



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

AMENDED

SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

Attendance: In response to the State’s declaration of a Public Health Emergency, the Mayor’s Proclamation of Emergency, and the ban on public gatherings in excess of those permitted in the current public health order, Historic Districts Review Board meeting will be held virtually.

Viewing: Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe’s YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCuW5Fb7iWuKpTdsWYNDurgA>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most smartphones, tablets, or computers.

Attending on Zoom: Members of the public may attend the Zoom meeting on a computer, mobile device, or phone. The video conference link and teleconference number will be posted at <https://santafe.primegov.com/public/portal> at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting.. The direct Zoom link is: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83191941803?pwd=NWpIL0Q1ai9sSjY1aFhFNWdHdXdlQT09> and use password: **348336**.

Attending Zoom by Phone: Members of the public can attend the Zoom meeting by phone by dialing:

US: **(253) 215-8782** or **(346) 248-7799** or **(929) 205-6099**

Webinar ID: **831 9194 1803**.

Public Comment:

• By video: A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conference (using a computer, mobile device, or smart phone) may provide public comment during the meeting. Attendees should use the “Raise Hand” function to be recognized by the chair to speak at the appropriate time.



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

• By phone: A person attending the Zoom meeting by phone may provide public comment during the meeting. Phone attendees should press *9 to use the “Raise Hand” function to be recognized at the appropriate time.

• In writing: A person may submit written public comments by 5pm the Monday prior to the meeting via the virtual comment “button” at

<https://santafe.primegov.com/public/portal>.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. February 9, 2021

D. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Case #2020-002818-HDRB. 324 McKenzie Street.
2. Case #2020-002983-HDRB. 209 Delgado Street.
3. Case #2021-003048-HDRB. 105 Calle La Pena.
4. Case #2021-003057-HDRB. 107 South Armijo Lane.
5. Case #2021-003062-HDRB. 350 Garcia Street.
6. Case #2021-003068-HDRB. 1668 Cerro Gordo Road.
7. Case #2021-003058-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
8. Case #2021-003084-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
9. Case #2020-002954-HDRB. 333 Sena Street.
10. Case #2020-003006-HDRB. 542 Camino del Monte Sol.

E. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

F. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #2020-002813-HDRB. 247 Anita Place. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Gene Tison, agent/owner, proposes to construct an addition on a contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
2. Case #2020-002916-HDRB. 481 Arroyo Tenorio. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. D'Angelico Enterprises Inc., agent for David and Anna-Karin Dillard, owners, proposes to construct a greenhouse addition on a non-contributing accessory structure. An exception is requested to Downtown and Eastside Design Standards (14-5.2(E)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas/Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
3. Case #2020-001979-HDRB. 613 Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Craig Hoopes and Associates, agent for Canyon Room Holdings, owner, proposes to raise the roof, replace and repair windows and doors, reopen an enclosed portal, and other general maintenance on a contributing residential structure, replace windows and doors, install a courtyard, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure, and demolish all non-contributing structures on the tract A which includes a triplex, 2 storage sheds, and a well house. (Daniel Schwab, DNSchwab@santafenm.gov 955-6660)

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #2020-002791-HDRB. 530 Garcia Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Beverly Foust, owner, requests historic status review and primary façade designation, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov) (POSTPONED TO MARCH 23, 2021)



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

2. Case #2021-003109-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
3. Case #2021-003110-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, proposes to remove a portion of a non-contributing yardwall and install a vehicle gate to a height of 4 feet 7 inches. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
4. Case #2021-003111-HDRB. 314 North Guadalupe Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Jim Heneghan, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 2,540 sq. ft. residence to the height of 15'0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'1" and 41" high yardwall and pedestrian gate on a contributing property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
5. Case #2021-003114-HDRB. 630 Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Santa Fe Monthly Meeting of Friends, owner, proposes to construct a 2,085 sq. ft. freestanding non-residential structure to a height of 14' 8" on a significant property. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
6. Case #2021-003113-HDRB. 324 Staab Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Sterling Resource Group, owner proposes to alter the roof style, reconfigure windows, and stucco the residence and yardwall on a contributing residential property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
7. Case #2021-003119-HDRB. 331 De Vargas Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Shaw Architecture LLC, agent for Four Plex LLC, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, a non-contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) to install single panes larger than 30 inches in dimension. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, DNSchwab@santafenm.gov)

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS
REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

K. NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, March 9, 2021

L. ADJOURN

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6521, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE: February 17, 2021

TIME: 11:59 AM



AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW
BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

In response to the State's declaration of a Public Health Emergency, the Mayor's Proclamation of Emergency, and the ban on public gatherings of more than five (5) people, the Historic Districts Review Board meeting will be conducted virtually using Zoom.

Viewing: Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCuW5Fb7iWuKpTdsWYNDurgA>. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most smartphones, tablets, or computers.

Attending on Zoom: Members of the public may attend the Zoom meeting on a computer, mobile device, or phone. The video conference link and teleconference number will be posted at <https://santafe.primegov.com/public/portal> at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting.. The direct Zoom link is: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83191941803?pwd=NWpIL0Q1ai9sSjY1aFhFNWdHdXdLQT09> and use password: **348336**.

Attending Zoom by Phone: Members of the public can attend the Zoom meeting by phone by dialing:
US: **(253) 215-8782** or **(346) 248-7799** or **(929) 205-6099**
Webinar ID: **831 9194 1803**.

Public Comment:

- By video: A person attending the Zoom meeting by video conference (using a computer, mobile device, or smart phone) may provide public comment during the meeting. Attendees should use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized by the chair to speak at the appropriate time.
- By phone: A person attending the Zoom meeting by phone may provide public comment during the meeting. Phone attendees should press *9 to use the "Raise Hand" function to be recognized at the appropriate time.



City of Santa Fe

AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW
BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

• In writing: A person may submit written public comments by 5pm the Monday prior to the meeting via the virtual comment “button” at <https://santafe.primegov.com/public/portal>.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. February 9, 2021

D. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Case #2020-002818-HDRB. 324 McKenzie Street.
2. Case #2020-002983-HDRB. 209 Delgado Street.
3. Case #2021-003048-HDRB. 105 Calle La Pena.
4. Case #2021-003049-HDRB. 555 San Antonio Street.
5. Case #2021-003057-HDRB. 107 South Armijo Lane.
6. Case #2021-003062-HDRB. 350 Garcia Street.
7. Case #2021-003068-HDRB. 1668 Cerro Gordo Road.
8. Case #2021-003058-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
9. Case #2021-003084-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
10. Case #2020-002954-HDRB. 333 Sena Street.



City of Santa Fe

AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW
BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

11. Case #2020-003006-HDRB. 542 Camino del Monte Sol.

E. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

F. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

1. Heritage Preservation Award Nominations for 2021

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. Case #2020-002813-HDRB. 247 Anita Place. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Gene Tison, agent/owner, proposes to construct an addition on a contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
2. Case #2020-002916-HDRB. 481 Arroyo Tenorio. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. D'Angelico Enterprises Inc., agent for David and Anna-Karin Dillard, owners, proposes to construct a greenhouse addition on a non-contributing accessory structure. An exception is requested to Downtown and Eastside Design Standards (14-5.2(E)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas/Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
3. Case #2020-001979-HDRB. 613 Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Craig Hoopes and Associates, agent for Canyon Room Holdings, owner, proposes to raise the roof, replace and repair windows and doors, reopen an enclosed portal, and other general maintenance on a contributing residential structure, replace windows and doors, install a courtyard, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure, and demolish all non-contributing structures on the tract A which includes a triplex, 2 storage sheds, and a well house. (Daniel Schwab, DNSchwab@santafenm.gov 955-6660)

H. NEW BUSINESS



City of Santa Fe

AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW
BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

1. Case #2020-002791-HDRB. 530 Garcia Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Beverly Foust, owner, requests historic status review and primary façade designation, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
2. Case #2021-003109-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
3. Case #2021-003110-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street. Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, proposes to remove a portion of a non-contributing yardwall and install a vehicle gate to a height of 4 feet 7 inches. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
4. Case #2021-003111-HDRB. 314 North Guadalupe Street. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Jim Heneghan, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 2,540 sq. ft. residence to the height of 15'0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'1" and 41" high yardwall and pedestrian gate on a contributing property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
5. Case #2021-003114-HDRB. 630 Canyon Road. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Santa Fe Monthly Meeting of Friends, owner, proposes to construct a 2,085 sq. ft. freestanding non-residential structure to a height of 14' 8" on a significant property. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)
6. Case #2021-003113-HDRB. 324 Staab Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Sterling Resource Group, owner proposes to alter the roof style, reconfigure windows, and stucco the residence and yardwall on a contributing residential property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray, 955-6127, asbordegaray@santafenm.gov)
7. Case #2021-003119-HDRB. 331 De Vargas Street. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Shaw Architecture LLC, agent for Four Plex LLC, owner, proposes



City of Santa Fe

AGENDA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW
BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2021
5:30 PM
ATTEND VIRTUALLY

to replace windows and doors, a non-contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) to install single panes larger than 30 inches in dimension. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, DNSchwab@santafenm.gov)

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

K. NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, March 9, 2021

L. ADJOURN

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6521, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE	
DATE:	February 4, 2021
TIME:	11:57 AM

SUMMARY INDEX
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
February 23, 2021

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
Call to Order	5:30 pm	1
A. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
B. Approval of Agenda	Approved as Amended	2
C. Approval of Minutes		
1. February 09, 2021	Approved as Amended	2
D. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved	3
E. Matters from the Public	Comments	3-4
F. Staff Communications	Comments	4
G. Old Business		
1. Case #2020-002813-HDRB 247 Anita Place	Approved as submitted	4-8
2. Case #2020-002916-HDRB 481 Arroyo Tenorio	Approved with conditions	8-18
3. Case #2020-001979-HDRB 631 Canyon Road	Approved as submitted	18-21
4. Case #2020-003113-HDRB 113 Staab Street	Approved with conditions	21-27
H. New Business		
1. Case #2020-002791-HDRB 530 Garcia Street	Postponed	27
2. Case #2021-003109-HDRB 128 West Berger Street	Approved as recommended	27-29
3. Case #2021-003110-HDRB 128 West Berger Street	Postponed for redesign	29-37
4. Case #2021-003111-HDRB 314 N. Guadalupe Street	Denied	37-48
5. Case #2021-003114-HDRB 630 Canyon Road	Approved as recommended	48-54
6. Case #2021-003119-HDRB 331 De Vargas Street	Approved	54-58
I. Discussion Items	None	58
J. Matters From the Board	Comments	58-59
K. Next Meeting	Tuesday, March 9, 2021	59
L. Adjournment	Adjourned at 10:54 pm	60

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE
HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD
February 23, 2021
VIRTUAL HEARING**

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Cecilia Rios, Chair, on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. at a virtual meeting held at <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofsantafe>.

A. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chairwoman
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Mr. John Bienvenu
Ms. Flynn G. Larson
Mr. Buddy Roybal

MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Mr. Anthony Guida

OTHERS PRESENT:

Noah Berke
Ms. Nicole Ramirez Thomas
Mr. Daniel Schwab, Senior Planner
Ms. Angela Bordegaray, Senior Planner
Ms. Sally Paez, Assistant 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 Preservation Office and available on the City of Santa Fe Website.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Ramirez Thomas noted 324 Staab Street should be Case #4 under Old Business and Case #2971 at 530 Garcia is on the agenda but was postponed to March 23.

MOTION: Vice Chair Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid to approve the agenda as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. February 9, 2021

Member Bienvenu, page 23, second full paragraph reads, “The ordinance calls them nonconforming structures and states you *can* do anything...” should be “you can’t do anything.”

Ms. Paez, page 5, the next to last line, *victim* should be dictum. She asked that the line be revised and say, “*Here it wasn’t relevant to the holding of the case and is what we would normally call dictum.*”

Chair Rios asked on page 49, second paragraph “preserve in amber” is correct. Vice Chair Katz explained amber is a gooey substance from trees that insects are preserved in.

