

**Eldorado Community Improvement Association, Inc.**  
**Architectural Committee Meeting Minutes of October 25th, 2016 DRAFT 1**

**TIME AND PLACE:**

The bi-monthly meeting of the ECIA Architecture Committee was held on Tuesday, October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at 7 PM at the Community Center.

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM.

**DESIGNATION OF QUORUM:**

Attending the meeting were members: Chair Katherine Mortimer, Co-Chair David McDonald, Casey Cronin, Gary Moran, Steve Taratula, Board Liaison Pam Henline, and Staff Liaison, Mark Young. A quorum was established for this meeting.

**Announcements:**

1. Mark Young announced that the meeting was being recorded.

**RESIDENTS:**

There were 4 residents attending the meeting as well as one guest.

**Consent Agenda Approvals:**

<b><u>L#</u></b>	<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b><u>Resident</u></b>	<b><u>Nature of Project:</u></b>	<b><u>Details:</u></b>
33607	24 Chusco Road	Kurt Ulrich	Repainting over stucco	Using compliant color similar to approved color Husk
11401	1 Azul Loop	Drew Nucci	Restucco	Compliant color Sto Torreón
10914	2 Hidalgo Court	Debra Ginnings	Garden Wall	Re-submission of plans that had been approved in 2015.
10126	79 Encantado Loop	Lynn Archer	Reroofing	White silicone Roof Approved as site visit
21529	17 Espira Court	Susan Mitchell	Restucco	Compliant color Suede
14714	26 Estambre Road	Dale Kronkrish	Restucco	Complaint color Casa

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. UBL #31514, Jodi Richardson and Dan Curley, 6 Valencia Court, with plans and a variance request to allow for the building of a portal, with a nonconforming metal roof that exceeds 20% of the building's façade and thus requires a variance. The total percentage of non-conforming surface is 30%. The construction of the portal will be of wood construction. Due to the fact that approval of variance is out of the purview of the Architecture Committee the committee could not approve of these plans and is recommending approval to the ECIA Board, for review at their November 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. The reason for the recommendation of this approval is that there are characteristics of this project, specifically the dense vegetation around the home, that ensure that this metal roof will not be visible or well screened and thus not contrary to the intent of the covenants. The required stipulation is that the metal roof shall have a low light reflectivity value of 40 or less

## **NEW PLANS FOR REVIEW:**

**2. UBL# 12601, Larry Knighten, 2 Casa Del Oro Place,** with revised plans to build a 2547 sq. foot addition to his home. The addition will include a 2 car garage, storage, family room and wall. There is a need for a variance due to the structure being 18 feet 4 inches tall. While the committee could not approve of these plans, as it is out of the purview of this committee to approve variance, they are recommending approval of these plans to the Board, due to the fact that the site will prevent the building height to block anyone's views. The stipulations attached to this recommendation are as follows:

- a. Resident shall provide ECIA a vertical dimension of the grade on the plans, within the next 10 days for review by the Board.
- b. Any exterior lighting shall be downward shielded.
- c. Resident shall provide a compliant stucco color to the ECIA, within the next 10 days for review by the Board.

**3. UBL # 13830, Eric and Wendy Redic, 13 Domingo Road,** with plans for a 6.107 Kw, 27 Panel, ballast mounted roof PV system. There will be number of arrays with 8 inch visibility of the panels over the parapets. With no issues of compliance the ECIA approved of these plans with the stipulations as follows:

- a. Resident shall contact the ECIA to confirm the height of the system at the time of construction and before the panels are installed.

**4. UBL# 34717, Lisa Jacques-Carroll, 9 Juego Road,** with plans for a coyote fence/dog run with enclosure space of 1700 new enclosure space.4 Height to be 5 feet. Also apportion of fence to be 16 inch tall stem wall with coyote fence top. Gate to be of same construction. With no issues of compliance the ECIA approved of these plans with the stipulations as follows:

- a. All stringers are to be on the inside of the fence.
- b. Resident shall call the ECIA at time of fence construction to ensure the height of the fence is at 5 feet above grade.
- c. Pilar color to match home stucco color.

**5. UBL# 22606, Nolan Zisman, 10 Monterey Road,** with plans for a 8' x 10' x 8 foot tall small accessory structure that is within a few feet of the home. The shed will match the color of the home. The color of the shed is desert tan and the roof will match the color of the home. The shed will be screened with trees. With no issues of compliance the ECIA approved of these plans with the stipulations as follows:

- a. All stringers are to be on the inside of the fence.
- b. Shed and trim to be painted to match the color of the home.
- c. Shed roof can be brown to complement the home.

