



Landmarks & Urban
Conservation Commission



Agenda Number: 6
Case No.: 09-LUCC-50054
Project # 1007470
March 17, 2010

Supplemental Staff Report

Agent	
Applicant	Jon Anderson
Request	Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction
Legal Description	Lots 4 & 5, Block 4, Luna Place Addition
Address/Location	908 Roma Ave. NW
Size	.1492 ac.
Zoning	SU2/TH
Historic Location	Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone

Staff Recommendation

DENIAL of Case # 09-LUCC-50054, Project #1007470, a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction, based on the Findings 1-19 beginning on page 12.

Maryellen Hennessy
Staff Planner

Summary of Analysis

This application is for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing building and construct a new single-family house on a site in the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone. This case was deferred from the January 13, 2008 hearing with direction to the applicant to provide additional justification for demolition of the existing building. This report contains only new information relevant to this application and this report is to be read in conjunction with the staff report dated January 13, 2010.

The applicant has provided economic information related to the request to demolish the existing building. Staff concludes that demolition of the existing building can be justified by the applicant's submittal.

The applicant has also modified the design of the proposed new building. Despite the modifications, staff concludes that the design of the new building uses an architectural vocabulary that is dissimilar to the buildings in the Fourth Ward Overlay Zone. The proposed building demonstrates substantial incompatibility with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward.

The proposal is sufficiently out of conformance with established policies and guidelines to conclude that it does not protect or enhance the historic zone in which it is located and is not eligible for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

PRIMARY REFERENCES: Landmarks and Urban Conservation Ordinance; Design Guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone.

City Departments and other interested agencies were given the opportunity to review this application from 12/17/09 to 1/7/09. Agency comments are found in the January 13, 2010 staff report.

Development Review Division Report:

New Information

This application was deferred from the January 13, 2010 LUCC hearing with direction from the Commission to the applicant to provide additional information to justify the demolition of the existing building at 908 Roma. The LUCC did not consider the appropriateness of the proposed new building at that hearing, concluding that it would be premature to do so without adequate information to decide on the appropriateness of the demolition. The applicant has provided additional information.

The applicant explains that the existing building is essentially a converted garage that does not meet acceptable standards for a residence. The economic information provided demonstrates both current income and expenses associated with the rental property and a projected income and expense scenario that includes amortization of the costs of necessary improvements. The applicant is a licensed professional architect in the State of New Mexico and staff assumes that he is qualified to provide cost estimates.

The current fixed costs associated with the rental property do not include acquisition cost or repairs. As such, the stated current expenses are conservative and perhaps underestimated. The costs associated with up-grading the property to better standards and projected potential rental income for an improved property both seem reasonable and justified. The expenses after improvements do not include interest costs, so again, those expenses are conservative. The economic scenario presented demonstrates a negative cash flow over ten years.

There is also new information regarding the status of the subject building in the historic zone. It was previously reported by staff that the building map of the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone may be in error, since the nomination for the State Register of Cultural Properties included a building list that noted the subject building as “neutral” rather than contributing. That nomination was prepared in 1981.

Further research by staff indicates that when the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay was created by City Council in 1991, the building designation map was referenced and included as an Attachment to the legislation. The map that accompanied the legislation was not identical to the building list on the state nomination or the inventory forms. The map should be considered to contain the official status of the buildings in the overlay zone since it was adopted with the legislation.

As discussed in the previous report, neither the development guidelines for the HOZ nor the LUC Ordinance makes a distinction between contributing or non-contributing buildings with regard to demolition. Consequently, the building’s “status” does not bear on the appropriateness of the demolition.

Finally, the applicant has made modifications to the design of the new building. The design now includes 1) a stucco finish to the masonry block, 2) painting of the metal window frames and 3) lowering the front yard wall to four feet instead of five and 4) a painted aluminum garage door.

The table below repeats much of the analysis contained in the January 13, 2010 staff report, but is modified to reflect the noted changes.

ANALYSIS

4TH Ward Guidelines

The table below provides an evaluation of the submittal as it relates to pertinent aspects of the 4th Ward Guidelines as approved by the LUCC in 2002.

