The following recommendations summarize the staff's analysis of the exception criteria for each request. A more detailed analysis and the applicant's responses can be found in the Exception Criteria and Response section of this report.

- 1) **14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii)** *No existing openings shall be closed.*
For the proposed closing of the north facing window on the west primary elevation, staff finds that the criteria have been met and recommends **approval** of the exception request.
- 2) **14-5.2(D)(2)(d)** *Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary facade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of structures instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion.*
For the proposed extension of the south portal, staff finds that the exception criteria have not been met and recommends **denial** of the exception request.
- 3) **14-5.2(D)(1)(a)** *The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.*
For the removal of two linear feet from the contributing yardwall, staff finds that the criteria have been met and recommends **approval** of the exception request.

Staff recommends approval of the other elements of the application that do not require exceptions as they comply with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Sample motions:

- a. Approve or deny the exception to **14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii)** for the proposed closing of the north facing window on the west primary elevation, finding that the exception criteria have/have not been met,
- b. Approve or deny the exception to **14-5.2(D)(2)(d)** for the proposed extension of the south portal, finding that the exception criteria have/have not been met,
- c. Approve or deny the exception to **14-5.2(D)(1)(a)** for the removal of two linear feet from the contributing yardwall, finding that the exception criteria have/have not been met, and
- d. Approve or deny the elements of the project that do not require exception.

Should the Board deny the exception request(s), the applicant shall return with an alternative proposal for review and approval prior to proceeding to building permit, or the Board may impose additional conditions of approval to ensure compliance with the Historic District overlay standards.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The single-family residence at 345 Garcia Street is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The accessory structure is listed as non-contributing, and the front yard wall is designated contributing. On November 26, 2024, in case #2024-009369-HDRB, the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) retained the contributing status of the residence, designated the west elevation, northwest corner, and the area around the chimney as the primary facades, downgraded the status of the accessory dwelling unit and associated carport to non-contributing, and designated the street front yard wall as contributing.

Likely constructed in the early 1930s, this Pueblo Revival style main residence is 2,637 sq. ft. and evolved over time as it is constructed of adobe, concrete block and wood frame. According to the 2024 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) there were significant changes to the structure circa 1987 including replacement of all of the windows and doors, the installation of the bay windows on the north, the introduction of new openings and closure of old openings; replacement of the Territorial-type pediment trim; raising of the ceiling, roof, and parapets at the back of the house; alteration of the former carport fenestration; change of front or west wall at the vehicular entrance, a pedestrian entry, and possibly at other points of fenestration. The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) does not have the 1987 case file and cannot verify the full extent of the alterations; however, photographs from the 1987 case were retained and attached to the 1984 HCPI.



Figure 1: East elevation with front yard wall

The accessory structure in the southeast corner was approved for demolition on May 13, 2025, under case 2025-010292-HDRB.

A tall street wall, partially serving as a retaining wall, crosses the front of the property. The base is retaining and is constructed of stone. The remaining portion of the wall is stuccoed and the full height is about 53 inches. Near the center is an arched opening at the pedestrian gate. The area of the gate was previously a parking space in the 1950s-60s according to aerial photographs. The current driveway and pedestrian entrance were constructed by 1973 and is historic at over 50 years of age. The second portion of the wall connects to the front wall in the northwest corner and extends east. It is about 39 inches in height and in areas shows several layers of plasterwork.



Figure 3: Yardwalls with construction dates

APPLICANT’S REQUEST:

The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

Main Residence:

1. Infill a window on the west elevation primary facade. An exception is requested to 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(iii) to infill a window on a primary façade. This window is not original to the structure and may sit in the space of a previously infilled door according to the 2024 HCPI.
2. Enlarge the existing 382 sq. ft. southern portal to 621 sq. ft. an exception is requested to section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) to enlarge the portal within 10’ of the primary façade.
3. Construct a 108 sq. ft. portal on the southeast facade.
4. Replace all windows with aluminum clad simulated wood windows with a white finish. The existing windows are not historic; the windows were replaced in 1987. The window replacement will consist of reconfiguring some openings, including replacing a window with a door on the south elevation of the courtyard under the proposed portal, enlarging the bay windows openings and creating two doors with a window on the north elevation. Create a window to the south of the door on the east elevation under the new portal. Staff notes that the bay window is from the 1980s remodel and is not original to the house.
5. Construct two exterior fireplaces with one at each of the two portals.
6. Install exterior lighting in Shielded Metal.
7. Stucco using cementitious “Buckskin”.
8. Paint trim in “white”.

