CITY OF SANTA FE
CITY ATTORNEY

MEMORANDUM

To: **Members of the Governing Body**

From: **Frank Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney** FER

Via: **Marcos D. Martinez, City Attorney**

Re: **Appeal # 2026-12870-APPL of Case # 2026-12571-HDRB.** Anne Pfauth and Thomas Eric Sikes, the Owners of a Contributing Property at 1295 Cerro Gordo Rd. in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Appeal the Historic Districts Review Board's June 23, 2026, Decision Denying a Proposal to Build a 1,390-Square-Foot Addition and to Remove Part of a Retaining Wall, and Denying Exceptions to Exceed 50 Percent of the Historic Footprint of a Contributing Structure and to Remove Historic Material. (Frank Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney; feruybalid@santafenm.gov)

Date: **November 13, 2026, for the November 18, 2026, Special Governing Body meeting**

The Property owners, Anne Pfauth and Thomas Eric Sikes (the "Appellants"), have filed an Appeal challenging a decision by the Historic Districts Review Board ("HDRB" or "Board") denying their application to build a 1,366-square-foot addition and to remove part of a historic retaining wall on a house at 1295 Cerro Gordo Rd. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 2]** The building is a historic residence with a contributing status in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and is situated on land once owned and farmed by Abundio Armijo, Sr., a founding member of La Union Protectiva. **[Ex. E, Historic Cultural Properties Inventory ("HCPI"), at 70]**

The architect, Harvey N. Monroe, Jr., proposed several alterations to the property, two of which required exceptions to Historic Districts standards in the Santa Fe City Code ("SFCC"), Section 14-4.6(E)(1)(I) and (2)(II)(c). The Code permits exceptions to the Historic Districts standards if the Applicant conclusively demonstrates the exception criteria. **[SFCC Section 14-4.6(D)(2)(b)]** He proposed an addition of 929 square feet of indoor living space and 461 square feet of new portals on the west and north elevations, and to remove about 12 feet of a rock retaining wall in front of the house to reconfigure a parking space. **[Ex. G, Applicant Submittal, at 91-92]**

In a public meeting June 23, 2026, the HDRB denied these two alterations, finding that the architect and property owners did not fulfill the exception criteria for these variations from the Historic Districts Code. **[Ex. C, Excerpt from Minutes, at 46]** The Board approved other renovations the architect proposed which did not require exceptions to the SFCC.

The Appellants appeal the HDRB's denial of these exceptions. In this "de novo" appeal, the Governing Body may uphold or reverse the HDRB's decision to deny these proposals and the exceptions. **[SFCC § 14-2.2(B)(7)]** A "de novo" hearing is one in which the Governing Body conducts an independent application of the law to the evidence to decide whether the facts and the law support the request for an exception.

I. BACKGROUND

A. The Property and its History

The adobe 1930s Librado and Plácida Ortiz House at 1295 Cerro Gordo Rd. is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The residence is 1,030 square feet, excluding the two portals, and expresses a vernacular Pueblo Revival style, with exposed vigas at the façade and rounded parapets. The south façade features an arched porch entry and appears to retain its original configuration. There was an addition of two rooms in the 1930s, which created a bump-out at the northeast corner. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 49]**

Ownership of this property by the Armijo family, eponyms of Armijo Lane which runs north and south nearby, dates back to 1917 when it formed part of a five-acre irrigated parcel held by Ramoncita Armijo, Ramon Armijo and Florencio Armijo. Abundio Armijo acquired the land on both sides of Cerro Gordo Road in the 1920s. **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 70-71]** The property remained in the Armijo family until this past year when Roberta Glynn Armijo, the last Armijo to own the house, placed it on the market. In 1996, the structure was 927 square feet when a room addition was placed on the north elevation and the west-elevation portal altered. The Historic Design Review Board awarded Ms. Armijo a Heritage Preservation Award in 1997 in recognition of the home's sensitive renovation. **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 74-75]**

The Historic Design Review Board approved the demolition of a detached garage in 1995 under Case # H-95-185. The HDRB approved the alterations Roberta G. Armijo made in 1996 under Case # H-96-024. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 50-51]** In a meeting May 12, 2026, in Case # 2026-12282-HDRB, the HDRB reviewed the long-standing contributing status of the property, reaffirmed that status and expanded the contributing designation to the historic rock yard and planter walls. The Board designated the east and south elevations, including the entry portal on the south, as the primary façades. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 50]**

B. Historic District Standards

SFCC Section 14-9.3 defines "Contributing Structure":

> CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: A structure, located in a historic district, approximately 50 years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

The Historic Districts Code has special restrictions on additions and alterations to contributing and significant structures, and special protections for certain architectural elements of those buildings if the features are historic. SFCC Section 14-4.6(E)(1)(a) reads:

> The status of the historic property shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status is prohibited.