**6. UBL # 32618, Jose Ortiz, Verano Loop,** with plans for home renovation to include. 1. Parapet change to add height to parapets to hide roof equipment. 2. Removing curved front arches in front area and replacing with a single exposed beam. 3. Enclosing rear patio area to a family room addition. 4. Restuccoing entire home and project color Hazelnut. With no issues of compliance the ECIA approved of these plans with the stipulations as follows:

- a. Any exterior lighting shall be downward shielded.

7. UBL# 30530, Robert Lujan, 3 Sombra Court, with plans for 3 separate 3 foot tall coyote screening fences. 3 to be 8 foot long and 3 feet tall and 2 other shorter 3 foot fences. With no issues of compliance the ECIA approved of these plans with the stipulations as follows:

- a. All stringers are to be on the inside of the fence.

8. UBL # 13303, Vinaya Wall, 2 Vista Grande Drive, with plans for a new 228 sq. foot garage to match the design of the home. Maximum, height will be 10 feet. Windows and doors to match the existing home. Due to the fact that a numerous important details were missing from the plan this plan were tabled pending further details from the applicant.

### **Other Business:**

1. Board Liaison, Pam Henline, pointed out that the Board has done a final Guidelines review and the Proposed Guidelines are now up in the website with a planned open public forum on December 17<sup>th</sup> at 10 AM. All members were encouraged to attend this meeting

2. The committee discussed the upcoming AC Holiday schedule for November, December and January they decided to hold meetings on the following dates, due to issues with having a quorum at these meetings around the holidays. Planned meeting dates are:

November 8<sup>th</sup>

December 6<sup>th</sup>

January 3<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>

### **FINAL ORDER OF BUSINESS:**

There was no further business.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM

Submitted By:

Mark Young, Staff Liaison \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Mark Young

---

**From:** Casey Cronin <caseyjcronin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 28, 2016 4:24 PM  
**To:** Mark Young  
**Cc:** MORTIMER, KATHERINE E. (kemortimer@ci.santa-fe.nm.us); David McDonald (dmcsantafe@yahoo.com); gmoransf@gmail.com; Steve Taratula (iwalkmore@hotmail.com); Robert Miller; Larry Lemmon (lemmon65@msn.com); Isabel Ugarte; Pam Henline  
**Subject:** Re: 1st Draft of Minutes

Hi Mark,

In reference to Old Business (#1), please add to the notes that my position was counter to that of the AC. My position being that no variance is necessary, because the proposed structure is fully in conformance with the Pueblo style of the residence. All portal structures within the pueblo style do not have parapets hiding the roofing surface. Further, the opening paragraph of the "Amended and Restated ... Covenants ..." explicitly grants the Landowner (party to the contract) the right to "... individual expression consistent with the historical traditions of the region." There is no evidence, only subjective opinion (however well informed or not about New Mexico traditions of the region) that the portal in question is out of style. And I disagree that it is out of style enough to warrant the AC's action requiring a variance to allow its construction.

In reference to New Business (#6), please note that I thought this long-span deep beam modification replacing the three arches will not comply with any accepted styles in Eldorado. I do think it will look out of the traditional styles.

In reference to New Business (#2), please add to your text that Covenant Article II, Section 5, Paragraph G states "**No two-story building and no building exceeding eighteen (18) feet as measured from either the floor of the lowest story of the building to the highest point of the building ... or from the lowest point where the natural grade of the lot meets the building to the highest point of the building, which ever is more restrictive shall be allowed ....**"

And, please note that I believe the method of measurement given by the Landowner does not comply with the method required in the Covenant paragraph.

While I am in favor of two-story buildings in Eldorado, as an AC member, I am obligated to highlight problematic issues with the proposed project and the opinion made by the AC. Because the AC accepts the method of measurement given by the Landowner for this two story addition they make precedence for future land development proposals. If the method of measure in the Covenant paragraph is used, the there is less freedom to build two story buildings.

For information about adding up height measurements of a typical building (generally) they may begin like this:

Height of First Floor Level above Highest Grade	Zero Feet--Six Inches
Height of First Level	Eight Feet
Horizontal Structure of Second Floor	One Foot (+)
Height of Second Level	Eight Feet
Horizontal Structure of Flat Roof	One Foot (+)
Height of Parapet (hiding sloped roofing)	One Foot--Six Inches
<u>Total Measure:</u>	<u>Twenty Feet.</u>

Thank you again, Mark, for adding these notes.  
Casey