Lot:

9. Construct a freestanding 436 sq. ft. guest house with garage to a height of 10’-0” where the maximum allowable is 15’-5” in the recent Santa Fe style.
10. Construct a 481 sq. ft. carport to a height of 10’-0” where the maximum allowable is 15’-

5”.

11. Alter the layout of the driveway resulting in a realignment of the fence and removal of 2 linear feet of the contributing wall. An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for removing part of the historically contributing wall.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Three exceptions are requested to 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(iii) to infill a window on a primary façade, 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) to enlarge the portal within 10’ of the primary façade, and 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for removing part of the contributing wall.

<u>Exception to 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(iii):</u> <i>For all facades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary facades of contributing structures no existing opening shall be closed. The applicant requests an exception to infill a window on a primary façade.</i>	
Criterion 1: Do not damage the character of the streetscape.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES

Applicant Response: Located in the 6’ north-facing offset on the Garcia Street primary façade, is a single 22” x 30” window that does not match any other window or opening in the house. Applicants request to close the opening on the exterior and remove the non-historic window and its non-historic wooden surround.

Granting of the Applicants’ request does not do harm to the spirit of the ordinance’s principle that “no existing opening shall be closed” on a primary facade.

- In this case, the single window opening that will be removed is not original to the structure.
- Moreover, the current window has not been in place for 50-years to qualify as “historic”.
- Exterior window surrounds were added in the late 1980s renovation.
- The window will be closed on the interior.

The non-historic nature of the windows in the home was identified in the property’s Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) of October 11, 2024.¹

As part of the renovation and restoration of the home, the Applicants will be substantially improving the interior of the primary entry room of the home. This will allow for a better functioning room and a more gracious greeting of guests. The existing wall-to-wall carpet in the entry will be returned to the original hardwood, the trio of non-historic six-over-six windows on the designated west facade will be replaced with new wooden windows of the corresponding size and configuration meeting Historic District standards. A replacement glass entry door and flanking windows will replace the current ones on the non-primary Southern facade – also meeting Historic District standards. The entry room will be newly plastered, with upgraded library shelving, the addition of a skylight, and interior lighting will be upgraded for the Applicant’s collection of contemporary New Mexican art. To provide more wall space for art, the small north-facing non-historic window in the entry room will be closed off on the interior. The opening will be plastered over inside to match the interior wall space.

The Applicants propose that this non-original non-historic opening and post -1987 window and surround be removed on the exterior. The roughly 22” x 30” opening will be closed, insulated and stucco would be applied on the exterior to match and harmonize with the building overall. The exterior of the 6’ facade inset would be all stucco. There are three primary reasons for this request:

- The current window does not contribute in a meaningful way to the primary façade and is not a distinguishing feature of the facade when the home is viewed from Garcia Street over the tall street wall. The prominent features on the primary facade are west facing -- a trio of 6 over 6 windows in the entry room and the pair of 6 over 6 windows in the living room. All these window openings and their sequence will be retained. By contrast, the non-historic window that would be removed is small, faces north away

from the street and is on a 6' offset wall setback on the primary facade.

- The single window opening is not original to the structure. Examination of the woodwork and plaster in the interior of the current entry room indicates that there was once a door from the room into the yard. The current small window opening was substituted for a door at a later point in time. This assessment aligns with oral reports from the prior long-time owners who shared with the current owners that the entry room was originally a porch that was subsequently enclosed as an entry area and “TV room” for their family.

- While it is possible for the small window and surround to be left in place as a non-operable or “ghost” window on the exterior, doing so would not promote the historic or visual integrity of the primary facade. For some, it could look odd. As part of the planned work, the entire building will be rehabilitated, new stucco applied, the building will be weather-proofed and made more energy efficient. To leave a small non-original opening, non-historic window and surround, and future non-functional window in place would compromise the ability of the applicants to have a well preserved, weather-tight and long-lasting building envelope.