Ms. Bordegaray noted that Member Guida used the word to refer to Historic Preservation and not putting things in amber, meaning *in stone*.

MOTION: Member Katz moved, seconded by Member Larson to approve the HDRB Hearing Minutes of February 9, 2021, as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, and Larson voting in favor and none voting against. Member Roybal abstained.

D. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Case #2020-002818-HDRB. 324 McKenzie Street.
2. Case #2020-002983-HDRB. 209 Delgado Street.
3. Case #2021-003048-HDRB. 105 Calle La Pena.
4. Case #2021-003049-HDRB. 555 San Antonio Street.
5. Case #2021-003057-HDRB. 107 South Armijo Lane.
6. Case #2021-003062-HDRB. 350 Garcia Street.
7. Case #2021-003068-HDRB. 1668 Cerro Gordo Road.
8. Case #2021-003058-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
9. Case #2021-003084-HDRB. 235 North Guadalupe Street.
10. Case #2020-002954-HDRB. 333 Sena Street.
11. Case #2020-003006-HDRB. 542 Camino del Monte Sol.

MOTION: Vice Chair Katz moved, seconded by Member Biedscheid to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz and Larson voting in favor and none voting against. Member Roybal abstained.

E. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Stephanie Beninato said regarding the house on Monte del Sol before the Commission last week about raising the wall height, that she noticed has a wire fence. Also, it has significant vegetation that makes the wall unscalable. Someone put a wire gate where there was coyote fencing and someone should check that out. She said she wanted to apologize and withdraw her standing objection on the case of Lee vs. Catron. She learned that the Supreme Court does allow the state agencies and public bodies to decide whether laypeople could represent laypeople at administrative hearings. Paralegals can represent with lawyer supervision, at the federal or state level and lawyers from out of state can have a local lawyer back them. When hired by a state agency they do not need a license.

F. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Schwab noted the coversheet for 630 Canyon Road is incorrect. He will correct that when discussing the actual case.

G. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Rios reminded applicants about the appeal process if they disagree with the Board's decisions. They have 15 days from the approval of Findings of Fact to appeal. She limited public comment to two minutes each at this meeting.

1. **Case #2020-002813-HDRB. 247 Anita Place.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Gene Tison, agent/owner, proposes to construct an addition on a contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray)

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Bordegaray shared her screen and presented the Staff report. 247 Anita Place is a 1,300 sf Mission Revival bungalow built between 1930 and 1936.

Its historic status is Contributing to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. Its defining features include its red tile roofed tower over the front porch, round arch porch openings, undulating parapet, and its stucco color and texture. Its white stucco has a unique textured pattern that resembles a "Spanish Lite Lace" pattern. Windows are double-hung with a 3/1 lite pattern. The bungalow is one of a few of this architectural style in this neighborhood, where Spanish-Pueblo Revival style buildings and structures dominate the streetscape. The garage at the end of the driveway to the west of the house was constructed at the same time as the house.

The applicant revised his proposal and returns to the Board to address the Board's comments and suggestions. The applicant also has provided stronger drawings of his project.

The applicant proposes to:

1. Construct a 317 sf addition onto the northeast corner of the house. The addition's north elevation has been moved one foot north. The revised height is 14 feet, previously 12', from finished grade and is one foot lower than the existing house. The addition will have a flat roof and undulating parapet that matches the original house.

2. The addition's windows will match the existing 3/1 lite pattern, white aluminum clad.
3. The rear entry door on the west elevation will be wood with 3/1 lite pattern above the wood paneled door to match the window style. Staff notes that the door is depicted as solid wood panel in the proposed west elevation. The rear entry has a 4 x 6 foot landing. The applicant proposes to step the back porch floor level to a landing so that a new set of steps that meet current residential stair code can be built. With the new parapet at 14 feet instead of 12 feet, the addition's floor level will be raised to the level of the new landing at the top of the stairs.
4. Add an overhang of approximately 18 sf over the new entry doorway on the west façade. The overhang will extend three feet over the entrance.
5. There will be a skylight over the bedroom area.
6. The addition will be stuccoed in the same skip trowel pattern as the rest of the house. At the same time, the main house stucco will be repaired and the entire house restuccoed, maintaining the skip trowel texture. The current multiple flaking layers of paint on the house vary from medium tan to creamy white. The stucco color that best matches the primary color is El Rey 106 "Bamboo". Further details on the stucco work are in the attached letter from GMB Construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios confirmed the proposed addition is on the north façade and is not primary and will be a foot lower than the existing contributing house.

Member Larson asked if the existing windows are wood or aluminum clad.

Ms. Bordegaray replied they are wood and all our original except for three that have been replaced. The proposed windows will be white clad wood.

Chair Rios confirmed the old contributing home could be distinguished from the new proposal.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Gene Tison, 226 Anita Place, was sworn. He said his son lives in the house at 247 Anita Place. He followed the suggestions from the original presentation. They raised the parapet, redid the floor level and put the steps on the outside to match the front. The window alignment is almost the same across the entire structure. They wanted an overhang at the back for weather protection. It is a common feature on many houses in the neighborhood. So, they added a 3-foot overhang "eyebrow" on the back porch and changed the door to a three-light top and a wooden panel on the bottom. We maintained the undulating parapet and have decided on a stucco color.

Chair Rios said his home is lovely and he did a great job adding the small addition. She understands from reading the report he has lived in the home for 48 years.

Mr. Tison clarified he has lived in his home at 226 for 48 years. His neighbor in the house at 220 Anita had the same builder.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Chair Rios asked if correct that the skylight proposed will not be visible.

Mr. Tison replied it will not. The skylight is to have more light, especially in the winter. He didn't want to put in windows because of weather and wants more space in the room.

Vice Chair Katz thanked Mr. Tison for a beautiful job.

Mr. Tison said they have worked on the project for a couple of months and if approved, he will have the architect continue the work and get paid.

PUBLIC HEARING

Stefanie Beninato and John Eddy were sworn in.

Ms. Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, thought the design nice in terms of matching the house and still is distinguishable. She was bothered by the blank wall on the north side. Energy-wise more heat will be lost with the skylight than having

windows, and windows would alleviate the blank wall. The house has so many nice windows and a blank wall is jarring.

John Eddy, 227 E. Palace, Suite D, said he liked Ms. Beninato's feedback on the massing of the back wall. He agreed a couple of windows would help break up the massing, but it is not a big deal. The shed-brow over the addition, is a clever and creative way to blend the addition to the rest of the house. He commended the applicant and appreciated his willingness to work with the Board.

Chair Rios asked which direction the blank wall faced.

Ms. Bordegaray replied it is facing the backyard on the north.

She added that the applicant mentioned the stucco, which is a unique feature of the house, which had been painted. She wanted to confirm the proposal is for cementitious stucco. The letter stated the contractor wouldn't lath the house but will apply cementitious stucco over the painted portion.

Mr. Tison said that was his understanding. They have used the same contractor for years and he was assured the contractor will maintain the skip-trowel finish that exists.

He said behind the north wall is a large elm tree that shades the area, but nothing can be seen except roofs. The skylights will have insulating shades that can be closed in the winter at night which increases the R value the same as a shade covering a window.

Member Biedscheid asked if the new door on the west elevation was shown correctly and is a 3 over wood door, not a solid wood.

Mr. Tison explained he liked the lights over the top and three wood panels below. it is like other houses in the neighborhood and to his current front door. The drawing shows it correctly.

BOARD DISCUSSION

MOTION: In Case #2020-002813-HDRB, 247 Anita Place, Vice Chair Katz moved to approve the application as submitted. Member Bienvenu seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

2. **Case #2020-002916-HDRB. 481 Arroyo Tenorio.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. D'Angelico Enterprises Inc., agent for David and Anna-Karin Dillard, owners, proposes to construct a greenhouse addition on a non-contributing accessory structure. An exception is requested to Downtown and Eastside Design Standards (14-5.2(E)). (Nicole Ramirez Thomas/Angela Schackel Bordegaray)

Ms. Ramirez Thomas presented the Staff report.

STAFF REPORT

481 Arroyo Tenorio is a single-family residence and garage built in the Territorial Revival style and was designated as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District in 2008 (H-08-028). The main house is believed to have been constructed in the early 1930s and had some minor alterations, which are not specified on the Historic Building Inventory form (dated September 19, 1984), in the 1980s. The property formerly had a guest house with a carport but the guest house is now independently addressed as 491 Arroyo Tenorio. And resolving the violation.

An update to the initial inventory of the property was done in 2006. The photo on the form shows a long (slightly sagging) portal, windows with broad wood trim, wood chamfered square columns with a small capital at the top, brick coping along the parapet of the flat roofs of the house and the portal, and long canales. The exterior of the building is stuccoed. The windows are described as lacking integrity due to replacement with plate glass and likely loss of original wood elements and are likely the reason for a non-contributing status along with the non-historic additions to the house in the 1980s. The garage and guest house were both listed as recent additions in 2006 with no date of construction given, they were however also part of the non-contributing status designation for the property at the time of the 2008 HDRB case.

The applicant requests the addition of a non-Santa Fe style greenhouse structure to the north elevation of existing 600 square foot garage. An exception is requested. In addition, the applicant is requesting to resolve a Notice of Violation

(NOV) for installation of three mini-split units to the main residence and re-roof of the garage.

A river stone wall lines the street front of the property. It has not been evaluated for status, but no change is requested to the wall at this time. The existing vehicle gate for the property was added circa 2008 and the design for the gate was part of the approval for the 2008 case that came to the HDRB. While obscured from view on Arroyo Tenorio because of the river stone wall, the proposed greenhouse structure is considered publicly visible based on previous HDRB discussions about visibility and yard walls and fences.

The applicant proposes the following remodel to the garage:

1. Construct a stem wall and greenhouse structure to the back of the garage (north elevation) to measure 225 square feet for the footprint of the addition and to be built to a height of 11 feet 6 inches.

- a. Construct a stem wall of cinderblock on the west and north sides of the greenhouse. The stem wall will be finished in stucco on the interior and faced with a decorative river rock veneer. The stem wall will be capped with flagstone.
- b. The greenhouse structure, which will sit atop the stem wall, will have a gray powder-coated aluminum frame, glass, and will have two doors (one on the east elevation and the other on the west elevation). It will be attached to the garage at the top of its frame and at the stem wall in an effort to create minimal impact to the garage. The greenhouse will not exceed the existing height of the garage. As with many greenhouses, the design does not comply with the Downtown and Eastside Historic District standards and the applicants request an exception to 14-5.2(E). The relevant code citation and exception responses are provided below.
- c. In response to the Board's comments on the case on January 28, 2021, the applicant redesigned the publicly visible south elevation of the greenhouse. This elevation will now be a stucco wall with a door and window. In this way, no greenhouse glass is visible from the Arroyo Tenorio streetscape.

2. The applicant wishes to resolve a NOV issued by the Historic Preservation Division and requests approval of the mini-split units on the roof of the main residence and the re-roof of the garage.

- a. The installation of three mini-split units; two on the main house and one on the garage. The units were placed on the roof of the house and garage at the time the property was for sale and prior to the current owner's purchase of the property. No administrative approval was requested for the mini-split unit. The applicant proposes to screen the mini-split units with a stuccoed wood screen. The stucco will match the existing structures.
- b. Re-roof for the garage. A re-roof for the house was approved administratively in 2020 but the request for re-roof of the garage was not requested at that time. The re-roof of the garage was discovered during an inspection for the swimming pool. The swimming pool was approved administratively in 2020. The re-roof included removal of the roof and replacement with a bitumen roof.

No exception for visible roof-top appurtenances was requested, though responses were provided by the applicant. Per 14-5.2(D)(3)(B), an exception is only required for roof top appurtenances for significant and landmark structures. However, it is recognized that in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District concealment of roof top equipment is needed per 14-5.2(E)(1)(D).