SFCC Section 14-4.6(E)(2)(b)(III) reads:

> Additions shall not exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the building's historic footprint and shall not exceed 50 percent of the existing length in linear feet of the primary façade.

Proposed additions or alterations that do not comply with Code restrictions for contributing buildings are not entirely prohibited; the HDRB can permit them if the property owner or project applicant requests "exceptions" and meets three criteria described in the Code at SFCC Section 14-4.6(D)(2)(b). The exception criteria for an alteration are:

> (a) It does not damage the character of the district;
> (b) It is required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare; and
> (c) It strengthens 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.

The applicant has the burden of "conclusively demonstrating" the exception criteria. **[SFCC § 14-4.6(D)(2)(b)]**

The Historic Districts Review Board found that a 1,366-square-foot addition, placed close to the south, primary façade of this historic structure, violated the restriction against additions exceeding 50 percent of the building's historic footprint. **[Ex. B, Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law, at 40]** The Board also found that the proposal to remove a part of the front, rock retaining wall violated the restriction against the removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features that embody the status of a contributing structure. **[Ex. B, Findings & Conclusions, at 41]** The Appellants claim they meet the exception criteria for these alterations. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 3-4]**

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. <u>Application and Staff Recommendations</u>

In June, 2026, the architect Mr. Monroe and the homeowners (the "Applicants") submitted an application for renovations of the property at 1295 Cerro Gordo Rd., which

included:

- Build a 1,366-square-foot addition connecting to the existing house on the west and north façades
- Remove a 12-foot section of the contributing rock retaining wall to create a driveway to the front of the house
- Build a 1,121-square-foot detached combination garage/office
- Replace the entry door on the south, primary façade, replace windows on the south and east primary façades, and replace all the windows on the other, non-primary façades
- Lower the interior floor level by about a foot **[Ex. G, Applicant Submittal, at 91-92]**

The Applicants withdrew the proposal for the detached accessory structure prior to the HDRB meeting. **[Ex. B, Findings & Conclusions, at 39]** The Historic Preservation Staff did not require an exception for replacement of the south- and east-elevation windows, since they were deteriorated beyond repair. No exception was necessary to replace the front door, since it is non-historic and structurally compromised due to its custom cut, and no exception is necessary to replace windows on non-primary façades. **[Ex. H, Window Assessment, at 111-115; SFCC § 14-4.6(E)(4)(I)(a)]** The HDRB seldom has authority over interior modifications, so no exception was necessary to lower the inside floor.

Of these five project elements, the Historic Preservation staff determined that two of them – the 1,366-square-foot addition and removal of a section of the retaining wall – would require the Applicants to fulfill the exception criteria in SFCC Section 14-4.6(D)(2)(II). **[Ex. D, Staff Memo, at 48]** The Staff set an HDRB hearing on the application for June 23, 2026. The Applicants requested that the HDRB grant the two exceptions, and their architect offered reasons they believed fulfilled the criteria. **[Ex. G, Applicant Submittal, at 92-93]** In its Staff Report, the Historic Preservation Staff recommended these findings:

1. That the Applicants **did not fulfill** the exception criteria for building an addition to a contributing structure that exceeds 50 percent of its historic footprint, and recommended **denial** of this project element; and

2. That the Applicants **fulfilled** the exception criteria for removal of the section of the historic rock yard wall, and recommended **approval** of this project element. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 48]**

The Staff recommended approval of other elements of the application, determining that they meet the Historic District General Design Standards and the specific design standards for the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 48]**

B. <u>Board Decision to Deny Both Exceptions</u>

On June 23, 2026, the HDRB held a public hearing about the application and request for the exceptions. Five members of the Board were present for the meeting, but Board Member

Scott Cherry recused himself from this hearing because his company (Lightfoot Building and Design) wrote the window assessment. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 44]** Four members participated in the hearing. Because the chair only has a vote in the event of a tie, three members voted. **[City Resolution # 2009-20, Art. 11, § 2(B); Ex. C, Minutes, at 46]**

City Senior Planner Lani McCulley gave a history of the property, described the project application, and recommended that the HDRB deny the exception for the 1,366-square-foot addition, and approve the exception for altering the retaining wall. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 44]** She noted that the existing structure is 1,100 square feet **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 52]**, meaning that the proposed addition is more than double the historic footprint.