**1. Please see packet for copy of the HCPI

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is met. This window appears to have been in a door opening that was modified in the 1987 renovation, according to the 2024 HCPI, it is not original to the structure nor is it historic and it does not match the other windows in the residence; therefore, it will not damage the character of the streetscape to remove this one window.

Criterion 2: Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Applicant Response: A hardship would be presented to the applicants by having to retain a non-functional, non-historic single-pane window on the exterior of the building envelope. Although it would be enclosed and insulated on the interior, retention of the window and surround on the exterior would represent an unnecessary intrusion into the façade that is not necessary for either design or historic reasons. The window and its’ surround would require ongoing exterior maintenance and caulking that would not be required of a well-maintained solid stucco wall for this offset portion of the facade. The structure would be less energy efficient and less sustainable without an offsetting benefit to the historic or visual integrity of the home.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is met. The general practice for closing off of windows on contributing, significant, and landmark structures has been to close the structure off on the interior. The existing window opening is neither original nor historic. The term “Public Welfare” is not defined in Chapter 14; however, the Governing Body has implemented the General Plan and ordinances in order to establish minimum standards for health, safety and welfare affecting land uses and development. The proposed window infill will not be contrary to the public welfare.

Criterion 3: Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Applicant Response: Closing of the opening and removal of the small single-paned window will improve the physical and visual integrity of the building structure, maximize the investments by the applicants in the overall rehabilitation and contribute to the visual and design integrity of the home.

With work planned on the exterior and upgrades to all the windows, retention of the identified small opening, non-historic window and late 1980’s surround is inconsistent with the quality desired and thoughtful planning for the building’s exterior and interior. Retention of a “ghost” window on the 6’ facade offset is both unnecessary for any historic integrity of the building and undesirable as a design option.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is met. The general practice for infilling off of windows on contributing, significant, and landmark structures has been to close the structure off on the interior. However, in this instance the window is located in a section of the building that is not practical, and the applicant has considered all design options. As this is not a historic opening, and the infill will not impact the contributing status of the structure, staff has no concern with the proposal.

<p>Exception to 14-5.2(D)(2)(d): <i>Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint, and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary facade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of structures instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion.</i> The applicant requests an exception to enlarge the portal within 10’ of the primary façade.</p>	
<p>Criterion 1: Do not damage the character of the streetscape.</p>	<p>Criterion Met: (Yes/No) NO</p>

Applicant Response: The Applicants have found it necessary to replace the current portal on the non-primary south facade of the building with a new one that is in keeping with the design of the current portal while addressing physical deterioration and limitations in the current construction. There is deterioration of numerous wood elements in the current portal from wood rot and water damage. This deterioration preceded the Applicants' purchase of the home. The roof of the portal is in poor condition. Without a canale, downspout or gutter, water now cascades off the roof at low points, which has contributed to the deterioration of the wooden posts and surrounds and surface materials.

A new portal will be constructed with like materials while designed to address current shortcomings.

- The portal will be enlarged from its current 8' depth to a depth of 12' across the width of portal. This will better protect elements under the portal and allow for a more functional use of the space by the owners and their guests for seating and covered outdoor dining.
- The roof will be rebuilt and proper drainage added.
- An outdoor fireplace in stucco added to the eastern end of the long portal at the farthest distance from the street will enhance the Applicants' ability to use and enjoy the south facing portal throughout the year. In their prior residence in Santa Fe, the Applicants spend considerable time in their outdoor portal with fireplace and wish to have similar near year-round enjoyment at 345 Garcia Street.

The Applicants request to allow this 4' extension of the portal's depth to adjoin the existing designated facade, so that the portal has a consistent 12' depth along the entire southern facade from its western to eastern end points. While "additions" are not permitted within 10' of a primary facade without an exception, the Applicants' proposal is both appropriate and a desirable use of the Board's discretion for the following reasons:

- The proposed portal extension is "open" and transparent. It is not the addition of a room or solid facade, which are understandably restricted. This extension does not add any significant mass to the building facade or change its current character. It incorporates the key elements of the existing portal, with a single corner post moved 4' to the south at the junction with the protected facade, a corresponding modest extension of the portal's stucco parapet above and new roof deck that faces south.
- Allowing for a 4' depth expansion across the full 50' length of the portal is designed to be harmonious with both the existing portal and southern facade and the character of portals across the historic district. It is a modest adjustment to improve function and address structural deficiencies. When completed as designed and proposed, it would be in keeping with portals found across the district and city.
- If an exception is not authorized, the backup and less desirable option is to stagger

the portal along the south facade. It would retain an 8’ depth for the first twelve feet from the designated façade after which the structure of the portal would bump out at the second post to a depth of 12’ for the remaining 38’ width of the portal. While this option would not require an exception, it will result in a portal design that is less customary, attracts attention, is less consistent with the current and typical portals in the historic district and functions less well than the proposed approach. Applicants have proposed a simple, “quiet” approach in their overall design and granting of an exception would advance the character of the district accordingly.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is not met. Though the portal is in need of extensive repair, *it* is historic as noted in 2024 HCPI. Because the portal is historic, modifying the shape and depth of the portal in kind modifies the character of the facade and communicates a false sense of history. Furthermore, the change in the portal could threaten the building’s contributing status, which is not permitted per Section 14-5.2(D)(1).

<p>Criterion 2: Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.</p>	<p>Criterion Met: (Yes/No) NO</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

Applicant Response: The current portal has deteriorated over time due to factors predating the Applicant’s ownership. Key structural elements need to be replaced, and its’ functionality improved. Applicants face an ongoing hardship beyond the deteriorated condition of the structure because the current narrow depth of the portal limits its function, use and enjoyment across seasons. During rain and summer monsoons the interior of the portal and entrance area is frequently drenched, a problem which will be substantially improved upon by the Applicants’ proposal.

In the Applicants’ plans, the entire portal will be rebuilt due to its deteriorated condition. Although the backup option for a staggered portal and bump-out could be done without an exception, it would still necessitate the rebuilding of the entire portal but with a less desirable design from the Applicants’ perspective and a reduced functionality. A staggered portal with a shallower 8’ depth at the designated facade would result in 40+ square feet less roof coverage, keeping the immediate entrance area and front door of the house “wetter” in inclement weather and perpetuating an ongoing hardship to the owners and guests as a result. The Applicants’ recommended plan would address the current problem and prevent an ongoing hardship. The current and future hardship will be substantially addressed through granting of an exception.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is not met. Increasing the depth of the portal will change the character of the house; the space is still usable as a portal with the current depth and the proposed change is not required to remain in the home or preserve the building. The portal exists with an eight-foot depth which is sufficient for protecting the entryway from hazardous conditions. So, repairing and restructuring in a larger size is not required to prevent any injury. The term “Public Welfare” is not defined in Chapter 14; however, the Governing Body has implemented the General Plan and ordinances in order to establish minimum standards for health, safety and welfare affecting land uses and development. Preservation standards were established to maintain the historic character of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and the addition of a feature that threatens the historic status is contrary to the public interest.

Criterion 3: Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Applicant Response: Reconstruction of the south-facing portal is needed. The design option recommended by the Applicants is the least obtrusive, most architecturally harmonious and “quietest” approach to improving the use, function and lifespan of the south facing portal. In making the substantial monetary investment to reconstruct the portal, the ongoing hardships associated with its shallow depth will be addressed. The proposed design with granting of the exception allows for a thoughtful, historically sensitive design which improves the function and long-term integrity of the portal. It is good value and design. It enhances the ability of residents to reside in the historic district. The less desirable backup option for which no exception is needed provides reduced value and perpetuates a hardship. It would require comparable construction cost for Applicants, without addressing all the current and ongoing limitations. The backup option would result in a less harmonious overall design. An exception is warranted and appropriate to enable the best design, improved utility and long-term outcome from the portal reconstruction.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception is not met. The proposed replacement means that the historic character of the building will not be retained, and the historic status will be threatened.

Exception to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a): *The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.* The applicant requests an exception to remove a 2’ section of the contributing wall.

Criterion 1: Do not damage the character of the streetscape.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
---------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Applicant Response:

- Removing 2' of yard wall will enhance the safety of backing into traffic on Garcia Street and will not damage the integrity of the district.
- As evidenced by the HCPI and the Staff report from the previous Case #2024-009369-HDRB, the wall has had many changes over time. The current driveway opening was perhaps created in 1973 and altered in 1987. This is the minimum alteration needed while still providing a safer and more easily maneuvered driveway.