3. The applicant requests approval to stucco the courtyard interior. No stucco color was named for the project, but the applicant will provide testimony at the hearing. The current stucco color is El Rey cementitious "Buckskin."

RESPONSES FOR A REQUEST FOR AN EXCEPTION TO THE DOWNTOWN AND EASTSIDE HISTORIC DISTRICTS DESIGN STANDARDS (14-5.2(E)) PER 14-5.2(D)(b) DESIGN STANDARDS AND SIGNAGE

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

Applicant Response: It is likely that the proposed design of the greenhouse structure may have little to no impact on the district and contains contributing design elements in regard to the Downtown and Eastside Design Standards because of the following:

1. The proposed greenhouse design will include a contributing river rock stem wall that will match the existing historic exterior of the property.
2. The structure will be stuccoed to match the existing stucco in areas where it may be needed in order to create a sense of historic continuity for homeowners to whom it will not be primarily visible to as the location of the proposed greenhouse is planned to sit with-in the inner walled courtyard of the additionally

walled off property. The two existing walls will offer almost zero visibility to neighbors and the surrounding public streets.

Staff Response: Staff agrees with the response. The design of the greenhouse does not affect the character of the district.

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

Applicant Response: Upon the homeowners recent purchase of 481 Arroyo Tenorio, please take into consideration their full application of all that they hope to embrace from what their new location has to offer and how it is now part of their lifestyle, health, and wellbeing. The homeowners wish to expand and supplement their lifestyle of health and wellbeing as sustainably and efficiently as possible by taking advantage of the therapeutic opportunities and activities that the proposed greenhouse will facilitate at this time in their lives. It is likely that, in order to replicate the benefits of having a greenhouse, the homeowners would have to make a significant effort to maintain those therapeutic opportunities elsewhere or may not be able to access those opportunities depending on their availability.

Staff Response: Staff agrees that there are sustainable aspects to a greenhouse structure that can prevent hardship.

(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: There are no known historic greenhouse design standards for greenhouses to follow. However, greenhouses still currently exist in historic districts.

The exterior design of the proposed greenhouse is specifically designed to accommodate maximum efficiency based on the manufacturer's engineering. However, the design elements that are included that do not compromise the integrity of the engineering have been incorporated to contribute to the historic value of the district. That being,

1. The proposed greenhouse design will include a contributing river rock stem wall that will match the existing historic exterior of the property.

2. The structure will be stuccoed to match the existing stucco in areas where it may be needed in order to create a sense of historic continuity for homeowners to whom it will not be primarily visible to as the location of the proposed greenhouse is planned to sit with-in the inner walled courtyard of the additionally walled off property. The two existing walls will offer almost zero visibility to neighbors and the surrounding public streets.

Staff Response: Staff agrees that specific design of greenhouse structures within the districts is not specifically defined, but greenhouses do contribute to the heterogeneity of that allows people to continue to live in the historic districts. Other designs were not presented but can be discussed by the applicant at the hearing.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS

14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District

(1) Old Santa Fe Style

(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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All H Districts and the exception to 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic Design Standards has been met.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked the distance from the street wall to the proposed greenhouse.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas didn't know. She displayed the site showing locations.

Chair Rios thought it appeared quite a ways from the wall and she would ask the applicant. She asked to confirm from the street you could see a stucco slanted wall. She assumed you could not see any glass.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she wouldn't. She displayed the illustration of the greenhouse window and door.

Mr. Roybal thanked the applicant for a great job of meeting the requests of the Board. He applauded the applicant for "an amazing job."

Vice Chair Katz asked if the door to the left is like the other multi-pane doors.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said all of the doors have divided lights. There is a window that is not 30" on diagonal, but it is not divided lite. The door proposed to be the divided light will go into the garage.

Vice Chair Katz said he wasn't clear from the packet what the stucco would be applied to and he was hoping it wouldn't be plywood.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas suggested the applicant respond. She thought it was a custom design for the greenhouse. It will be a more robust and congruent stucco application.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

John Santos, with Dean Jellico Enterprises, 1718 Cerrillos Road, was sworn.

Chair Rios asked for the distance from the street wall to the greenhouse and another question was what kind of stucco is applied to on the slanted wall.

Mr. Santos explained the distance is 50 feet from the stucco wall to the existing stone wall. The application of the stucco wall will be engineered with the proposed greenhouse. It will be 2x6 plywood sheeting with the normal stucco process of paper, the lath, the brown coat, and stucco. The image shows sharp lines, but he will follow rounded edges that are more consistent with the house.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

There were no other questions for the applicant.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Eddy, previously sworn, found the sharp angles jarring and a departure from the architecture of the house. The garden wall has a beautiful undulation on both ends of the wall. Creating undulations on the angled wall of the greenhouse to make it similar to the garden wall would make it less jarring. The height of the wall could be raised closer to that of the gate entrance. Possibly, the undulation could be matched on that side as well. He admitted he was obviously redesigning but wondered how others felt about the hardness of the angle.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn, said she wondered why the applicant didn't do a free-standing greenhouse north of the pool. She agreed about the sharp angle. She asked, since they are doing 2 x 6 construction if there could be a step-down parapet to be more in keeping with other parts of the building. She thought the angle disharmonious with the structure.

Will McDonald, 488 Arroyo Tenorio was sworn. He lives directly across the street and sees the front of the house from his kitchen window. He displayed a photograph that showed the rooftop appurtenances on the garage. He showed a close up of the mini condenser and a satellite dish. He wasn't sure what purpose the satellite dish served, possibly it was for the guest house, but he sees these every day. He would appreciate it if they were removed. The mini-split condenser apparently cools something in the garage, and he would like that addressed.

Chair Rios allowed Mr. McDonald to continue speaking after two minutes.

Mr. McDonald showed photographs of the façade with the greenhouse. He said he could see quite a bit of the greenhouse and didn't feel it had a negative impact. But further west, looking back, he took a photograph from the street and noted you will be able to see the glass of the greenhouse. It is not as invisible as portrayed.

Chair Rios asked how much of the glass could be seen and from where.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas displayed a street view of the greenhouse.

Chair Rios asked the purpose of the satellite dish and mini-split condenser.

Mr. Santos replied he wasn't sure VIYR the purpose of the satellite, possibly it is not being used. He didn't know and couldn't answer.

Chair Rios confirmed if the satellite services are not being used, it could be removed. She asked about the mini-split.

Mr. Santos said the mini split is for cooling. The three options given at the last meeting were to remove, screen, or paint the unit. The most complicated and expensive would be removing the system more than screening. Painting is the most convenient, but the applicant is willing to do what the Board recommends.

Vice Chair Katz followed up on Mr. Eddy's comment about softening the stuccoed wall. He asked if the wall could step down or undulate, so the angle wasn't as sharp.

Mr. Santos replied doing that would be a design challenge because of the pitch. They tried to adjust the pitch as much as possible, considering the sharp angle and nature of the garden wall. There were two approaches, to alter the slope of the greenhouse to match the garden wall, or for the garden wall to match the greenhouse wall. The existing step downs are curved and not extremely angled. But with the garden wall accent on top of the greenhouse wall, you would still have an angled slope. It would look awkward. The slope was left as it was because it seemed less visually distracting.

Mr. Santos said the ceiling of the greenhouse is sloped and also creates an awkward visual for the resident. They tried to accommodate the front that is visible as much as possible. Potentially they could add a subtle accent but wasn't sure that would be effective. The biggest visual conflict is the extreme slope and flat angle of the garden wall. It conflicts in a lot of ways and has been a challenge. Even doing a curved step down it will still put it into an extreme slope.

Mr. Santos said they were open to any recommendations to make this work.

Chair Rios thanked Mr. Santos for his cooperative spirit. She asked the length of the angled wall, corner to corner from the tallest to the lowest part.

Mr. Santos replied it is 15' 6" or so. It will be bigger than the greenhouse. From the other side of the greenhouse there is an envelope extending 6-8 feet.

Member Larson didn't have an issue with the angle on the wall, but the stucco looked squared off in the renderings. It would look nicer if the stucco were rounded. Her suggestion was a parapet rather than being flush with the

greenhouse wall that would add more step down to match the yard wall. She realized that having the structure going all the way up to the parapet on the regular house, could be a challenge.

Member Bienvenu agreed with the comments. He found it looked extremely geometric. He thought if this were completely visible from the road it would probably be unacceptable. He was concerned upon learning that more glass will be visible from some places on the road. That might be minimal, but what is visible is just the top portion of the structure. What is proposed will solve the public part if something can be done along the top to mimic the undulating pattern or for a step down pattern on the wall. The challenge then will be to integrate that with the rest of what is not publicly visible.

Member Bienvenu thought making those modifications will fit with what the Board was seeking at the last hearing. He appreciated the applicant's ongoing willingness to accommodate the additional concerns.

He asked Mr. Santos if he knew the cost to put the mini splits on the ground.

Mr. Santos replied it is around \$2,000 for the one on the garage with repairs to the roof, the removal and labor. The residence mini-split is already fully screened and is not visible.

Member Bienvenu felt that was not unreasonable. He believed the Board would have required the condensers be on the ground originally. He was in favor of that as the solution to the issue.

Ms. Paez noted that Ms. Beninato wanted to comment again, and Mr. McDonald had been allowed to speak longer than two minutes.

Chair Rios called on Ms. Beninato.

Ms. Beninato commented that in the photograph she saw you could still see a couple of inches of the mini-split even with the shielding. The request that it be on the ground is appropriate as it was done without approval. If they allow the condenser to be shielded, it should be higher than the condenser to be not visible from the road.

Chair Rios asked if Mr. Santos about his statement that two of the mini-splits were already shielded and there was only one to shield or put on the ground.

Mr. Santos replied the one on the residence is screened and not visible. The one shown in the photograph is on the garage and was inherited by the new owners.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas understood they were installed by the real estate agent . She confirmed two are already screened. The one on the garage has just a bit of the screen closest to the house that can be seen.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2020-00 2916-HDRB. 481 Arroyo Tenorio, Vice Chair Katz moved to approve the application with the conditions that 1) The roof top appurtenances, the mini-split and satellite dish on the garage be removed to the ground. 2) Effort made to minimize the straight angled line of the greenhouse that will be stuccoed through stepping down at the top, etc. Member Bienvenu seconded the motion.

Member Bienvenu requested a friendly amendment for the radius of the stucco corners visible on the new greenhouse match those on the existing structure. Vice Chair Katz accepted the amendment.

Chair Rios requested the mini-splits visible from any angle on Arroyo Tenorio, be fully screened. Vice Chair Katz accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas reminded them about the approval of the reroof so the violation is addressed.

Vice Chair Katz added to the motion that the reroof that was done is approved. Member Bienvenu agreed.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-1) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz and Larson voting in favor and Member Roybal voting against.

3. **Case #2020-001979-HDRB. 613 Canyon Road.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Craig Hoopes and Associates, agent for Canyon Room Holdings, owner, proposes to raise the roof, replace and repair windows and doors, reopen an enclosed portal, and other general maintenance on a contributing residential structure, replace windows and doors, install a courtyard, and stucco a non-contributing residential structure, and demolish

all non-contributing structures on the tract A which includes a triplex, 2 storage sheds, and a well house. (Daniel Schwab)

Mr. Schwab presented the report and shared slides of the complex and different structures.

STAFF REPORT

613 Canyon Road is a property with four existing buildings and numerous additional accessory buildings.

Unit B, also known as the Vigil Residence, is designated contributing. It is located in the northeast portion of the property. Unit C1 and C2 (or the Duplex) is also contributing. It is located on the central-east portion of the property, directly south of Unit B. Tract A contains numerous structures that are all non-historic, constructed in the 1970s. Tract A is located in the northwest portion of the property. Unit B is designated contributing. It is known as the Vigil Residence. It is approximately 2000 square feet, mostly from adobe. In case H-18-084-A, the southwestern corner of the structure was designated primary. On the south façade is a cantilevered roof dating from the 1960s and non-historic doors.

