

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: December 10, 2024
TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members
FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division

2024-009398-HDRB, 346 Hillside Ave., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Martha Davis, owner, requests to alter a previous approval including removing a fireplace, changes to windows, doors, exterior stairs, patio, installing a water feature, HVAC, skylights, constructing fencing with pedestrian and vehicle gates to the maximum allowable height of 4'-11", and adding a standing seam metal roof. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(6) for changing the roof material not in-kind.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

Historic Inventory Form

Zoning Review Sheet

Other: previous case documents

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

Proposal Letter

Site Plan/Floor Plan

Elevations

Photographs

Other: Exception Criteria

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the exception criteria have not been met and recommends denial of the exception request to replace the shingle roof with a charcoal-colored metal roof. Otherwise, staff recommends approval of Applicant's Request Items 2-15 of the application 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. Two motions will be required in this case.

Sample motions:

- a. Approve or deny the exception to 14-5.2(D)(6) to replace roof materials not in-kind.

- b. Approve or deny Case #2024-009398 to allow those alterations to 346 Hillside Ave. that do not require an exception.

Should the Board deny the exception request, the applicant shall return with an alternative proposal for review and approval prior to proceeding to building permit.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The property located at 346 Hillside contains both a single-family residence and a studio. The main residence is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, and the detached studio is listed as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.



Figure 1: Location of 346 Hillside Avenue

The home was constructed around 1920 in a simplified craftsman bungalow style. The fenestration is symmetrical on the north elevation, with a front door flanked by large windows. The hipped roof had brick red asphalt shingles. The kitchen addition on the east elevation, constructed between 1948-1958, has a flat roof (see Figure 2).

A sunroom on the south elevation was approved for removed in 2004, but the addition which was approved to replace it under case H-04-035 was never built. At that time a non-historic portal on the north elevation which connected to the kitchen was also approved for removal. The rear door

“floats” and it is likely that there were concrete stairs similar to the ones further east on the south elevation that led to the backyard (see aerials). A tall wall on the west elevation connects the residence with the studio, which was likely a garage.

A status review with primary façade designation was heard under case #2022-006142-HDRB. At that time, the HDRB retained the main residence’s contributing status and assigned the north elevation, west elevation, and the northernmost portion of the east elevation excluding the kitchen addition at the southeast corner (with flat roof) as the primary facades and designated the garage/studio as a non-contributing structure.

In 2023, under case #2022-006237-HDRB the HDRB approved additions to the east and south elevations (non-primary), a portal on the south elevation and a deck and stone planters on the south elevation of the main residence. They further approved the removal of a portal on the south of the studio with an addition and portal to replace it. Later under case 2024-007809-ADMIN a roof mounted mini split system was added to the overall project.



Figure 2: Pre (2022) and Post (2024) construction

During construction, the applicant made unauthorized changes to the board approved design (Case #2022-006237) and constructed items not previously considered or approved by the HDRB. On 10/25/2024 Historic Preservation inspectors issued a Stop Work Order (Red Tag) to the owner for the unauthorized alterations.

APPLICANT’S REQUEST:

The applicant now requests approval of the unauthorized and unapproved items, including:

- 1) Replace the shingle roof with a charcoal-colored metal roof. An exception to section 14-5.2(D)(6) for changing the roofing material not in-kind is requested.
- 2) Eliminate the fireplace in the new addition design (Studio).
- 3) Eliminate a bedroom window under the portal of the addition (Studio).
- 4) Install a roof mounted HVAC on the main residence. The HVAC unit will not be publicly visible.
- 5) Reconstruct the stairs on the north side of the kitchen to bring them up to current code.
- 6) Install guard and handrails at the steps.

- 7) Install skylights. The skylights are not publicly visible.
- 8) Install exterior lighting.
- 9) Construct an 18” high coyote fencing on top of the existing 4’6” tall yard wall for a total height of 72” in the rear of the property.
- 10) Construct coyote fencing along the street frontage to the maximum allowable height of 59”. Staff notes that this fence currently stands at 86” in height and is planned to be cut down. The 73” high metal pedestrian and 69” high metal vehicular gate along the street frontage that were installed in 2020 will be retained in this newer fencing.

As stated in the previous case (2022-006237-HDRB) for this property’s alteration:
“The character of the proposed renovation treatments is divergent from the historic character of the main residence. Unique architectural features on the historic building speaks to the place and time it was built as in the 1920s the bungalow was a very popular building type. This structure does not express that which is described in the Downtown and Eastside design standards; as a contributing building and the standards associated with additions set forth in Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(a) having similar materials and architectural treatments. The proposed windows and doors do not illustrate compatibility with the historic windows and doors on the residence.”