Additional background:

The 300 block of Garcia Street is primarily residential with a mix of residences, compounds and businesses. The City has shown wide latitude in approving the width of driveway entrances to homes and residences on the street. Entrances off the block range from over 600" for a business to one residence at 108" on the lowest end. The median entrance width on the street is approximately 168" – with half narrower and half wider.

Applicant's yard wall entrance is 128", the 3rd narrowest driveway entrance on the block. The applicants' proposal would allow the widening of the entrance by 2 feet, a modest request that would result in an opening on the yard wall that would remain among the smaller and below the median for the block.

Approval for removal and rebuilding of an orthogonal driveway entry wall will substantially improve conditions for safe and comfortable entry and exit from the driveway.

Granting the request will not change the character of the district. For example, applicants' neighbors immediately across the street at 344 Garcia Street have an approximately 167" opening in their yard wall – a wall similar in height to 345 Garcia Street. Next door to that house is a similarly wide opening in a tall yard wall. The Applicants' immediately adjacent neighbors at 333 Garcia have a 144" opening for the driveway in their tall yard wall and the other adjacent neighbor has a 118" opening in a low yard wall.

Applicants' yard wall has undergone significant changes over time as is evidenced from examining the wall itself, looking at the stone foundations and the stucco. The wall was raised in height. The pedestrian entry gate was moved from a position farther north on the yard wall to its current position. The former driveway entrance was also moved south from its original position to its current position on the yard wall. Stonework also indicates that the current driveway entrance was made narrower when it was moved to its current position. The proposed change would simply be the latest in a series of changes to the Applicants' yard wall over its 90-year history. All have been done without altering the historic character of the district and well within the range of similar projects authorized for the block.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception has been met. This design minimizes the impact on the neighborhood and the district as designed and helps with safety with ingress and egress of the property.

Criterion 2:
Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

Criterion Met:
(Yes/No)
YES

Applicant Response:

The use of the driveway is currently restricted by the narrowness of the opening onto Garcia Street and complicated by the slope of the driveway making visibility more challenging, representing a multiple-times-a-day hardship for the applicants.

- The current narrow driveway opening in the yard wall, coupled with the current curved wall adjacent to the driveway poses a significant, recurring hardship for the applicants as users of the driveway, their guests and safety issues for people who transit Garcia.
- Removing 2’ of yard walls will greatly enhance the safety of backing into traffic on Garcia Street and will not damage the integrity of the district.

Additional background:

Entering the current opening and driveway from Garcia can be done with care. Exiting via the driveway is much more challenging since it requires the driver to back up and turn the car at the same time to exit onto Garcia Street. In rain, snow or at night it is more challenging to the driver, even with backup cameras on the vehicles. Applicants’ have scraped both of their cars, at considerable costs to repair, in backing out of the driveway because of its awkward layout, which will be resolved with the proposed changes.

Finally, because of the narrow opening in the Garcia Street yard wall, backing out onto the street is done “blindly”. Backup cameras and car sensors help identify oncoming cars and pedestrians, but substantial challenges remain. A modest widening of the entrance should allow for better vision onto Garcia Street, with resulting benefits to the public. These benefits will be achieved without harm to the historic character of the block and district.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception has been met. This design minimizes the impact on the neighborhood and the district as designed and helps with safety with ingress and egress of the property; therefore, decreasing risk of injury to the applicant, other vehicles and pedestrians on Garcia St, and the community.

<p>Criterion 3: Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.</p>	<p>Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES</p>
<p>Applicant Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By removing two feet of wall, the driveway becomes more manageable for everyone that might have the opportunity to use the driveway, including delivery vehicles, yard maintenance crews and others in addition to the residents. It will strengthen the heterogeneous character of the City within the historic districts. • It will return the opening to a width closer to its original width prior to an earlier modification. <p>Additional background:</p> <p>The Applicants’ proposal is a design option that is consistent with those of the historic district and substantially like the current design at 345 Garcia Street, while correcting for the current flaws and limitations that pose a recurring hardship to the Applicants and safety issues. The amount of historical material to be removed from widening is modest. The material to be removed by straightening the adjacent wall will not result in any meaningful change in appearance since that wall will be rebuilt with similar materials but in a better configuration. The entire yard wall will have new stucco applied and stonework will be repaired – all in accordance with City and Historic District standards and guidelines.</p> <p>Approval of Applicants’ request will result in the reduction of an ongoing hardship, much improved conditions for daily use of the premises and improved public safety, while preserving the historic character of the district. The request is fully consistent with decisions and standards applied by the City to other residents on this block of Garcia Street.</p> <p>Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion for exception has been met. This design minimizes the impact on the neighborhood and the district as designed and helps with safety with ingress and egress of the property while minimizing the impact on the contributing yard wall.</p>	