Portions of the ceiling of Unit B do not meet IBC code requirements and it is constructed within a setback. The Board of Adjustment has granted the applicant a variance to increase the height and it will be raised to a parapet height of 11 feet. The maximum allowable height is 16 feet. The windows on the primary façades will be repaired. All others will be replaced. They will have divided light patterns and exposed heavy timber lintels. One small window in the rear of the building will be in-filled. The structure will be re-stuccoed using cementitious El-Rey stucco colored "Adobe". A portal that was enclosed in the past to form an entry will be re-established.

Unit C1 and C2 is also contributing. The applicant proposes to replace all windows with metal clad replacements with divided lights. The historic doors will be retained. A small portal matching that on the north elevation will be constructed on the south, non-primary elevation of the structure. It will be then restuccoed in cementitious El Rey "Adobe" and a small courtyard created with CMU walls to a height of 5 feet 6 inches.

The units in Tract A are to be demolished. This includes the triplex, two non-historic wooden accessory sheds and one non-historic well-house built over an abandoned well. It is intended not to propose a new construction for this tract at the present time.

The portal is no longer being applied for because it would require an exception.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked the number of buildings proposed for demolition.

Mr. Schwab replied it is the apartment plus the two small outbuildings.

Chair Rios noted that Mr. Schwab indicated the Tract A buildings were built in the 1970's, but she read they were built in the 1980's. She asked to confirm. Mr. Schwab did not know. She said she would ask the applicant.

Member Biedscheid confirmed the historic doors on the east elevation will be retained.

Mr. Schwab said he couldn't remember where he got the information, but he came to the conclusion the doors were possibly historic.

Member Biedscheid said she couldn't tell if the doors are being retained because in the façade drawings they appear different than in the proposed.

Mr. Schwab thought it a non-historic door on the east elevation.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she presented the case a few years ago before the Board and the doors were not historic.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Charles Rosenberg, 333 Montezuma Ave. was sworn and made no presentation.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Chair Rios asked if the buildings in Tract A are from the 1970's or '80s.

Mr. Rosenberg said he was before the Board a couple of years ago to confirm status of the buildings. John Murphy did an extensive report, and his research showed the buildings were from the 1970's.

Chair Rios confirmed he did not propose to replace any historic windows or doors on the primary façades.

Member Biedscheid indicated a photograph in the HCPI report with a description saying portal walls are painted white with original rustic wood panel doors. She asked Mr. Rosenberg what would happen with the two doors.

Mr. Rosenberg replied it is difficult to see in the photograph, but they will remove the screen door that is in front of the wooden door, but not the wooden door.

PUBLIC HEARING

Stephanie Beninato asked to clarify whether the portal will or will not be restored. She questioned how the Board of Adjustment does approvals before coming to the HDRB. If nothing is being done to a primary façade and the building is not 50 years old, the Board doesn't have jurisdiction to object to the buildings proposed for demolition.

Chair Rios pointed out if the buildings were built in 1970 so they are now 51 years old.

John Eddy questioned demolition on the apartment on Tract A. The additional sheds built in that area are inconsequential. A lot of his friends had rented these homes at that time and this was a family compound shared with outsiders. He agreed the infill over the portal should disappear. He was curious if the fireplace within the portal will remain and continue to be visible to the public.

Mr. Schwab reported that the plan shows the fireplace is not in the portal, it is in the adjacent office and will be retained.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2020-001979-HDRB, 613 Canyon Road, Vice Chair Katz moved to approve as submitted. Member Bienvenu seconded the motion.

Member Bienvenu asked Staff if Findings are need that the standards for demolition were met.

Mr. Schwab replied that wasn't needed.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas disagreed. Member Bienvenu was correct that the Board should affirm the evaluation of the demolition standards.

Member Bienvenu requested a friendly amendment that the motion include that all applicable standards for demolition set forth in Chapter 14.3-14 have been met. Vice Chair Katz accepted the friendly amendment.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

4. **Case #2021-003113-HDRB. 324 Staab Street.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Will McDonald, agent for Sterling Resource Group, owner proposes to alter the roof style, reconfigure windows, and stucco the residence and yardwall on a contributing residential property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray)

Ms. Bordegaray provided the Staff report.

STAFF REPORT

324 Staab Street is a contributing structure to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The Sandoval House is best described as simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival style first built in 1930s, with two additions added by 1942, in the common accretion pattern of historic adobe buildings. It has three masses connected: two symmetrical wings and a tall center section. It has a flat roof and rounded corners. A historical feature is its simple nature with no ornamentation. The structure has been a duplex for a long time. It has undergone minor alterations.

Recently, the applicant received H-Board approval to add a shed portal to the front north façade of the house between the building's two wings. Also approved was a re-roof and re-stucco of the entire structure (Case #2020-002535-HDRB).

The current proposal consists of alterations to the rear of the house to both units A and B. The following are changes proposed:

Unit A

1. Replace two windows on the center of the south elevation. New

windows will be SierraPacific white aluminum clad casements.

2. Replace door on the southern portion of the west elevation. New door will be whitealuminum clad with glass.
3. Remove existing overhang above the door.
4. Replace window and resize window opening on south elevation. New window will be an awning window smaller than the existing window. The new window will be Sierra Pacific white aluminum clad.
5. Replace window on the southern portion of the east elevation. In its place will be a trio of windows: a center picture window flanked by two casement windows. The new windows will be Sierra Pacific white aluminum clad.
6. Replace window on center portion of east elevation. New window will be Sierra Pacificwhite aluminum clad casement.
7. The applicant proposes to reroof the shed roof of the southeastern corner "BedroomTwo".

Unit B

8. Replace window on south end of west elevation and door on south end of south elevation. New windows will be Sierra Pacific white aluminum clad. The new door will be white aluminum clad with glass.
9. Applicant proposes to remove existing overhang over the door.

Units A and B (Entire structure)

10. The applicant proposes to refurbish the windows on the primary north façade and windows on the east and west facades. The applicant proposes to paint the windows white to match white cladding of the new windows.
11. Add six skylights located behind parapets.
12. Restucco the entire house with elastomeric El Rey, color "Tumbleweed" similar to the existing El Rey "Suede." A color swatch is included in the case packet.
13. Restucco front yard wall to match house, El Rey "Tumbleweed."

Staff notes that the applicant received a temporary permit to demolish the eastern half of the historically contributing concrete masonry yard wall during construction. This permit conditions are that the demolished wall portion that was removed be replaced in-kind with respect to design, materials, style, and height, material, and style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff finds that the proposal meets the 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all H Districts, and the 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Standards. Staff conditions approval of this proposal on replacement of the east side of the front yard wall upon final inspection.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked to confirm the wall was designated as contributing. She asked if the wall will be rebuilt since they were given permission to demolish.

Ms. Bordegaray said the wall is contributing and it will be rebuilt in-kind in material, color, height, etc.

Chair Rios asked from what street would the proposed alterations be publicly visible.

Ms. Bordegaray said none are visible, it is in the back of the house.

Chair Rios asked if there is a wall or fence in back.

Ms. Bordegaray said the applicant could speak to that. She did not know.

Chair Rios asked to confirm that all of the windows proposed will have divided lights.

Ms. Bordegaray explained there are both divided and undivided. The non divided are on the south elevation where they will remove wooden casements and replace with lights that are not divided.

Chair Rios asked if that would be approved because they are not on a primary façade.

Ms. Bordegaray said they are not primary façades. She thought the applicant could address why the windows would be different

Chair Rios confirmed that the windows would not be visible from a public way.

She noted six skylights are proposed. She assumed they would be low profile and the motion should include they cannot be seen.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas brought up Google to view the back of the land. She displayed the south side of the street and a view of the primary elevations, east, south and west. The backyard had had no public visibility.

Member Larson asked if Ms. Bordegaray if she said some windows on the primary façade had grilles.

Ms. Bordegaray replied there are grilles on the front of the house. She displayed the windows. The date of the windows is unknown, they are non-historic and most likely added in the 1980's.

Member Larson asked if the date of the distinctive paint colors on the steel windows was known.

Ms. Bordegaray didn't know but suggested the applicant may know.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Mr. McDonald said he didn't know the date on the windows, but they are old-fashioned casement windows. The concrete sills underneath indicate a previous window was there and he thought steel casement windows were probably 1950's. He did not know the age of the color. They are proposing white, but the windows on the back that will be replaced they would like to keep red. Both sets of windows cannot be seen at once.

He asked to display the south elevations and said on the divided lights, Code in 14-5.2 (D?)1.c, says single panes of glass larger than 30 inches are not permissible except otherwise provided by this section. But in 14-5.2 (E).2 Code says, "*Windows, doors, and portals on publicly visible portions of buildings and walls shall be one of the Old Santa Fe styles.*" And in regard to the light divisions, "*except in buildings which may have larger plate glass areas.*" Because this is not on a publicly visible portion of the building he reads that to mean non divided lights are acceptable. It is a question of cost, but he wouldn't fight it. That will not relate to the casements and doors.

He said the three awnings in a row on the south are 24 inches square. He believed they met minimum diagonal.

Chair Rios said she would guess that the proposed six skylights are low profile.

Mr. McDonald replied yes, and in any case, they have tall parapets on this house. Whatever they put there will not be publicly visible.

Member Larson asked about the paint colors. She finds that defining of the time period of the house. She said it would be ideal if he brought a sample for the Board to see to make a more informed decision on approving a change in color. She thanked Mr. McDonald for being flexible.

Mr. McDonald said he was willing for the color to remain red.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas asked if the stucco is elastomeric.

Mr. McDonald replied it is for the entire house and a matter of keeping the costs down.

Chair Rios confirmed this is a contributing house and the original stucco was cementitious. She said normally the Board encourages applicants continue the original, cementitious.

Mr. McDonald said he could live with that.

Member Biedscheid asked that the concrete sills be preserved and not stuccoed over.

Mr. McDonald explained they are currently stuccoed over from he thought, the installation of the steel casements. It would take some effort to clean them and they would prefer not.

Member Biedscheid said she didn't intend that he remove the stucco. She was hoping that the application of the stucco wouldn't change the general shape.

Mr. McDonald replied no they will add stucco, but it will not change the look. He believed the concrete sill preserves the nature of the historic building.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said on the windows on the east and west side, Mr. McDonald indicated at least one of those will be publicly visible. There should be more discussion on how visually compatible a white window and a red window will be. And if there will be a disruption of harmony with the changes to the windows. She preferred divided lite windows on Unit B and agreed Unit A, the window interferes with the view of the façade. She found it

ironic they insisted on having a portal. Not just an eyebrow over the primary façade of the front door but one that extended over the entire building. Yet they want to remove the windows on the back. Especially for the window on Unit B it would seem they would keep that for practicality. The floor plan shows that windows, at least from the east side, will be visible from an angle.

John Eddy (previously sworn) appreciated that the stucco should remain cementitious in this district was brought up.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Rios asked to see the east and west elevations.

Mr. McDonald addressed Ms. Beninato's comment that on the end of the proposed east elevation at the south end, it is slightly visible from the street. He agreed now that they have discussed keeping the windows red they should match. Both of those windows will be visible at the same time. All of the windows on that side will be cladding for the new windows matching the red, and the others will be painted. None of the west is visible because the fence is about 3 feet from the property line. The windows will be refurbished and can be painted the same as the front. Those are probably not visible about half the year because of vegetation and the fence.

Member Biedscheid preferred the windows and doors be the same color. She asked Staff if Code has a provision requiring a single color in this district.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said there is no provision to require that. She agreed it should have continuity of color in the windows, doors and general style of the house.

Ms. Paez asked they may be thinking about the provision that requires all exterior walls to be painted the same. There isn't one that applies to the windows.

Chair Rios agreed that makes more sense for all windows to be the same color.