Relative to the studio, the architectural vocabulary is very modern in nature and is not of “Old Santa Fe Style” or “Recent Santa Fe Style.” The cantilevered portal element and large glass doors on the south elevation is inconsistent with the design standards that are set forth for non-contributing buildings in the Downtown & Eastside District.

It is the opinion of staff that, as designed, the proposed additions will impact the overall architectural integrity of the building and could threaten the contributing status of the residence.”

Changing the roof of the contributing structure further diverts from the character of the contributing building as there is no evidence that the roof material has ever been metal. The dark color of the metal roof is also not present on the streetscape. Therefore, staff recommends denial of the roofing material change for this contributing structure.

It should be noted that no evidence has been provided by the applicant as to a historic existence of a metal roof on the historic structure. Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) states, “*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.*” Without any documentation regarding the roof material, it is conjectural as to whether metal roofing existed historically.

Staff has done some research of historic aerials, and it is inconclusive as to the material of the roof. The only evidence available is the 1984 HCPI which stated that the roof had asphalt shingles.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to Section 14-5.2(D)(6): The applicant requests an exception to replace the roof with a material not in-kind on a contributing structure.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: The pre-existing asphalt shingle roof is not an architectural feature that embodies the District. The new roof matches the dimensions, hipped design and character of the pre-existing roof, which is most likely not a historic roof, given the typical lifespan of asphalt shingle roofs. The color of the new roof is similar to the pre-existing roof and design and color styles present in the streetscape along Hillside, including the house at 368 Hillside, and in the Downtown/East side of Santa Fe generally, and will match the historic character of the neighborhood more closely than the pre-existing roof. The new roof will not damage the character of the district. The metal flat roof on the addition indicates that the original roof on the main house may have also been metal. However, neither the HCPI nor review of historic air photos provide documentation of the original roof material.

Staff Response: Staff does not agree with this. While the roof shape and dimensions have not changed, the asphalt shingle roof was a reddish brown not a black in color and there is not a single black roof in the streetscape.



Figure 3: previous roof of structure and neighborhood roofs

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: The pre-existing roof suffered from multiple major leaks that caused interior damage and the Applicant's roofing contractor concluded that the asphalt shingle roof was at the end of its lifespan. Periodic replacement of roofs is necessary to protect against water intrusion that would adversely affect the structural integrity of houses as well as its livability. As with all roofs reaching the end of their lifespan, the new roof is necessary to prevent further hardship in both respects. Deterioration of the house due to ongoing leaks would ultimately harm the public welfare, as the structural integrity of this 100+ year old contributing house would be compromised. The Applicant's desire in carrying out the remodel, of which this exception request is a part, is to protect and preserve the house and its appearance as a part of the fabric of the District.

Staff Response: Staff finds this does not address the reason for the change in material. The need for a new roof is not in dispute. Per section 14-5.2(D)(6) roofs on contributing structures shall be replaced in-kind. As there is no proof that this roof has ever been a pro-panel metal roof, the applicant needs to clarify why it is a hardship to install a new asphalt shingle roof.

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

Applicant Response: The Applicant evaluated design options for the new roof, including patching the existing roof and installing a new asphalt shingle roof. The Applicant’s roofing contractor advised that the condition of the pre-existing roof was such that patching was not a viable option, as the roof had reached the end of its useful lifespan. The Applicant chose to retain the longstanding design of the hipped roof, with a material that provides better performance and durability than the pre-existing asphalt shingle roof and a color consistent with metal roofs in the neighborhood. Metal roofs are common in the neighborhood and given the original construction date in the early 1920’s the original roof may have been metal as well. The roof on the addition was metal when the Applicant purchased the property. The Applicant rejected other design options that would change the appearance of the roof.

Staff Response: Staff disagrees with this response. While replacement of the roof was required, there is not sufficient evidence that this roof has ever been metal. Contributing structures are required to have architectural features replaced in-kind by code section 14-5.2(D)(6), an asphalt shingle roof is a viable replacement for an asphalt shingle roof and will last approximately 20 years under Santa Fe weather conditions. A metal roof is not a requirement to “improve performance and durability” of a roof. Historically in the 1920s, roofing materials included asphalt, slate, tin, galvanized steel, concrete tiles and wood shingles. The product of pro-panel would not have been original to a 1920s constructed building. If the roof had previously been metal, it would have been galvanized steel sheets or tin most likely as a terneplate roof or tin shingles.

APPROVED AS TO FORM BY THE PLANNING AND LAND USE DEPARTMENT:

Title	Name	Initials
Department Director	Heather Lamboy	HLL
Assistant Department Director	Maggie Moore	MRM
Planning Manager	Gary Moquino	GM
Planner Senior	Lani McCulley	<i>LJM</i>