SOUTH MESQUITE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Following are the minutes of the South Mesquite Design Review Board meeting held on January 8, 2020 in 1158 at City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, NM 88001.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Williams
                          Ernie Campos
                          David Chavez
                          Tony Dahlin
                          Faith Hutson

STAFF PRESENT: Sara Gonzales, CLC Planner
                  Troy Ainsworth, Historic Preservation Specialist
                  Larry Nichols, Community Development
                  Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Sec.

I. CALL TO ORDER (6:00)

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 6, 2019

The minutes were motioned by David Chavez, seconded by Faith Hutson, and unanimously approved.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case 19DR0500142: Request to construct a new addition to an existing upholstery business for a property located at 235 S. Mesquite Street. The subject property is zoned C-2 (General Commercial District) and is located within the Original Townsite in the South Mesquite Overlay District. Submitted by Arrowhead Construction LLC, representative. Council District 1.

   Sara Gonzales described the overall project of a commercial addition to a property that is zoned C-2 with an upholstery business since 2007. The building is noncontributing as original building built in 1969 and last addition built in 2008. The new addition would be to the north side of the property. The addition will incorporate similar paneling/doors, etc. and match the previous addition.

   The case was moved by Tony Dahlin, second by David Chavez, and unanimously approved.

2. Case 19DR0500141: Request to replace windows and doors on the street facing facade of the primary structure located 333 E. Organ Avenue. The subject property is zoned R-4 (High Density Residential and Limited Office
District) and is located within the Original Townsite in the South Mesquite Overlay District. Submitted by Darcy Riley-Pierce and Cesar Pierce, property owners. Council District 1.

Sara Gonzales described the overall project of window and door replacements for a multifamily residence. The structure is listed as contributing per the State Historic Registry due to the original construction done in 1880. The applicant is working with a glass shop to mimic the window design. The windows currently do not seem to fit in the original openings due to framing work already having been done. Also the wood doors have been removed. Front doors will be two panel steel doors for the front facade and steel doors with a window in the rear facade. Applicant is willing to paint the doors to give them a more rustic look.

Code states "materials used for windows are complimentary, but also able to use vinyl clad or aluminum, and should resemble windows in size and in style." Under doors "original doors shall be retained and repaired or restored to the greatest extent possible. If existing doors are beyond repair new ones shall match the original material and should be used in similar in design."

Staff recommends approval with condition that the new doors should be replaced with the original materials based on code provision. The windows should be replaced to fit the original openings of the existing structure.

Tony Dahlin mentioned the windows were close to size of the opening and many were single hung and felt they were fine as is. Robert Williams was in agreement. Troy Ainsworth mentioned buildings are a historic marker, and color would help to blend into the neighborhood.

David Chavez questioned the stoops and asked about restoration/replacement. He also asked about the lighting/light fixtures and the wiring running along the outside of the building and the parapet of part of the building. Darcy Riley-Pierce stated they want to remove the excess wiring. The stoops/steps will be improved and painted to match the building's new color. The lamps/lights they are doing a real basic, Robert's property has similar light fixtures. She mentioned the parapet will remain as is.

Larry Nichols asked about why the work was started without a permit. Darcy Riley-Pierce explained that they hired who they thought was a contractor, but there was a misunderstanding and he was not a contractor. Larry Nichols stated that a stop-work order was posted and a request to acquire proper permitting was requested. The stop-work order was torn down. Darcy Riley-Pierce stated they were unaware of that until speaking with Mr. Chavez. Larry Nichols asked about plans/scope of work for the project. Darcy Riley-Pierce stated they had hired Steven Green. Sara Gonzales gave a discussion about
the permitting process for the various types of permits, permits needed, and
the overall process for permitting and construction.

Tony Dahlin mentioned there being five doors, but Darcy Riley-Pierce stated
the building has been used as a three units and in keeping the historic
appearance it will continue to contain five doors, but only three units. The
intended use will be rentals, residential use as three separate units with two
bedrooms each.

Troy Ainsworth stated he and Sara Gonzales had an in depth discussion a
judicious balance between what the scope of work interd to accomplish and
how to accomplish it within the confines of the district.

Approval to the plans that are submitted that have been discussed here.

Motion to be approved with the recommendations as discussed at this
meeting: being the doors to be as described materials with painting them to

Faith Hutson mentioned that the doors and windows not be white vinyl.

Faith motioned approval with the following conditions;
1) Board is okay with the metal doors being used as long as they have an
appropriate color.
2) Board is fine with also the use of the vinyl windows, provided that they
have color and they are Mullions in them for divided light.
3) Window sizes are fine as is.

The case was moved by Faith Hutson, second by David Chavez, and
approved.

IV. DISCUSSION OF OTHER ITEMS

Robert Williams suggested putting the pamphlet discussion on next month’s
agenda.

David Chavez stated he thought this was the longest case reviewed ever in the
five years he has been on the Board, but the worst abuse of the lack of permits
and the continuation of working on property with pulling the red tag off.

Larry Nichols stated removing the red tag is a violation of the New Mexico
Administrative Code. Violations are responsibility of the property owner.

Troy Ainsworth stated there is a shared responsibility

Faith Hutson mentioned Troy being on the radio and mentioning the ordinance. If
working in a historic area of the City call staff, call the City for information.
David Chavez mentioned that he got a text about something unusual going on at that corner. He walks and saw construction going on. There are no permits on the property. In the afternoon Robert Cruise calls and says there is something going on. When David got there an individual working there must have stepped on a nail and it went through his foot, so there was blood everywhere. So obviously no permit, someone has no insurance. The mess just got worse. David and Troy had a meeting at Klein Park and it is still happening. He got it taken care of at City Hall and it still continued to go. Robert Cruise was talking with the couple who owns the property, both attorneys, and her concern was "are they going to stop having me work on it. We're on a timeline." Robert said "there's a good chance because you haven't pulled any permits." David explained he understands City and state code and that they are in violation, and also someone got hurt they are liable for that also. Owner did say the contractor works in the City.

Sara Gonzales mentioned she had some questions come in. People looking at properties along Campo and they have general questions. Sara would like some feedback so she can direct them. Campo is directly across from Downtown, the height restriction is 14-feet. What does the Board feel about somebody putting mixed use and two-stories? So someone working in the area and residence on top and commercial on the bottom. No plans or applications yet, just need a feel for how the Board feels about the design elements of them because it's more just general questions. Height restrictions amended in 2015, how do we direct them?

Ernie Campos felt that write down questions and bring back to next scheduled meeting to discuss. Robert Williams mentioned it is going to be a case-by-case basis.

Troy Ainsworth stated that a case-by-case approach in the Overlay District design including in the updated Comprehensive Plan the notion of comparable building materials, setback, height, mass, all characteristics. In a general perspective how does everyone feel about infill development I think is the overarching question and what approach does staff take in fielding these questions. There can be overarching design and is it compatible for this particular neighborhood or is it compatible elsewhere.

Faith Hutson stated they have a height restriction for a reason. Careful thought was put into the redo of the overlay and it still needs to be a case-by-case basis because once you set a precedence how to deal with it. Leave it they can apply for a variance.

V. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

VI. ADJOURNMENT (7:22)
Chairperson