Mr. McDonald also agreed and said doing red around the house will be fine.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2020-00113-HDRB, 324 Staab Street, Member Larson moved to approve the application with the following requirements, 1) All approved windows should match the existing red color of the north façade; 2) Unit B is approved with the matching red color and 3) Units A and B, all items are approved with the condition that the stucco be cementitious instead of elastomeric. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion.

Chair Rios made a friendly amendment that none of the skylights are visible.

Member Larson accepted the friendly amendment as did Member Biedscheid.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #2020-002791-HDRB. 530 Garcia Street.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Beverly Foust, owner, requests historic status review and primary façade designation, if applicable, for a non-contributing residential structure. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray) *This Case is postponed.*
2. **Case #2021-003109-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, requests a historic status review of a yardwall on a non-contributing residential property. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)

Mr. Schwab presented the report.

STAFF REPORT

128 West Berger Street is a property with non-contributing status to the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The existing shed was already reviewed for status in 2018, but the street-lining yard wall was not designated.

The wall was built in around 1960 of concrete masonry and has been plastered several times since then. There are a number of similarly high walls close to the street in this streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION 222:31

Staff recommends the historic status of the structure be maintained as non-contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Chair Rios reminded the Board members this was only a historic status review of the wall.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

None

APPLICANT’S PRESENTATION

David Smith, 142 West Berger Street, was sworn.

Chair Rios confirmed that Mr. Smith agreed with the Staff recommendation to keep the status noncontributing. She said she agreed this should remain noncontributing. She pointed out the walls in the neighborhood were either short or no wall and they keep getting higher.

PUBLIC HEARING

John Eddy said he remembered how short the walls were and if you saw a really high wall it communicated the person probably had more money. It is expensive to build a wall, it doesn’t provide a roof, it basically defines your property and gives a modicum of privacy or at least boundary. Shorter walls remind them of a humbler time and why he is taken aback when he sees a really high wall. He knew Chair Rios took a lot of care with this consideration. He encouraged the Board continue to do that as well.

Stefanie Beninato agreed with John Eddy. This is not about privacy but about defining boundaries. Lower walls are more friendly, and it wasn’t about keeping people out. High walls are not a deterrent, they allow crime. If someone gets over the wall you can’t see what is going on. High walls have made Santa Fe less of a community in terms of interaction with neighbors. She hoped the owner’s proposal will keep that in mind.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Rios commented that walls in Santa Fe have been increasing in height for years. Now, often that is how people identify Santa Fe. She has friends visit who are astounded at the number of homes with high walls.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2021-003109-HDRB, 128 West Berger Street, Member Larson moved to approve per Staff recommendation to keep the status noncontributing. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

3. **Case #2021-003110-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street.** Don Gaspar Area Historic District. David Smith, agent/owner, proposes to remove a portion of a non-contributing yardwall and install a vehicle gate to a height of 4 feet 7 inches. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, dnschwab@santafenm.gov)

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Schwab presented his report from memory.

128 West Berger Street is a property with non-contributing status with a noncontributing wall in the Don Gaspar Area Historic District. The shed in the back of the lot was designated non-contributing.

The lot was part of a consolidation in 2018 so that no access is currently available from the street. The applicant now proposes to create a 14 foot wide opening to allow access to the lot and the apartments located on it. This will include a gate that will be constructed to a height of 4 feet 7 inches, which is the maximum allowable wall height. It will be a "Sage" green steel frame to match the house with a wood infill with a Cedar wood stain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked if the proposed gate was solid or could be seen through.

Mr. Schwab explained it has a metal frame with wood panels in between and you cannot see through it.

Member Biedscheid confirmed the allowable height is 4'7", the same height of the proposed gate. She thought it looked shorter than the wall. She asked if the wall is nonconforming.

Mr. Schwab replied yes, it exceeds the allowable maximum height.

Member Biedscheid asked if there is an opportunity to remedy the wall exceeding maximum or could it be a consideration in approving the gate.

Mr. Schwab said it is not a consideration. The opening meets the guidelines and the existing is considered a legal nonconformity.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas responded there is an opportunity to remedy that. The construction is happening to the wall on both sides and this would not pass inspection. They will need to lower the height to six feet and the front yardwall to streetscape standards.

Ms. Paez said in her experience, they normally allow nonconformities to remain if more than two thirds is kept. Based on earlier cases, you can't increase the nonconformity but if reducing the height, normally it would be approved by zoning.

Mr. Schwab understood from similar cases that this is not a demolition and rebuilding. It is a change to an existing nonconforming wall. Demolition is considered as destroying two thirds of the wall. This is less and can remain a legal nonconformity. It is not required to come into conformance other than the new portion, and that conforms.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she didn't see a PZR in the packet. That would answer their question.

Ms. Paez said the box is checked but she didn't see it in the materials presented.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Schwab the height of the existing wall and what height is allowed.

Mr. Schwab said the height of the proposed gate is 4'7" which is same as the maximum allowable height. The existing is at 6'2 inches.

Member Bienvenu said he wondered about the nonconformity as well. The section addressing legal nonconformity is 14-5.2(A)6 and that has two different provisions. One is nonconforming buildings and the other is nonconforming structures. He assumed the wall is a structure and not a building. The section states that for nonconforming buildings they may not be added to or altered in any way unless the proposed addition / alteration would bring the whole to a degree of conformity acceptable to the Board.

Mr. Bienvenu read, for structures Code states, "*Structures not conforming to the style, standards set forth in this section shall be considered nonconforming. No alteration or repair may be made of any such structure other than its removal.*" Either of those seem to imply the rest of it has to be made conforming or it has to be taken down.

Mr. Schwab said he based his comments on the 868 East Alameda street yardwall. He was advised by the Division Manager of the Land Use Zoning Division that it is a legal nonconformity. It is not a demolition, and changes could be made to it without the wall being brought into conformance.

Member Bienvenu said this doesn't raise the demolition section of the ordinance as much as the nonconforming section. He felt the same about the South Armijo Lane case that nonconforming. In that case building, it is not to be changed other than to bring it into conformance. He thought that section applies in this case.

Mr. Schwab noted that the section being changed is being brought into conformance.

Member Bienvenu read from the ordinance, "*The proposed addition or alteration will bring the whole to a degree of conformity*" for buildings. And for structures they are to be taken down.

Ms. Paez said she has never seen Staff apply (A)6. She usually uses the chapter on nonconforming structures and nonconforming uses. She thought Member Bienvenu's interpretation was reasonable. She read, "*Structures other than buildings, including signs, not conforming to the architectural style or sign standards.*" She said that is where she gets lost. An architectural style isn't missing, it's a height limitation. She continued reading, "*shall be considered nonconforming.*" She continued, "*No alteration or repair may be made of any such*

structure other than its removal.” She said that is pretty straightforward and may be a fair application of this, but she has never seen that done.

Mr. Schwab thought the Code provision that governs this is related to *height*.

Ms. Paez said it can be read as suggested. It is problematic that they don't have a PZR that would have been helpful as a zoning review.

Member Bienvenu said it is important section of the ordinance. First, applies it is under the General Provision standard of the ordinance. It clearly has the intent to recognize there will be nonconforming structures when the ordinance was passed, and they want those brought into conformance.

Member Bienvenu thought the intent was that over time, all of the historic districts would conform to general standards. Those that didn't, without a special reason, would be brought into this compliance.

Vice Chair Katz asked to confirm that the 4'7” height is by historic code and not zoning.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said that was correct.

Vice Chair Katz thought that supported member Bienvenu's analysis that it is part of the style of the non-building structure and subject to the provision.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas noted that she received an email from Noah Berke with Planning. He stated according to current Planning, only the portion being removed would need to come into conformance. She reiterated that her experience with section (A)6, is as Member Bienvenu read. Regarding the PZR, zoning would have signed off on it and would not worry about the 6'2” in height.

Chair Rios asked if the ordinance trumped that.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained it can be more restrictive but not less restrictive. And 4'6” is more restrictive because it is by order of the overlay ordinance.

Chair Rios asked to hear from the applicant.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Mr. Smith said none of this was brought to his attention. He provided history that the gate is mandated by the City because it is two lots. This lot only has access from the driveway on the right of the adjoining property. The wall, for the most part, represents the whole lot and there is no access by the previous owner. They never needed it. He wouldn't be doing anything to the wall except giving access to the other lot, because it takes it takes too much parking from his home. He doesn't want the wall, but the City will require it. In his consultations with Mr. Schwab and Mr. Berke it was never mentioned that the whole wall would have to be four foot seven.

Ms. Paez offered to have Mr. Berke join the meeting. Chair Rios said she would like to hear from him.

Mr. Berke explained when Mr. Smith first approached him it was on a lot line adjustment. They discussed the wall, the visibility, and access to the site. He asked Mr. Smith to get approval from Engineering for a curb cut and they granted him access. It is shown on the plat but was never reviewed for zoning compliance. That includes a visibility triangle for anything over 30 inches. Potentially the triangle may require Mr. Smith to demonstrate that the gate meets the site requirements for access to the street. Demolition of part of the wall or set back from the property line may be required. His division has not received a PZR request, but they would not require the entire wall be brought down to 6 feet. Only that visibility be maintained, and the new portion of the fence/gate be 6 feet or less.

Chair Rios thanked Mr. Berke. She said she found the discussion interesting.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Vice Chair Katz asked Mr. Smith if he would be willing to lower the wall to 4'7 inches.

Mr. Smith replied possibly in the future. They might remodel the shed on the back and build a new house behind the wall. He assumed there would be multiple street changes at the time of adding a new house. But this application is just to come into compliance for a legal lot to provide legal access.

Vice Chair Katz said he understood but that would require the wall be lowered to 4 feet 7 inches.

Mr. Smith asked if that was a fact, or under discussion.

Vice Chair Katz said it is under discussion, but he had never known Member Bienvenu to be wrong on a legal issue.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas noted there is some uncertainty based on the traffic engineer not having reviewed if viable for the curb cut entrance. That is an issue too.

Chair Rios asked if possible the application before them may not be appropriate.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained that generally the PZR is part of the application given to the applicant with the packet. The applicant would take that to Current Planning who provides Staff with an approval. The applicant didn't do that and the PZR was missed. The packet says the PZR was not received by Staff and Mr. Berke indicated that the traffic triangle and curb cut may prevent putting in a driveway there.

Chair Rios thought it sounded like a postponement.

Mr. Smith added there is a curb cut permit and Mr. Berke told him something more might be needed to make the wall compliant with visibility. But Mr. Berke never said this could not be accessed from the street.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas agreed a curb cut could happen, but it hasn't been signed off on by the engineer.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato agreed if not requiring demolition of the wall, conformance with the height is required under the historic overlay ordinance. And in this case is more restrictive. She recalled the wall on Alameda was a contributing wall and even though the traffic engineer recommended part of the wall be taken down for sight lines, City Council upheld the Historic Board decision. They asked the owner to work out something with the Board to maintain as much of the wall is possible. It is not asking too much for the current owner, not someone in the future, to bring the structure into conformity. The ordinance is not ambiguous.

Mr. Eddy agreed. He thought having the legal acuity of Member Bienvenu is helpful. The wall will need to be altered and it was unfortunate the applicant was not correctly informed. He thought the Board could not approve the request.

Mr. Smith asked for direction. It appeared that what was needed first he wasn't told about; to go through traffic to find out about the sight lines. He was

advised to go to historic first on the status of the wall and the opening. He asked how to get this before the traffic engineer to find out about sightlines before he makes a design decision.

Chair Rios asked Mr. Berke and Ms. Ramirez Thomas to comment.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas explained the packet Mr. Smith received has the Preliminary Zoning Review Sheet (PZR) standards. Mr. Smith should submit that to Mr. Berke's division and will be routed through Traffic.

Mr. Berke agreed that part of the PZR process which didn't happen was a checkmark showing the traffic engineer sign off. He thought they were talking about two different processes. One is on lot consolidation or lot line adjustment, which is an administrative process through his division. His division would look for access and if a PZR had occurred they would have received a guarantee of sight visibility, and the sight triangle. Most likely that would dictate how the application should move forward. He agreed the more restrictive of the two provisions should be applied and sounds like it will be the historic provision since it is more restrictive.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Berke the height required for visibility.