III. Design Guidelines for New Construction	Analysis	Does the submittal satisfy the design guidelines?
A. Standards for New Construction		
1. Public facades of proposals for new buildings shall be more carefully reviewed than other sides. Street appearance is vital.	This design’s public façade comes in layers, the first of which is a yard wall as wide as the house next door and four feet tall. The next layer is a garage wall with overhead door. The next is a two-story wall with very large glass and masonry surfaces. None of the nearby houses, and very few buildings in this Historic Overlay, display anything comparable.	
2. New construction should add visual interest and a sense of scale at the street level, and at the same time be compatible with predominant general characteristics of contributing buildings in the vicinity. The new structure should reflect designs traditionally used in the area.	The proposed building does not reflect designs or general characteristics of the contributing buildings in the area. Compatibility can be achieved with the use of similar shapes, patterns, materials and details. This building employs none of those other than stucco exterior finish.	NO
3. New buildings shall not be imitations of contributing buildings or of other new buildings, but shall be unique in design. Compatibility is appropriate, but imitation is not appropriate.	The proposed building is unique in design and does not attempt to imitate contributing buildings, however, it is not compatible with contributing buildings in the area because it does not utilize similar massing, roof shape or window patterns.	Yes and NO

<p>4. New construction shall have a scale, proportion, and massing similar to that of contributing buildings on the same block. If none exist, then it shall be similar to that of contributing buildings in the area. In all cases, the scale, proportion and massing of new construction will be compared with the scale of contributing buildings.</p>	<p>The scale of the proposed building is not dissimilar to other buildings but the massing is very dissimilar to the contributing buildings. See B.1 below.</p>	<p>Yes and NO</p>
<p>B. Scale, Proportion, and Massing</p>		
<p>1. Scale is how we perceive the size of a building element or space relative to other forms. It can also be defined as the size of a new building and its mass in relation to open spaces. "Human Scale" is a dimension that relates to our own size. Buildings in the Fourth Ward derive their scale from their height, their regular placement on lots, and their abundance of familiar and human-scaled architectural detailing. The scale of Fourth Ward is one to three stories, with larger, deeper lots on the north/south streets, and wider, shallower lots on the east/west streets. The major building type is a single-family house.</p>	<p>This design is set among buildings of lesser scale, but its lot is no larger than those of its neighbors. It is taller perceptually in having a wall on the front façade that rises uninterrupted to 22 feet above grade. Its elements, ranging from street-facing windows to building wall surfaces to the front-yard wall, are far larger than comparable elements of nearby buildings. The width of the façade at 36.5 feet, which is extended visually by the front yard wall, is slightly more than other facades on the block, which range from about thirty to thirty three feet.</p>	
<p>2. Proportion is the relationship between the height and width of a building or opening, or the amount and placement of openings compared to the amount of solid walls. In the Fourth Ward, the relationship between the height and width of a building is usually 1:1 or 2:1. There are a high proportion of windows and doors to walls.</p>	<p>The front façade of this building is thirty-six feet wide and the height is twenty feet, making the proportion 1.8:1</p>	
<p>3. Mass is the geometric bulk of the structure, usually rectangular in form. In the Fourth Ward, buildings are made up of regular larger masses, with smaller masses attached, such as porches or pitched roofs.</p>	<p>This building has one large rectangular mass with the chimney wall and the garage attached as smaller masses, but not the typical massing of porches or pitched roofs.</p>	<p>Yes and No</p>
<p>C. Pattern and Rhythm <i>Pattern is the form of the building, space,</i></p>		