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-5.2 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

(A) General Provisions

(1) General Purpose

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

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

(C) Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts

(Ord. No. 2004-26)

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

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

(4) Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All *development* located within the historic districts and subject to this Section 14-5.2 shall comply with all applicable general *development* standards set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(D), as well as any applicable specific *development* standards set forth in Subsections 14-5.2(E) through (I).

(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts

In any review of proposed additions or alterations to *structures* that have been declared significant or contributing in any historic district or a *landmark* in any part of the *city*, the following standards shall be met:

(1) General

- (a) The status of a significant, contributing, or *landmark structure* shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a *structure* to lose its significant, contributing, or *landmark* status, the *application* shall be denied. The removal of

historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.

- (b) If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent *structure* to lose its significant, contributing, or *landmark* status, the *application* may be denied.

(2) Additions

- (a) 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 will make the addition indistinguishable from the existing *structure*.
- (b) Additions to *buildings* that meet the standards of Subsection 14-5.2(E) shall continue to meet those standards set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(E) in addition to the standards set forth in this section.
- (c) Additions are not permitted to *primary façades*.
- (d) Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint, and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary facade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of *structures* instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion.
- (e) The height of additions:
 - (i) For significant and *landmark structures* shall be a minimum of six (6) inches less than the parapet or equivalent roof-feature of the existing adjacent connecting facade.
 - (ii) For contributing *structures* shall be no more than one additional *story* higher than the existing *structure*. To the extent architecturally practicable, two-story additions shall be set to the rear or the side rear of the *structure*. When an additional *story* is to be placed upon an existing contributing *structure*, that footprint may be no greater than fifty percent of the footprint of the existing *structure*, subject to the provisions of Subsection A(1) above. For the purposes of this paragraph, an additional *story* shall not exceed twelve (12) feet from the existing rooftop to the highest point of that *story*.

(4) Porches and Portals

Existing *porches* or *portals* shall not be enclosed.

(5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

- (a) For all facades of significant and *landmark structures* and for the primary facades of contributing *structures*:
 - (i) Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size,

style, and material of the original. Thermal double pane glass may be used. No opening shall be widened or narrowed.

- (ii) No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.
- (iii) No existing opening shall be closed.
- (b) For all façades of significant, contributing and *landmark structures*, architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event *replacement* is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. *Replacement* or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.

(E) **Downtown and Eastside Design Standards**

The *governing body* recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the *city* from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with *adobe*, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a *development* from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

(1) Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with *adobe*, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

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

- (c) Solid *wall* space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;
- (d) The rule as to flat roofs shall not be construed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof *structures*, but such *structures* other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the *street* on which the *building* fronts;
- (e) True old Santa Fe style *buildings* are made of *adobe* with mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the *adobe* effect can be simulated is permissible; provided, that the exterior *walls* are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating *adobe*, laid on smoothly, is required; and
- (f) It is characteristic of old Santa Fe style commercial *buildings* to place a *portal* so that it covers the entire sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style

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

- (a) No *building* shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed *portales*, *setbacks* or other design elements;
- (b) The combined door and window area in any *publicly visible* façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a *portal*. No door or window in a *publicly visible* façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;
- (c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof *treatment* described below;
- (d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any *publicly visible* façade shall be *adobe* finish, or stucco simulating *adobe* finish. The balance of the *publicly visible* façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for *building permits*;
- (e) The *publicly visible* façade of any *building* and of any adjoining *walls* shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under *portales* may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and *portals* on *publicly visible* portions of the *building* and *walls* shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; except that *buildings* with *portals* may have larger plate glass areas for windows under *portals* only. Deep window recesses are characteristic; and
- (f) Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