Mr. Berke said anything over 30 inches has to be set back from the street. The wall is over 30 inches. The status review might tell them if they can remove more portions of the wall. The driveway currently is too small and will not provide access to both lots. He explained they have gone through the Fire Department and the Zoning Review and he thinks the applicant wished to sell the lot. The new owner will get access and have obtained a permit for access, but what that looks like has not been determined.

Chair Rios thanked Mr. Berke.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas apologized for the confusion. She addressed Mr. Smith and explained for future knowledge, the PZR is standard and is required for HDRB applications.

Mr. Smith said he will proceed in that direction but wasn't sure if better to postpone. It may be a totally new design.

Chair Rios suggested postponement would be better for a new design.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas suggested postponement to March 9 and if Mr. Smith is not ready he could be added to the next available agenda.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2021-003110-HDRB. 128 West Berger Street, Member Bienvenu moved to postponed to March 9, 2021 for redesign consistent with discussion. Vice Chair Katz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

4. **Case #2021-003111-HDRB. 314 North Guadalupe Street.** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Andrew Lyons, agent for Jim Heneghan, owner, proposes to construct a freestanding 2,540 sq. ft. residence to the height of 15'0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'1" and 41" high yardwall and pedestrian gate on a contributing property. (Angela Schackel Bordegaray)

Ms. Bordegaray presented the report.

STAFF REPORT

The applicant wishes to construct a 2,540 square feet single-story Spanish-Pueblo Revival style residence on a rectangular site in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The site fronts North Guadalupe Street on the south side. The proposed house will be situated to the north and in front of a 1920s bungalow style house. The existing bungalow is set to the rear of a large lot that is situated at the corner of North Guadalupe and Jose Streets. The bungalow has a historic status of Contributing to the district.

The proposed house will have nearly flat roofs hidden behind parapets and canales. Its front/north elevation is wall-dominated with two facades varying in height. Its proposed height is 15', close to but below the maximum allowable height for this site at 15'1". The house will have a front entry portal on its north façade that matches the house in architectural style. All exposed wood will be stained with Cabot's "Cordovan Brown", and the stain will be used on the exposed wood portion of the galvanized metal-lined canales as well. The applicant proposes a vintage pair of front entry doors to be stained Valspar's "Classic Mahogany".

All but one of the windows will be aluminum-clad wood units, most of which are casements. There are two double-hung units under the front entry portal, and three awning windows in the garage. A vinyl awning window will be installed in the bathroom on the east elevation. Two sets of French doors are proposed on the east elevation. The window and door cladding will be Sierra Pacific "Brown".

The building will have a one-car garage with a metal garage door to be painted to match the stucco. Exterior lights will be antique bronze and rustic brown.

Proposed skylights will be flat Velux-style units, out of public view. The air conditioning condenser will be ground-mounted and located on the east elevation.

A low 41" yard wall will be erected in front of the house at the sidewalk. It will have river rock bases, pilasters and a pedestrian gate. The yard wall height meets the maximum allowable yard wall for this streetscape. The new gate will be constructed of vertical wood planks, with clavos and be stained similar to the front entry doors, "Classic Mahogany".

The new house will be stuccoed with La Habra's "Suffolk" to match the existing yard walls on the site. The yard wall on the west elevation was recently constructed by the owners of the lot behind/south of this site.

The brick paving of the portal will be red, as will the path leading from the portal to the pedestrian gate at the front of the property along North Guadalupe. Story poles were put up.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff finds that the proposed construction meets the General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, Section 14-5.2 (D); Height 14-5.2(D)(9), and the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District 14-5.2(I).

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios confirmed the proposal is right on Guadalupe Street and the height is 15 feet. She asked if the house has step-downs and is more than one level.

Ms. Bordegaray replied it is at one level, but the front elevation has a couple of different façades.

Chair Rios confirmed the house is 2500 square feet. She said she assumes the open space is in compliance.

Ms. Bordegaray explained it was a zoning consideration if referring to lot coverage. This has met been reviewed and met the preliminary zoning review standards.

Chair Rios asked if she was seeing different light patterns on the windows on the west elevation.

Ms. Bordegaray believed they were all the same.

Chair Rios asked if the person sending the letter of concern would speak tonight or if Bordegaray could summarize their concerns in regard to the Board.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas noted that the person is present and intends to comment.

Member Biedscheid asked to clarify that the existing bungalow on the property is the proposed residence.

Ms. Bordegaray explained it is on a separate lot behind this project. She thought there was a lot split.

Member Biedscheid explained she was asking because the bungalow is a contributing structure. Her concern is the impact to the unique setback from Guadalupe of the contributing status of the bungalow. It certainly blocks the view and inhibits its ability to contribute to the streetscape. She wasn't sure how to look at that if separate properties.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Andrew Lyons, PO Box 8858, was sworn. He clarified that in this zoning district there are no lot coverage restrictions that apply. The lot coverage is 27.8% between the two houses. Secondly, the bungalow is on the same property at the southern end.

Three new houses are being built at same time and will be subdivided at some point. The property beyond is where three new houses are being built. The property was recently subdivided. The site plan shows the existing bungalow to the south and the proposed new house to the north on one lot.

Lastly, the height of the proposed house varies. The portal is the lowest section, there is an enclosed section for a bathroom and closet behind the two windows, and the higher areas are the living room, dining room, and kitchen. Moving south toward the bungalow the structure drops 2 feet over the bedrooms and drops again to the garage.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Chair Rios asked if the light patterns on the windows were the same.

Mr. Lyons was not sure what she meant. He noted on the elevation displayed that the two windows in the bedrooms are wider than the window in the living room and the tall skinny French doors. The door has divided lights but is not wide enough for vertical mullion so there are horizontal divisions.

Member Roybal asked if the corners will be rounded because the drawings show sharp corners.

Mr. Lyons replied yes, the intent is to be the classic Pueblo Revival with rounded corners and parapets and a softer look.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato said this property epitomizes greed in Santa Fe. The bungalow house was the sole structure on the property. The back lot was supposed to be two, but the owner put three units. There was a lot of discussion about the wall coming down the driveway and if the garbage pails could be put in front. She recalled one lot. Now the original house will be outsized by the new house.

She thought zoning requirements limited a new structure at 50% or no more than 100% of the existing house. The contributing house will now look like the guest unit. This will obscure the contributing structure which may lead to its downgrade of status. It will no longer be visible unless you're at a certain angle.

She couldn't understand how they can put a house bigger than the original house. This will really change the look of the house and the feel of the lot which had a lot of open spaces and a beautiful back yard. Now it has three structures on it.

Kathy Rivera, PO 363, was sworn. She is a neighbor and familiar with the history of the property and the lot split and the decision to place the new construction in the back. A bungalow with a very large front yard is rare and unique to the area.

The long-term residents are aware of the contributing status of the bungalow. The property was sold as a contributing property confirmed by the Board in June 2019.

The Board has discussed several times in the last few years the construction in the back as well as the surrounding lots. Some of the discussions included matching colors and styles to this bungalow. The new requests put the bungalow at risk of being hidden altogether.

With respect to the senior planner and the language in the description, she suggested another concept. This is not a vacant lot, this is the front yard to the bungalow, and it always has been the front yard. There is not a lot split as confirmed. The lot split was to make the construction in the back.

The new requests will do two things. It will hide the unique house, the bungalow, and keep it hidden from the streetscape and public view. Secondly eliminates the existing front yard, landscape and the two long-standing trees.

She understood the Board's role is a steward of unique properties of the streetscape. She asked them to reject the request. It dramatically changes the existing streetscape of this neighborhood and completely hides the unique contributing building from public view. It is not in keeping with good stewardship of contributing buildings, especially one that makes a statement just by its presence.

Long-term precedent that shows its time and place and use in Santa Fe. We will no longer be able to see the bungalow from the street. This flies in the face of the understanding of the original construction. Concerns was that the construction should be placed in the back so as not to detract from the façade of the contributing building and large front yard.

Mr. Eddy heartily agreed with both speakers. The fact that this is a single lot, and the property is being developed is a deal breaker. If it had been a lot split they would have a different argument. The view of the bungalow in the back will be obliterated. It is again erasure of the cultural fabric of Guadalupe Street. It is the first view many people see coming into Santa Fe from the north. It is worth protecting and earlier speakers made compelling arguments for that.

Chair Rios asked the name of the person who sent the letter of concern.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas stated it was Mr. Raven Wingert who appeared to have left the meeting. She offered to summarize his letter.

She said Mr. Wingert's primary point is that a project is scheduled on North Guadalupe to begin this year which impacts the intersection of North Guadalupe and Jose street. The intersection has been problematic for years. His concern is that this project site and the residential project on 502 José Street proposed for 314 units have not considered that Guadalupe Street modifications will begin soon.

The City's own publications explain the evolution of development of Guadalupe Westside district from family farmlands to subdivisions. The architectural impact was it is a neighborhood of bungalows. Another issue is that while the urban design features retaining trees that are healthy with trunks larger than 6 inches, the tree in the front of the property has a beautiful form in regard to the vegetation.

While the parks project is nearing completion and the Hennigan project will initiate construction. Construction access should not use the single driveway planned for road projects. He worries about congestion by construction in multiple construction projects.

The Guadalupe Westside Historic District bungalows (he attached a diagram of the number of existing in proximity to the subject property), while this is a bungalow it has not been externally modified. The proposed new residence at 2540 sf does not acknowledge the historic existence of bungalows.

The new primary residence does not include any significant sheltered exterior space nor leave any for future owners. There are only two parking spaces for the owners and visitors because of a much larger parking area at the south end of the property. It is more than 200 feet for guests to reach the entrance to the residence and slightly more than 100 feet to the closest parking.

Chair Rios said the letter will be made part of the record of this case.

She asked Mr. Lyons to address the comments from Mr. Wingert.

Mr. Lyons said both he and the owner Jim Henneghan wanted to comment.

Mr. Lyons said regarding the construction access, this driveway is dedicated for both this property and the property in the rear. Mr. Wingert's suggestion for a second driveway would have to go before City Traffic. They already have a driveway. He doubted a second driveway off Guadalupe would be approved when

there is already a dedicated driveway. His client, James Henneghan, can address the remaining questions.

Ms. Henneghan, 2321 Calle Calibri, was sworn. She found it unfortunate they are called greedy for the plans they have. We are just trying to build a home for a family of five and have taken care to ensure the project follows codes and laws. They are not asking for any exceptions. They have worked collaboratively with Jay Parks throughout the process to ensure it is both good for the neighborhood and all regulations are followed.

Regarding the comments in the letter. Ms. Henneghan addressed the ingress and parking planned for both properties. Parking exceeds the requirements for in number of spots. The trees on the property have been neglected for at least a decade. They are not as healthy as indicated. Regarding the style of the home with followed guidelines for design in all aspects. She was not aware of any rule governing them to make the design any different. If compared to the others in the area she would reiterate there are homes, restaurants, breweries, a Blakes, and a clinic, so a variety of structures.

She is also a native New Mexican and values the aesthetics of our city. We also want to make Santa Fe a livable city for us. The intent is to live in this neighborhood. There is no greed involved, we just want to build a house our family fits into. She believes the house is aesthetically pleasing and in line with the aesthetics of Santa Fe and complies with the requirements as well.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Henneghan if she was or was not the owner of the bungalow.

Ms. Henneghan said she is the owner.

Chair Rios asked Staff to describe the neighborhood density.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas replied the neighborhood is incredibly dense for Jose Street. There are a significant number of units off and away from Guadalupe Street. At 314, where the property is, is very open in the front with a long yard. It is commercial because it is BCD along Guadalupe. The level of congestion is from the back from Jose Street. The plan is to realign but the intent is to make it more pedestrian friendly and less of a traffic thoroughfare.