<p><i>or object grouped together. Rhythm is the regular occurrence of those patterns that organize and harmonize a series of like forms or spaces. In Fourth Ward, lot sizes, building sizes, pitched roofs; porches, window and door openings, and street trees all create rhythm. Other patterns and rhythms are window configuration (such as 6/1 panes, grouped in threes) that are repeated throughout the house. Rhythms can be formed using more than one pattern.</i></p>		
<p>1. New construction shall conform to established rhythms on the buildings and on the sites.</p>	<p>This design somewhat conforms to the established rhythm of its block. The front-yard wall is set back ten feet from the front property line, which is not an established rhythm for this neighborhood. Properties either have front yard fences at the front property line or open front yards.</p> <p>The front façade, excepting of the chimney wall and garage is all window and no wall. This is very different from the other window patterns in the Fourth Ward district.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>2. New construction shall employ at least two of the following methods:</p>		
<p>a. Incorporate similar patterns of architectural details from existing contributing buildings. Texture and scale of those details are important considerations, without duplicating a historically accurate detail.</p>	<p>This guideline makes clear the non-necessity of duplicating historic details but calls for relating new construction to historic buildings via similar patterns of details. No pattern of detail similar to contributing buildings can be identified.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>b. Match patterns of exterior materials with those of contributing buildings.</p>	<p>This design has a stucco finish on exterior walls. While some contributing buildings have stucco finishes, clear glass windows and wood front doors, as this design does, the pattern (form and style in an artistic work) of materials in this design is very different. The front façade excepting the chimney and garage is all</p>	<p>NO</p>

	windows and no wall. This is a dissimilar pattern.	
c. Match rooflines with those of contributing buildings.	This roofline mixes flat projecting and flat with parapet. The result matches no contributing building in the area.	NO
d. Incorporate historically accurate patterns of existing doors and windows from contributing buildings.	There is no incorporation of historically accurate patterns.	NO
D. Siting and Setback		
1. The established, traditional setback shall be maintained, unless demonstrated by the applicant to be unattainable.	This block's buildings have consistent front setbacks, and the proposed front setback falls between those of adjacent buildings. The front yard wall, which is set back ten feet from the front property line with planting in front introduces an element that affects the perception of the setback.	Yes and NO
2. If there is no established setback for the block, the setback for new construction shall be determined by using the average setback of the block. If between two buildings, new construction shall match the setback of the adjacent buildings. Where the adjacent buildings do not have a uniform setback, the average setback between the two adjacent buildings shall be used.	The integrated garage influences the front setback of this building. The Downtown Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan requires a twenty-foot front setback for a garage. This can be considered average for the block as shown on the attached aerial photograph. On the west, the adjacent building has a smaller side setback. The front yard wall intrudes on the setback space.	Yes and NO
E. Height		
1. As determined by local zoning requirements and compatible with contributing buildings in the area. Where the allowable height of 26 feet exceeds that traditionally found in the neighborhood, incorporate design features that are harmonious with surrounding properties.	Though twenty feet tall, an allowable two-story height, this design's only lower feature, the garage, does not mitigate the difference between the twenty-foot height and those of surrounding properties whose eaves are less than ten feet	NO

	above grade.	
F. Exterior Materials		
1. The use of traditional materials and those newer materials compatible with contributing buildings in the area is strongly encouraged. Traditional materials include wood, stucco, brick, adobe, stone and cast stone.	Stucco is used in the area, as are wood front doors. Wood is prevalent in the Fourth Ward district and this building has no wood other than the front door.	Yes and NO
2. Plastic, vinyl, aluminum siding or other metals shall not be used, with the exception of metal window frames.	A metal fascia is proposed at the roof, but is to be painted.	Yes and NO
G. Architectural Details		
1. New construction shall not duplicate or replicate any contributing buildings, but rather use them as examples of appropriate style and design features.	This building does not replicate any contributing building style nor does it reference any style or design features of the contributing buildings.	NO
2. Large blank walls are not appropriate.	The fireplace element on the front façade is a large blank wall, as is the front-yard wall.	NO
3. Details and massing shall be on a human scale.	Other than standard sized entry and garage doors, there are no architectural elements that would be considered to be on a "human scale".	NO
4. Front porches are encouraged on all residential structures.	There is no porch provided.	NO
H. Windows: <i>All buildings in the district are marked by an abundance of openings, because when these buildings were constructed, electric lighting was a luxury. The pattern of a high proportion of windows and doors, regularly placed, creates a pleasing rhythm and maintains a human scale.</i>		
1. Residential properties shall have approximately 30% of the wall surface in windows on the ground floor facades (specifically the front facade).	The front façade of the proposed building does not read as distinct upper and lower stories as is typical of houses in the historic district. The fireplace element is a dominant feature that has no separation of upper and lower stories. The garage element appears as a story and a half.	
2. Commercial, office, or multi-family structures shall allow approximately 50% of the ground-	Not applicable	