Architect Harvey Monroe, speaking via teleconference, and owners Anne Pfauth and Eric Sikes, who appeared in person, explained that a new driveway, created by opening the rock yard wall, would allow access to the house by vehicles without crossing the neighbor's property. Drivers cross the adjacent property to the east to access this property because they are not aware the property has a rear access, Mr. Monroe said. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 44]** This modification would permit reconstruction of the stairway approaching the front of the house, which does not meet current safety codes, Mr. Monroe said. **[Id.]** Regarding the addition, Monroe pointed out that there used to be a historic garage structure in the proposed location, and the addition would mostly occupy that space. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]**

Ms. Pfauth said she and Mr. Sikes use the back entrance, and the reconfiguration of the driveway is intended for guests, delivery drivers, emergency and other vehicles, who frequently use the neighbor's driveway, despite that Ms. Pfauth provides directions to the rear entrance. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]** Mr. Sikes said the existing stairs present a safety issue, not solved by routing vehicles to the rear, and that the front entrance would need to be blocked to prevent vehicle access there if the exception is not granted. **[Id.]**

In the public comment section of the hearing three local residents addressed the Board, each being first sworn:

- Elizabeth West said the rural character of Cerro Gordo Road should be preserved and suggested that the rear driveway be used as the exclusive approach to the house. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]**

- Theresa Armijo, who lives on the neighboring property at 1299 Cerro Gordo Rd., said that her lot and 1295 Cerro Gordo were once a single lot. She said the rock retaining wall has been there at least 70 years and she did not understand why it has to be altered. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]**

- Stefanie Beninato noted via teleconference that the driveway in question was designed to be common and provides access to other properties, the proposed opening would not accommodate emergency vehicles, and delivery drivers commonly park on the street. She said the size of the addition was not justified. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 46]**

Board Member John Bienvenu said traffic would be routed to the back entrance of the

house by changing the address of the house to Armijo Lane, which would not change the historic designation of the house. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]** Ms. Pfauth responded that that may be possible. **[Id.]**

Vote: With respect to the addition exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint, Member Bienvenu moved to adopt the Staff's recommended findings that the exception criteria had not been conclusively demonstrated met, and to deny the exception request; and

With respect the proposal to remove a portion of the contributing retaining wall, to enter findings that the exception criteria had not been conclusively demonstrated:

- The wall is a characteristic feature of the historic streetscape;
- Removal of the wall is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicants;
- Removal of the wall would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City;

and to therefore deny these elements of the project application. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 46]** Board Member Jennifer Biedscheid seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, by a vote of 3-0. **[Id.]**

With respect to all other elements of the project application (other than for the free-standing accessory unit, which was withdrawn), Member Bienvenu moved to approve them. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 46]** The motion passed unanimously, by a vote of 3-0. **[Id.]**

On October 27, 2026, the HDRB adopted written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law reflecting its decisions regarding the property. **[Ex. B, Findings & Conclusions, at 38-42]** The Appellants request that the Governing Body review the HDRB's denial of their requests for the addition and for reconfiguration of the retaining wall. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 2]**

III. APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY

A. Applicable Code Sections

Under SFCC Section 14-2.1(B)(6)(d)(II), an appeal of an HDRB decision may be filed for one or more of the following reasons:

(a) To contest non-compliance of a final action with Chapter 14 or Sections 3-21-1 through 3-21-14 NMSA 1978 (the New Mexico zoning enabling act);

(b) To contest the application of SFCC Chapter 14; or

(c) To appeal a decision lacking substantial evidence to support it.

B. The Appellants' Claims

In their Verified Appeal Petition, the Appellants claim:

1. The HDRB failed to consider that previously there was a 417-square-foot historic structure, since demolished, should have been considered when calculating the percentage by

which the new addition exceeds the historic footprint. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 2]**

2. Denial of the addition results in an inadequate home size for the current standard of living, and a disregard for accessibility and the proportion of homes in the surrounding neighborhood, which average more than 1,900 square feet. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 2, 4]**

3. The proposed addition would be placed in a location where a historic, detached garage with contributing status previously was demolished, thus this addition would mostly restore the historic footprint of the property. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 4]**

4. Denial of the request to remove a portion of the retaining wall in front of the property creates health, safety and ADA-accessibility issues for the owners of the property and for the general public. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 2]**