Mr. Roybal was concerned that the applicant went through a lot to meet all the requirements to build their home on this lot. There is a mixture of everything on Guadalupe and building this home is not going to affect the district. He is concerned the Board is trying to redirect this when the applicant met the

requirements. It will make a wonderful home for a family and is close to downtown and all of the activity on Guadalupe.

He said he is in favor of the project and also the rights of someone who buys a lot to build a home on it. He thought the project should be approved.

Member Larson indicated the public raised valid points, especially regarding the contributing building. This does tell the story of the district with the deep lot. She thought that important to consider. The design of the house is in compliance and done well and she had nothing to add to the design. But it is difficult because the Board is trying to protect character of the district. They couldn't say that nothing can be built there, but they can try to mitigate what would be lost if this is added to the streetscape.

She asked to look at the streetscape on Google Maps. She noted the mature trees on the lot which make it more difficult because they tell the landscape history.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas noted that the Board has no purview regarding vegetation. She said Mr. Berke could comment on the preservation of mature trees.

Member Biedscheid agreed with the members of the public and thanked them for being so forceful in their comments. She sympathized with the applicant who followed the rules on design. But she isn't able to look at the design of the house because of its impact on the contributing bungalow.

She said they sometimes tend to devalue open spaces when making decisions. The description of a vacant lot is not accurate for this project. This is part of the contributing structure and its placement on the lot is important. She read from 14-5.2(D)1(a) on the status of the building, "*The removal of historic materials or alterations of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.*" She said the space contributing to part of the status here is affected by the proposal.

She said Ms. Beninato pointed out the long conversations the Board has had about the wall and the colors and the impact the development had on the back of this property. To discount the impact of something right on Guadalupe is inconsistent with our discussions when we approved development in the back. It is about the placement on the lot and its impact to the contributing bungalow.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas reviewed the Google map overview noting the bungalow isn't visible. The intersection of Guadalupe and Jose Streets was shown;

across the street is an Alsups with a Martinizing next door. Jose Street has a veterinary office and a small building and there are several properties further back.

Member Bienvenu said he appreciated the applicant's frustration. It is a beautiful project and they have done a great job and are correct that it is designed within the guidelines. In fact, the building is much nicer than most others on Guadalupe. The problem is that it is hiding and dwarfing the contributing structure.

He said the ordinance is very specific if new construction causes a downgrade of an existing structure the Board may deny the application. In this case, he concludes the new construction would downgrade the bungalow because it would become invisible. It almost would make no sense being on the same lot with a structure that is immediately adjacent and in front of it on the street and bears no harmony with it. In this case this particular contributing structure is significant enough that the Board does not want to lose it. Also, the owner of the property could probably predict that they would not be able to expand on the remaining parts of the lot. He was inclined, for those reasons, to believe this would not be approved.

Vice Chair Katz asked where the back line of the property is on the photograph displayed.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas indicated what she believed to be the back of the property, but Mr. Lyons indicated it was further down and directed her to the correct location.

Vice Chair Katz said he agreed with the comments that the new construction was blocking the contributing structure and is harmful to the streetscape.

Mr. Berke explained a lot split was done and is a legal lot of record and shows the lot line. Staff looks at the BCD section of Code which is streetscape section. He pointed out that Code talks about design objectives for the townscape and the BCD Westside Guadalupe. It says to maintain the small scale and residential character and streetscape. After that Staff looks at the BCD guidelines for development, which has no density requirement. There is also no landscape requirement. The surrounding neighborhood directly to the east is high density residential (R-29). The development patterns show many small individual lots and a lot of density. Multiple units are on single parcels sometimes in excess of 10 units. Also, gradually you come to this property with a mix of residential, small residential, as well as commercial development.

There are no landscaping requirements for this property because it is the BCD Westside Guadalupe subdistrict. Also, significant trees of six-inches or

greater are only required to be replaced if required as part of a development review, such as screening or part of the streetscape. This project was looked at as a house and a guest house. The bungalow is considered a guest house because the new development will be the primary dwelling unit. It meets all setback requirements and satisfies the streetscape ordinance for the district.

Chair Rios asked for more information on the lot split.

Mr. Berke shared his screen. Ms. Bordegaray indicated it is included in the packet. The applicant submitted the lot split in 2019. The lot line was displayed showing splitting the property into two tracts. Plans were reviewed by Fire and the DRT team. The rear lots with 3 units were shown. This was processed through a formal lot split and the applicant submitted a permit for the three units in the back. The lot split was approved and was publicly noticed and heard by the Summary Committee in 2019.

Chair Rios confirmed that the property being discussed now with a bungalow house is not the lot that is the split lot. The split is further back.

Mr. Lyons added the lot line indicated by Mr. Berke was incorrect and it was actually further north.

Mr. Berke apologized and agreed, it is behind the bungalow.

Mr. Lyons added that when you view the aerial of Google Earth, they can see the lot was all farmland at one point. The lot is an anomaly and is a large lot with vacant land in comparison to the surrounding neighborhood. That was especially the case prior to the lot split and the three new houses in back that were built.

Mr. Lyons said 314 and 314A was all one lot until two years ago. It is not out of character for a house to be built on the forward northern portion of a lot. In fact, it is in keeping with the rest of the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas wanted to look at the contributing status of the bungalow at the back in depth. She read from Code, (D)1.A, *"The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved or proposed alteration, will cause a structure to lose significant contributing or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic material or alteration or architectural features or spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited."*

She said the challenge with calling on the spaces is that landscaping, yard, etc., cannot be part of the contributing status of the property. It is questionable to interpret yard space as one that embodies the status. Her understanding and experience of code is that refers to more like a courtyard or similar space created by surrounding structure.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas cautioned the Board to consider how the contributing status or any of the primary façades of the actual structure that is contributing, is affected by building a house near or in front of it.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Ramirez Thomas to remind them of the primary façades.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas replied she heard them cited and would have to look at the case where it was designated. She guessed it would be the east and north façades because they are publicly visible.

Chair Rios said it appeared the entrance to the bungalow was on the south elevation. Ms. Ramirez Thomas didn't know.

Chair Rios asked to confirm with Ms. Heneghan.

Ms. Heneghan said the entrance faces Guadalupe.

Mr. Lyons said there is an entrance on both north and south. He explained there is a back door into the bungalow from the garage.

Ms. Heneghan said she wanted to take a moment to reiterate they have been thoughtful about reviewing. They have followed the rules regarding the space versus the structure when it comes to a contributing status. She responded to Member Bienvenu who questioned why we might have the impression we would be allowed to do this. She wants to reiterate that there was nothing to indicate that they would *not* be allowed to do this. They have gone through many milestones. They purchased the lot they subdivided it and got the permits. There were many opportunities to see caveats. The answer to that question is nothing was indicated that they could not move forward in this way.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Member Bienvenu thanked Ms. Heneghan for her explanation. He said he did not mean to suggest that she actually had that knowledge. He was just remarking that the public could have known based on the facts.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case 2021-003111-HDRB, 314 North Guadalupe Street. Member Bienvenu moved the application be denied on the basis that the proposed new construction would cause the adjacent structure on the lot to lose its contributing status, per 14-5.2(D)1.b of the ordinance.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (3-2) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu and Katz voting in favor and Larson and Roybal voting against.

Chair Rios explained to the applicant the appeal process to City Council and Staff could guide them.

5. **Case #2021-003114-HDRB. 630 Canyon Road.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Lorn Tryk Architects, agent for Santa Fe Monthly Meeting of Friends, owner, proposes to construct a 2,085 sq. ft. freestanding non-residential structure to a height of 14' 8" on a significant property. (Daniel Schwab)

Mr. Schwab provided the Staff report.

STAFF REPORT

630 Canyon Road is property with non-residential structure designated Significant to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The main structure on the street, known as the Olive Rush House, is a significant structure used by the Santa Fe Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

The Society proposes to construct a new structure behind the main structure, in a location with no public visibility. It will have 1500 square feet of heated space and 585 square feet of portal. The maximum allowable height is 14 feet 9 inches, and the structure will be 14 feet 8 inches in height. The main room will have an octagonal form, with additional rooms on the west, north and south. Portals will extend in front of the north façade and the southeast corner. The stucco will be El Rey "Buckskin." The windows and doors will be colored Sierra Pacific "Seawolf" and the wood framing of the portals will be clear stained. All rooftop appurtenances will be screened by parapets and outdoor lighting will be dark sky-compliant sconces with an oil-rubbed bronze finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios asked how far back the proposed is from the significant house.

Mr. Schwab did not know. He suggested asking the applicant.

Chair Rios asked what is on the roof of the proposed building.

Mr. Schwab indicated that is the top of the portal. She was seeing the octagonal shape, but the roof is flat and conforms to the design guidelines. It could be seen if standing behind the Society of Friends House but not publicly.

Chair Rios asked if the trees currently existed.

Mr. Schwab said it is similar, but the photograph is doctored.

Member Roybal asked if this is a commercial building being added in a residential area and the front building contributing or significant.

Mr. Schwab explained the front building is significant.

Member Roybal asked if this is the same problem as the prior case that it would be devalued as significant when a new building is added on the same lot.

Mr. Schwab said it is not the same. This is located behind the main structure many feet away with no public visibility. It will not change visibility of the significant structure.

Mr. Roybal said the building sounds more like a commercial building than residential.

Mr. Schwab explained it is a meeting room and community space for the Society of Friends, a religious institution.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Jan-Willem Jansen was affirmed (sworn). He explained they are a religious Society of Friends, Quakers, located on Canyon Road. He said we have been here many decades and have outgrown our building. We looked for a while for a new meeting space and that led us to look at opportunities for a meeting space /worship hall in the back of the property. The purpose of their application is to have more space for worship and the children, currently tucked away in a small space. This is an opportunity to expand.

Chair Rios asked the distance between the significant house and the proposed building.

Mr. Jansen replied it is about 85-90 feet from the old to the new building.

Mr. Schwab added the architect, Jan Wiesnewski he has been working with also wanted to comment.

Mr. Jan Wiesnewski, PO Box 98, Tesuque, New Mexico was sworn. He thought Mr. Jansen covered most of it. The main reason for the building and the garden is that the Friends want to stay on the property, not sell. Even though it impacts the garden, it is the best choice. The rendering is a realistic rendering of the garden with the new building drawn into it.

He said the main meeting room will be adobe, not only traditional material for the area but works well acoustically and in other ways too. The main octagonal will be adobe with rest wood frame, including the portal. The materials will be traditional, and the design is simple, and the colors will be similar to existing structures.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

There were no questions for the applicant.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said she's very excited that the Friends will stay in that location and have proposed a very innovative structure. This will not impact any façades of the significant structure. The New Mexico Museum Foundation was approved by the Board for a triangular building. This building is in keeping with the Society's needs for a rounded room. They have had a school for children for a long time. This is a very adaptive and good use of a large lot.

Regarding concerns of similarity to the previous case, a case on Don Gaspar was far back from the street and they wanted to put up a fence. The Board denied that because of the large setback, and not typical of the lot. She hoped that the Friends would maintain the old meeting room as well.

Bettina Rafael was affirmed.

Bettina Raphael, 611 Cortez Street, said she has lived here 30 years and has functioned as an art conservator and restorer of historic objects. She feels strongly about historic and object preservation. She has been attending the Quaker meeting for at least 15 years and is familiar with the project and the history of Olive Rush.

Ms. Raphael said the Board has not been given background on the importance of this property. She provided history on Olive Rush who came to Santa Fe in 1920 and bought the house. She lived in it until her death in 1966 and in that time was considered the First Lady of the Arts by the art colony. Ms. Rush painted the La Fonda Hotel, taught at the Indian School and her artwork was shown across the country. She was noted for her garden which is where this building is proposed. She was known for soliciting plants from across the city and documenting them and her paintings often reflected her garden.