shall allow approximately 50% of the ground-floor front facade to window and door openings.		
3. Use of traditional window shapes and types is encouraged, with clear glass predominating. Lightly tinted glass may be used on upper stories.	The tradition in this district is punched window openings. Sash windows (usually wood) are the most common type found on the contributing buildings. The windows on the street façade of the proposed building do not “read” as an opening in a wall as a punched window does, they “read” as a large glazed area on the buildings façade. This treatment cannot be considered traditional in the context of the Fourth Ward Overlay Zone. Windows on the other facades include shapes that are atypical of the district. Most windows on buildings in the district are vertically oriented rectangular punched openings.	NO
4. Stained glass, beveled glass, or other architectural glass may be used.		
Shiny aluminum sliding windows and darkly tinted or reflective glass are prohibited.		
I. Entries and Doors <i>A defining feature of the district is the emphasis on entries of the historic houses. They are always oriented to the street and are one of the most significant elements of the house. Entries of single-family houses are usually defined and enhanced by a porch.</i>	The proposed entry is defined spatially by flanking elements – the garage and the front-yard wall, rather than a porch or raised stoop. The entry is street-oriented and emphasized in a different way than usual.	
1. Primary building entrances shall be oriented to the street. The use of architectural detail to highlight the entry is preferred.	The primary entrance is on the street façade however no architectural detail is associated with the entry.	NO
2. Front entry porches are strongly encouraged on single-family dwellings.	There is no porch provided.	NO
3. Use of a combination of wood and glass door with a historic design is encouraged.	A solid wood door is proposed.	NO
Shiny aluminum doors are prohibited.		
J. Rooflines <i>Single-family homes traditionally had intricate rooflines and facades punctuated by porches,</i>		

<i>dormers, and other elements. Historic roof shapes include: flat with a parapet, gabled, gambrel, hipped, or a combination of some of these shapes. Multi-family dwellings and non-residential buildings traditionally had flat roofs. However, since both flat and pitched roofs are historically present, either may be appropriate on a new structure, depending on location of the new structure.</i>		
1. Historic roof shapes shall be used on all new structures. Both flat and pitched roofs are historically correct, depending upon the overall design of the structure.	The proposed building has a flat roof; however, on the main mass of the building there is no parapet as would be typical of a flat roofed building in this district. Pitched roofs prevail on the block. The roof on this building is not a historic roof shape for this historic district.	NO
Hyperbolic, partial mansard, or barrel vault roofs and metal roofing are prohibited.		Yes
K. New Accessory Structures		
VI. Miscellaneous Features		
A. Area features to be preserved: Original sidewalk paving, buggy steps, horse rings, lawn curbs.	Not applicable	
1. All site and right-of-way alterations shall be reviewed by the LUCC for a Certificate of Appropriateness.		
B. Fences and Walls		
1. Front yard fences are not encouraged. If a fence is necessary in the front yard, it shall be no taller than 3 feet and shall continue to the rear of the yard.	A 4' high CMU wall (stucco finish) is proposed in the front yard.	NO
2. If a taller, privacy fence is desired, it shall be located in the rear yard, with the fence beginning at the rear edge of the house.		
3. Concrete block walls shall be stuccoed and architecturally integrated to the building.	The proposed wall is stuccoed	Yes
Unstuccoed, smooth-faced block walls, chain link fencing, chicken wire and coyote/patio fencing shall not be approved.		
C. Landscaping	These guidelines are advisory only.	N/A

LUC Ordinance

The table below provides an evaluation of the submittal as it relates to the LUC Ordinance and the specific development guidelines as analyzed above.