5. The owners of 1295 Cerro Gordo Rd. have no easement or other legal mechanism to use the neighbor's driveway, and access to the back of the house from North Armijo Lane would not permit access to the front of the house after the addition is built. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 5]**

6. To change the address of the Cerro Gordo Road property would disregard the historic placement of the house, which always has had a Cerro Gordo Road address, with access to the front. **[Ex. A, Appeal Petition, at 5]**

IV. ANALYSIS

A. <u>Evidence Considered by the Board</u>

Documents the Board reviewed which supported their decision included the Historic Preservation Division Staff Report **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 47-63]**, a Historic Cultural Properties Inventory by an experienced architectural historian, John W. Murphey **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 64-89]**, and the sworn testimony of witnesses **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45-46]**.

According to the Staff Report and the presentation by Senior Planner Lani McCulley:

- The low planters immediately in front of the house appear in early photographs and lend period character to the property, helping to establish its historic setting. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 50]**

- The lower rock work is first clearly visible in 1978 aerial imagery. Both the low planters and the retaining walls are designated as contributing. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 50]**

- This is historically a small residence, and the character of the district is damaged when a historic residence is overtaken by an excessive additions, 135 percent the size of the original home. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 52-53]**

- The homes in this neighborhood with larger footprints are newer, not historic, homes, and

it is unlikely a historic structure will comport with present-day standards for living space. **[Ex. D, Staff Report, at 53]**

According to the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory:

- The property was once part of a five-acre parcel owned by the Armijo family. In 1931, Abundio Armijo, Sr., deeded this lot to his daughter, Plácida, reflecting "the continued subdivision of a larger family landholding using informal boundaries and access routes rather than surveyed lots." **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 71]**

- A professional survey recorded in 1966 established a 10-foot driveway, providing a second access to the property, from Armijo Lane. **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 73-74]**

- When Plácida Armijo (Ortiz) died in 1976, her husband Librado Ortiz succeeded to the ownership of the property, and the personal representatives of his estate deeded the property to Roberta Glynn Armijo, a niece, after Librado died in 1988. **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 74]**

- The property was owned by the Armijo family and its descendants for almost a century. **[Ex. E, HCPI, at 75]**

A long-standing resident of the neighborhood, Theresa Armijo, testified that the rock retaining wall has been there at least 70 years. **[Ex. C, Minutes, at 45]**

In denying the exception criteria, the HDRB made these findings, as set forth in the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

Addition Exceeding 50 Percent of Historic Footprint:

(a) Granting the exception would damage the character of the district because this small residence of 1,100 square feet would be dominated by a 1,390-square-foot addition, plainly visible from the street, and more than doubling the size of the historic residence;

(b) The exception is not required to prevent a hardship because the Applicants were fully aware of its size and location in a Historic District when they bought it, and there has been no showing that a differently configured addition would not solve any inconveniences; and

(c) Granting the exception would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City because there has been no showing that a smaller connection to the residence, with the bulk of the new construction detached from the historic structure, would not solve any habitability issues. **[Ex. B, Findings & Conclusions, at 40-41]**

Removal of Contributing Retaining Wall Section:

(a) Granting the exception would damage the character of the district because

historic rock retaining walls are highly characteristic of this part of the district;

(b) The exception is not required to prevent a hardship because this is a condition that existed when the Applicants bought this property, there is an existing driveway to the house with its entry on the east property line, and there is an alternative access to the property via an easement from North Armijo Lane; and

(c) Granting the exception would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City because there is no persuasive evidence that the existing access to the house via the east driveway and easement from North Armijo Lane impairs the habitability of this residence. **[Ex. B, Findings & Conclusions, at 41]**

B. Standard of Review

On appeal, the Governing Body should determine whether there is substantial evidence to support the exceptions. **[SFCC § 14-2.1(B)(6)(d)(II)(c)]** The Governing Body should independently apply the relevant Code provisions to the facts of this case.

V. CONCLUSION

In considering the Appellant's appeal, the Governing Body must address the following question:

Have the Appellants conclusively demonstrated they fulfill all three criteria for the two exceptions to the Historic District standards:

1. For an addition exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint of a contributing structure; and

2. For the removal of historic materials from a contributing retaining wall.

If the answer is "**no**," deny the appeal.

If the answer is "**yes**," state the facts supporting each of the three criteria.