The back of the property has been neglected for the past 20 years. The front part of the garden between the proposed building and old meeting house was full of vegetables and flowering plants, etc. Ms. Rush was famous for her tea parties that artist of that. Attended. The garden was an intrinsic part of her life and she gave the property to the Friends Society. The agreement was that the property, which she believes includes the garden, and its historic nature be preserved and respected. She thought that was now in question with the proposal to build. The building will consume half of the garden and destroy the remaining in bringing in the building materials. There is no reason to jeopardize the integral history of the property and olive Rush's legacy to construct a 1500 sf building.

Chair Rios asked if she was against the proposed building.

Ms. Raphael said she was and the decision to build is not unified in its approval.

Marilyn Bane, 622 ½ Canyon Road, was sworn. She lives on the other side of the coyote fence from the proposed construction. She has been there 30 years and the ranch house Ms. Raphael referred to was owned by Jose Gonzales and his grandmother and was sold to Ms. Rush. The Friends were good about allowing

the neighbors and visitors view the wonderful garden. She was so proud of the garden that she donated an Olive Rush watercolor to the caretaker of the house.

The view in the photograph was where they had vegetables and it has great sentimental value. They would sit on the benches and enjoy the quiet that is very valuable to a lot of people, not just the neighbors. She has received many phone calls that ask her to stress the importance of the garden. She feels the garden is significant.

Her concern is that the garden will not remain. The only solution she sees possible is if the structure could be further back to give more room for the garden. Another concern is whether all of the construction will remove the trees and the heritage flowers and seeds. If possible, she would ask the design to be moved further back from the main house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Member Biedscheid found it interesting having two cases back to back involving spaces. She felt position was strengthened by this discussion. This is an historic garden that has lot of meaning to the community around the building. This is different from the other case in that the new building does not impact the existing structure. However, it does impact the space. The Friends have been good stewards of the property and the stories of the garden are interesting. That the garden now has pieces of it throughout town lends to the significant status of the building and the legacy of it living on, literally.

She said she was interested to know the applicant's thoughts about the impact to the garden and how that could be mitigated.

Member Larson thanked the public for sharing their stories. That helps the Board have informed discussions and make better decisions. It is difficult to have these considerations on the spot on the modest and thoughtful design. We are an architectural review Board and must consider streetscape. There are few instances when we the Board talks about landscape preservation. She was interested in hearing the thoughts of other members.

Member Bienvenu said the landscape issue is interesting. This garden is completely enclosed at the rear of the property from the view of public right-of-way. He thinks it important and highly respects the views and desire to preserve it. But he doesn't believe it within the Board's jurisdiction, which is limited to matters involving public right-of-way.

He said the hope is that the Society is taking into account to mitigate the effects to the extent possible. Hopefully in their discussion they reach consensus in preserving Olive Rush's legacy. And hopefully they discuss this with other historically minded people interested in preserving what is important to Santa Fe.

Mr. Schwab supported Member Bienvenu's view. The architectural spaces that embody status do not include nonvisible garden areas. It would be difficult to find Code saying this project would have impact on the status of the structure. He understands the Society operates using a consensus based method and the public can express their views. But the Board should consider this a multi-year process. This concept has been gestating over many years and that should be kept in balance when hearing opposing views in this short meeting.

Vice Chair Katz was curious whether the garden could be moved back 20 feet to preserve more of the garden.

Chair Rios asked the architect how much of the garden would be compromised and whether the project could be moved further back to preserve the garden.

Mr. Wiesnewski said yes it is possible. But the shape of the building is specifically designed for the least impact, particularly on significant trees. In particular there is a large mature apricot tree.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas displayed an aerial view from Google Earth.

Chair Rios confirmed Mr. Wiesnewski was saying that the building will be situated is the least compromising to the garden

Mr. Wiesnewski pointed out the winding pathways and the beginning of the building where the pathway terminates. He noted the large tree he preferred to preserve.

Mr. Schwab said it is important to consider that the site has been carefully sited in reference to important elements in the garden. Moving the house further back will likely compromise the tree the Society wants to preserve.

Mr. Jansen added that the location was carefully chosen and is actually where there is only grass. There are no historic plants that will be impacted as mentioned by Ms. Raphael. There will only be junipers and a few lilacs on the north side. Moving the building to the south they are nearing the setback on the rear of the property. In order to keep the property on the southern end usable, they cannot

squeeze that too much. It is currently a children's play area and important to maintain some space there for reasons of safety and usability.

He noted the most valuable part of the garden in the 90 foot area between the old building and the new proposed building will remain entirely intact. The access path will be from the front to the back over the existing path. The main garden will be entirely protected, and a condition with the contractor is only small vehicles and equipment will be used there. They don't want to impact the garden.

Mr. Wiesnewski said he would note that the carport is the primary access to the rear and is part of the protected house. No large equipment will come through the garden. Almost everything will be hand carried or on a golf-cart type vehicle.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2021-003114-HDRB. 630 Canyon Road, Member Bienvenu moved to approve the application as recommended by Staff and as compliant with all applicable design standards. Vice Chair Katz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (5-0) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Bienvenu, Katz, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.

7. **Case #2021-003119-HDRB. 331 De Vargas Street.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Shaw Architecture LLC, agent for Four Plex LLC, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, a non-contributing residential structure. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) to install single panes larger than 30 inches in dimension. (Daniel Schwab, 955-6660, DNSchwab@santafenm.gov)

Mr. Schwab presented the report.

STAFF REPORT

331 De Vargas Street is a multi-unit residential structure in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. It was constructed in 1980 and as such is non-contributing to the district.

It is unclear whether the existing windows are original to the house, although the applicant maintains that they have been in place for over 40 years. A photo from the 1985 HCPI appears to show windows with divided lights and white muntins.

The applicant comes to the Board requesting approval for the following items:

1. Replace two existing doorways with casement windows on the street-facing elevation to match existing fenestration on the building.
The applicant is applying for an exception to Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) to install single panes of glass larger than 30 inches in dimension.
2. Reduce the width the existing full-length stairway so as to service a remaining doorway and install a planter in this location.
3. Stucco over the reduced openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project and finds that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts but does not find that the exception has been met and that the application does not comply with 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards. The Board may find that the exception criteria have been met upon testimony from the applicant.

Mr. Schwab said items two and three are recommended for approval, however the exception has not been met.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Chair Rios confirmed this is the only elevation being impacted.

She asked Ms. Paez to talk about the impact of the conformity standard in reference to the project.

Ms. Paez asked Mr. Schwab if correct that the applicant is replacing nonconforming and want to remain nonconforming.

Mr. Schwab replied existing non-conforming windows will remain and the proposal for the replacement windows is that they match the nonconforming windows.

Ms. Paez explained every nonconforming feature of the house cannot be changed when something is done. Code has to be interpreted reasonably. She mentioned previously, she has never seen Staff apply that provision. The applicant does not want to change the nonconforming features, but she would let the Board debate that. It is a tricky question.

Mr. Schwab explained the argument is having to put in divided lights would create an incongruous overall image. Some windows are divided lights, and some have large panes. The applicant prefers to keep the windows the same.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas clarified the applicant wanted to replace some but not all of the windows. Only windows being removed have to come into compliance, not the entire house. It is what is being changed and why A 6 applies. If a window is not being removed it doesn't have to conform until it is replaced.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION

Steve Shaw, 1061 Bishops Lodge Rd., was sworn. The owners have been on De Vargas since before Castillo came. They appreciate the historic character of the architecture. They have endeavored to keep their buildings in compliance with H-Board covenants and want to do the right thing. This seems the most seamless way to implement modifications needed to keep the space. They are replacing the two doors with smaller fenestration in the same width and everything else. You can see the tops of these from the street.

Mr. Shaw said we have seen as we walked around the building that every piece of fenestration is handled in kind, similar to what is shown. A photograph shows a window at the east end of the façade. That is exactly the window proposed to be introduced in the two doorways.

Mr. Shaw said it would be ironic to see the Board recommend architectural alterations to a longstanding architectural precedent. He said their case, and the exceptions, were that it would compromise the character, the quality of the architecture, and constitute a change from what has been in place since at least the 1980's.

QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT

Vice Chair Katz said he noticed that the rendering of elevations on page A, 3.0, has a large window to the right of the entryway with fake muntins in it. That puzzled him because it is inconsistent with what the applicant said.

Mr. Schwab displayed the rendering.

Mr. Shaw explained those are not muntins, but an applique applied by a tenant to the inside face of the windows. The tenant preferred “divided light” windows. They are not in any way even similes of divided light windows.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Beninato (previously sworn) said the Board has discussed this before. They said if it faces the street and is more than 30 inches it has to have divided lights. This building appears consistently not to have divided lights. She felt a better design was not having three doors in a row. She urged the Board to approve this.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Rios said in her experience on the Board there have been applications that have non-divided lights and the applicant wanted to put additional non-divided lights. And because the Board feels it appropriate to continue with the same windows, they approve the non-divided lights.

Member Larson asked if that should be specified in the motion.

Ms. Paez replied Staff recommended the exception not be approved so it would help Staff when preparing the final written decision to have the Board’s Findings on how the exception criteria was met and what they found compelling.

Mr. Schwab explained the exception criteria refers to the district as a whole. The decision of the Board should reflect the concern for the district standard.

ACTION OF THE BOARD

MOTION: In Case #2021-003119-HDRB. 331 De Vargas Street, Member Larson moved to approve the application as submitted in Items 1 through 3 and finds that the exception criteria for Items 1, 2, and 3 have been met, and the Board agrees with the applicant’s exception responses, specifically that the choice to maintain non-divided light windows is in keeping with the existing structure and harmonizes with the structure’s appearance. Member Roybal seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed by majority (3-2) roll call vote with Members Biedscheid, Larson and Roybal voting in favor and Members Bienvenu (with comment) and Katz voting against.

Member Bienvenu said he voted against for the reasons set forth in Staff Recommendations.

I. DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no discussion items.

J. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Vice Chair Katz brought to the Board's attention the project at the PERA Building. They are installing solar collectors over a portion of the parking area that will be very visible and essentially across from the house just discussed. He wondered if the city had discussed the panels with the State, or if that was possible.

Vice Chair Katz said you can see the canopy solar collectors online. They are all over the parking lot. Possibly the panels could be shielded. He was curious to hear the thoughts of those at the State. He added that the state probably has a good basis to say the structure is not covered by the historic rules and technically they are probably right. But the purpose of that is for conversation between the City and the State. Possibly they could make this be more harmonious.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said no one has contacted her and generally those who maintain the building are very communicative. She offered to have Staff contact them to discuss.

Ms. Paez agreed and said he was right it's probably not required they consult with the Board. She did review the State law regarding the Historic District and Landmarks Act that speaks to this. The Act talks about their ability to apply our ordinance to the renovation of State buildings. That probably excludes solar collectors in the parking lot. And it does talk about construction and renovation of the exterior envelope of a building and defines a building.

She thought it would be a friendly request to collaborate within the spirit of the statute. Paragraph M speaks to capital outlay projects and it is appropriate for Staff to contact someone to initiate input on behalf of the City.

Chair Rios agreed they could approach them on a friendly basis for discussion. She thought it appropriate and people would be open minded in Santa Fe to talk to a preservation Board.

Ms. Ramirez Thomas said she would contact them.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Paez the latest on field trips.

Ms. Paez explained that with yellow status it increases mass gatherings from 5-10 as well as gatherings in vehicles. The opportunity to caravan, or getting a van, is getting closer. The hope is to get to green and they are trending in the right direction.

She is continuing to watch the status. There is more flexibility now to get into a van and drive around, but 10 people cannot socially distance in a van. She is willing to explore options and mentioned it to Director Isaacson. He knows the importance of the trips to the Board regarding their work and is open to exploring it as well.

She is optimistic about the changes and encourages her to consider this as they continue to improve.

Chair Rios asked that she keep them posted.

K. NEXT MEETING: March 9, 2021


L. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rios adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:54 pm,

Approved by:

Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer
For Carl G. Boaz, Inc.