LUC Ordinance (§14-12)	Analysis	Does the application satisfy the ordinance criteria?
§14-12-8-B- (1) The change is consistent with the designation ordinance and specific development guidelines for the historic overlay zone	<p>The change is not consistent with the designation ordinance Section 4.C. stating “new construction should utilize exterior materials generally found in the area (wood, stucco, brick, adobe stone or cast stone) and have parking located to the rear of the structure”. There is an existing garage at the rear of the property but another garage is proposed for the front of the house.</p> <p>The new buildings in not consistent with the majority of the guidelines for new construction in the specific development guidelines as detailed above.</p>	NO
§14-12-8 (B) (2) The architectural character, historical value, or archaeological value of the structure or site itself or of any historic zone in which it is located will not be significantly impaired or diminished	The architectural character of the historic zone will be impaired and diminished with the construction of a building that is dissimilar in many respects to the buildings common to the zone.	NO
§14-12-8 (B) (3) The change qualified as a “certified rehabilitation: pursuant to the Tax Reform Act of 1976	Not applicable	
§14-12-8 (B) (4) The structure or site’s distinguished original qualities or character will not be altered. Original shall mean at the time of initial construction or developed over the course of history of the structure.	Not applicable	
§14-12-8 (B) (5) Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced, if possible. If replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the original as closely as possible in like material and design;	Not applicable	

<p>§14-12-8 (B) (6) Additions to existing structure and new construction may be of contemporary design if such design is compatible with the historic zone in which it is to be located</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	
<p>§14-12-8 (B) (7) Demolition shall only be permitted if it is determined that the property is incapable of producing an economic return as presently controlled and that no means of preserving the structure has been found. In making a determination regarding reasonable economic return the Commission may consider the estimated market value of the building, land and any proposed replacement structures, financial details of the property including but not limited to, income and expense statements, current mortgage balances and appraisals, the length of time that the property has been on the market for sale or lease, potential return based on projected future market conditions, the building's structural condition, and other items determined to be relevant to the application.</p>	<p>See analysis below</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Demolition

The applicant explains that the existing building is essentially a converted garage that does not meet acceptable standards for a residence. This history of the building is supported by the Sanborn maps appended to this report that show an accessory building at this location as early as 1931.

The economic profile provided by the applicant demonstrates both the current income and expenses associated with the property and a projected income and expense scenario that includes amortization of the costs of the necessary improvements. The applicant is a licensed professional architect in the State of New Mexico and staff assumes that he is qualified to provide cost estimates.

The current fixed costs associated with the rental property do not include acquisition cost or repairs. As such, the stated current expenses are conservative and perhaps underestimated. The costs associated with up-grading the property to current acceptable standards and projected potential rental income for an improved property both seem reasonable and justified. The projected expenses after improvement do not include interest expense so; again, those expenses are conservative.

The economic scenario presented demonstrates a negative cash flow over ten years.

Given the size and the quality of the existing building, it is fair to conclude that there is relatively little value in the existing building. The building is not a good example of any particular building style or craftsmanship. Removal of the building could be justified under the economic circumstances.

Additional Considerations

The Downtown Neighborhood Association was notified of this request. A letter from the Downtown Neighborhoods Association opposing the application was entered into evidence on January 13, 2010. No comment has been received on the revised design.

Conclusions

As discussed in the analysis above, demolition of the existing converted garage building can be justified under §14-12-8 (B) (7). The building is not a good example of any particular architectural style or craftsmanship. It was an accessory building that was converted to the dwelling unit we see today probably between 1947 and 1951. The economic analysis that the applicant presents for an improved dwelling unit demonstrates a negative cash flow without including acquisition or interest expenses.

The request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction has been reviewed against the criteria for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness contained in the *LUC Ordinance* and the *Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Design Guidelines*. Replacement with the proposed building is not consistent with the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness under §14-12-8 (B) (1 and 2). The proposed new building is not consistent with the majority of the guidelines for new construction in the specific development guidelines as detailed above.

While it is not the intention of the guidelines to limit new development to a particular style or to encourage the design of replica buildings, they encourage sympathetic new construction that harmonizes with the existing structures in the district. That harmony can only be achieved by utilizing basic elements that are common to the architecture of the district.

As outlined in the tables above, the proposed design falls far short of achieving compatibility with surrounding buildings. The visual character of this design is significantly different from its neighbors.

The proposal does not meet the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan in that the design of the new development does not respect existing neighborhood values and resources of other social, cultural, and recreational concern. The introduction of the proposed development has the potential to negatively impact the Fourth Ward historic district.