VI. MOTION OPTIONS

There are two options for motions on each set of exception criteria in this case:

A. For an addition exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint of a contributing structure:

1. I move to **deny** the appeal, on the grounds that the Applicants have not conclusively demonstrated the three exception criteria to build an addition exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint of a contributing structure; **OR**

2. I move to **grant** the appeal, on the grounds that the Appellants have conclusively demonstrated the three exception criteria to build an addition exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint of a contributing structure: [insert the facts supporting the exception criteria]

(a) Do not damage the character of the district because _____ ;

(b) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare because _____ ; and

(c) 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 because _____ .

B. For the removal of historic materials from a contributing retaining wall:

1. I move to **deny** the appeal, on the grounds that the Applicants have not conclusively demonstrated the three exception criteria to remove historic materials from a contributing retaining wall; **OR**

2. I move to **grant** the appeal, on the grounds that the Appellants have conclusively demonstrated the three exception criteria to remove historic materials from a contributing retaining wall: [insert the facts supporting the exception criteria]

(a) Do not damage the character of the district because _____ ;

(b) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare because _____ ; and

(c) 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 because _____ .

VII. LIST OF EXHIBITS

A	Verified Appeal Petition	July 16, 2026	pp. 1-37
B	HDRB Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	Oct. 27, 2026	pp. 38-42
C	Excerpts from Board Meeting Minutes	June 23, 2026	pp. 43-46
D	Historic Preservation Staff Memo	June 23, 2026	pp. 47-63
E	Historic Cultural Properties Inventory	Apr. 10, 2026	pp. 64-89
F	Historic Building Inventory	June 7, 1983	p. 90
G	Applicant Submittal	June 10, 2026	pp. 91-104
	3D Views, Site/Floor Plans, Elevation Drawings		pp. 97-104
H	Window Assessment	Apr. 20, 2026	pp. 105-115
I	HDRB Case File # H-96-24 (1996 addition)	Feb. 13, 1996	pp. 116-131
J	HDRB Case File # H-95-185 (garage demolition)	Dec. 12, 1995	pp. 132-145

APPENDIX:
EXCERPTS FROM SANTA FE CITY CODE

§ 14-4.6 – Historic Districts

(A) General Provisions

(1) Purpose

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of Santa Fe and to ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City, the Governing Body deems it essential to preserve the qualities relating to the history and culture of Santa Fe, and maintain a harmonious outward appearance in order to preserve property values, and attract residents and tourists alike. The specific purposes of this subsection are to:

(a) Ensure the continued existence and preservation of historic areas and buildings;

(b) Require the continued construction of buildings in Santa Fe's historic styles; and

(c) Ensure a general harmony as to architectural style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

. . .

(C) (3) Review by Historic Districts Review Board Required

. . .

(b) The historic board shall judge any proposed alteration or new structure for harmony with adjacent buildings, preservation of historical and characteristic qualities, and conformity to the standards for architectural style set forth in this subsection.

. . .

(D) Exceptions

. . .

(2) Design Standards

(b) Approval Criteria: In order to approve an exception, the HDRB shall make findings of fact that the applicant conclusively demonstrated that the requested exceptions comply with all the criteria listed as follows:

(I). Do not damage the character of the streetscape;

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

(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.

. . .

(E) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts

These standards shall apply to all additions or alterations to existing structures in the

Historic Districts. Contributing, significant and landmark structures may be subject to specific additional restrictions, and district-specific standards in subsection 14-4.6(G) may also apply.

(1) General

(a) The status of the historic property shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status is prohibited.

(b) If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application may be denied.

. . .

(2) Building Additions

. . .

(b) Size and Location

(I) Additions are not permitted to primary facades.

(II) All additions shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the primary façade.

(III) Building additions shall not exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the building's historic footprint and shall not exceed 50 percent of the existing length in linear feet of the primary façade.

(IV) To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing non-primary façade of a structure rather than attaching them to the primary façade of a structure.

§ 14-9.3 – Definitions

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A structure, located in a historic district, approximately 50 years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

FOOTPRINT

The configuration of the area of ground covered by a structure, including all its parts.

HISTORIC OR HISTORICAL

Belonging or relating to history.

HISTORIC MATERIAL

Materials located in that are listed in or eligible for listing in the national register of historic places or designated as historic under an appropriate state or local law and is 50 years

old or older.

HISTORIC STRUCTURE

A structure that is 50 years old or older.

STRUCTURE

Anything that is constructed or erected with a fixed location on the ground or attached to something having a fixed location on the ground, including buildings, mobile homes, walls, fences, swimming pools, spas, tennis courts, signs, flag poles, microwave satellite receiving dishes, TV antennas and communication devices.