FINDINGS for a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction - Case 09-LUCC-50054 / Project # 1007470 (March 17, 2010)

1. This application is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction at 908 Roma Ave. NW, described as Lots 4 and 5, Block 4 of the Luna Place Addition, a property in the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone, zoned SU-2/RO.
2. The subject property contains a one-story concrete block house of approximately 700 square feet. This building is designated on the State and National Registers forms as neutral to the Fourth Ward historic district and on the overlay zone designation map as a contributing building.
3. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 700 sq. ft. building and construct a new 2,00 sq. ft. single-family residence.
4. Section 14-12-8(A) of the Landmarks and Urban Conservation Ordinance states that within the boundaries of a historic zone, the exterior appearance of any structure shall not be altered, new structures shall not be constructed, and existing structures shall not be demolished until a Certificate of Appropriateness has been duly approved.
5. The LUC Ordinance specifies that an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved if it complies with several specified criteria. The LUC Ordinance Section 14-12(8)(B)(1) states that a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved if "*The change is consistent with the designation ordinance and specific development guidelines for the landmark or historic zone*".
6. The proposed new building is not consistent with the designation ordinance R-46-1991 Section 4.C which states that new construction should have parking located to the rear of the structure. There is an existing three-car garage at the rear of the property but the proposal includes another garage at the front of the house facing the street.
7. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.A.2, 3 and 4. The new building does not reflect design traditionally used in the area, it is not compatible with contributing buildings in the area in its massing, roof shape, materials or window patterns as analyzed in the staff report.
8. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.C.1 and 2.a., b, c and d. The proposed

building does not match or replicate patterns of exterior materials, rooflines or patterns of existing doors and windows from contributing buildings as analyzed in the staff report.

9. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.D. 2 because the block wall in the front yard intrudes on the setback space.
10. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.G.1, 2,3,and 4. The proposed building does not incorporate styles and design features of contributing buildings, it includes large blank walls and no front porch is provided.
11. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.H.3. The proposed new building does not use traditional window shapes or types.
12. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.I.1, 2 and 3. The entry door is not defined by a porch or enhanced with architectural detail.
13. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section III.J.1 because it does not utilize a historic roof shape.
14. The proposed new building is not consistent with the specific development guidelines for the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone Section VI.B.1 because a four-foot tall block wall is proposed in the middle of the front yard.
15. The LUC Ordinance Section 14-12(8)(B)(2) states that a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved if *“The architectural character, historical value, or archaeological value of the structure or site itself or of any historic zone or urban conservation overlay zone in which it is located will not be significantly impaired or diminished”*.
16. The proposed new building has the potential to impair or diminish the historical value and architectural character of the historic zone due to its incompatibility with the development guidelines.

17. The *Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan* Established Urban Area policies include: Policy d: “The location, intensity, and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, and recreational concern.” The proposed new building does not support Established Urban Area Policy d because the design of the new development is not compatible with the cultural resources of the Fourth Ward historic district.
18. The *Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan* contains goals and policies related to Environmental Protections and Heritage Conservation. Section 11.C.5 Historic Resources goal is to protect reuse or enhance significant historic districts and buildings. The proposed new building does not support the Historic Resources goal because the historic district is not protected from new development that is incompatible with the development guidelines.
19. The *Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan* Section 11.C.9 Community Identity and Urban Design goal is “*to preserve and enhance the natural and built characteristics, social, cultural and historical features that identify Albuquerque and Bernalillo County sub-areas as distinct communities and collections of neighborhoods.*” Policy b states “*In each Community Area, strategic planning, neighborhood planning, development and redevelopment shall be evaluated in light of its relationship to and effect upon (3) Local history, specifically architectural styles and traditions and current and historic significance to Albuquerque.* The Community Identity and Urban Design goal is not supported by the proposed new building because it does not reflect the building traditions of the historic neighborhood thereby not preserving the built characteristics and historical features that characterize the Fourth Ward historic district.

RECOMMENDATION - Case No. 09-LUCC-50044/ Project # 1007470

DENIAL of **Case No. 09-LUCC-50044/ Project # 1007470**, an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction, located at 908 Roma. This property is more specifically described as Lots 4 and 5, Block 4, Luna Place Addition a non-contributing property in the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone, zoned SU-2/RO, based on the above 19 Findings.

**Maryellen Hennessy, Senior Planner,
Current Planning Division**

Attachments: Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, Aerial photograph, Letter from DNA

