



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
April 8, 2025, at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue**

Meeting Minutes

View meeting on City YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yzSTGZAn_DA

Call to Order

Acting Chair Bienvenu called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board to order at approximately 5:30pm in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present

Mr. John Bienvenu, Vice Chair (Acting Chair)
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Ms. Madelein Aguilar Medrano
Ms. Amanda Mather
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent

Ms. Cecilia Rios (excused)

Others Present

Ms. Heather Lamboy, Planning and Land Use Director
Mr. Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager
Mr. Frank E. Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Paul Duran, Senior Planner
Ms. Amanda Romero, Senior Planner
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner

Note: All items in the Board packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Board packet is available on Civic Clerk at <https://santafem.portal.civicclerk.com> and can be requested from the Historic Preservation Division.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Moquino stated that under new business case item d. 2025-010093-HDRB at 224 and 228 East Palace Avenue has been postponed to May 13, 2025, but they will be presenting an informational presentation of the project under staff communications.

Mr. Moquino also stated that the next hearing will be held on May 13, 2025.

Member Degnan moved to approve the agenda as amended. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

3. **Approval of Minutes**

a. March 25, 2025

No changes were made to the minutes of March 25, 2025.

Member Degnan moved to approve the minutes. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

4. **Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law**

a. 2024-007675-HDRB. 918-D Acequia Madre (November 26, 2024)

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the minutes for November 26, 2024. Member Degnan seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

b. 2024-009377-HDRB. 449 Camino Monte Vista (December 10, 2024)

c. 2024-009399-HDRB. 465 Camino Manzano (December 10, 2024)

d. 2024-009398-HDRB. 346 Hillside Ave. (December 10, 2024)

Member Aguilar Medrano moved to approve the minutes for December 10, 2024. Member Degnan seconded. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

5. **Matters from the Public**

Stefanie Beninato shared further information regarding quorum requirements for majority votes. She provided a handout on the subject. She then asked about St. Catherine's Indian School. She thought there was going to be some kind of review or presentation to the Board, but she had not seen or heard about it on the agenda and was curious what was happening with that possible case.

An unknown constituent asked about the current makeup of the Board and the requirements per code.

Acting Chair Bienvenu recommended the constituent have a meeting with staff to discuss the subject.

6. **Staff Communications**

- a. Amanda Romero presented the 2025 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Award nominees and requested that each Board member place their vote for the nominees by Friday, April 11, 2025, at 5 pm via email. She reminded everyone that the Awards will be at San Miguel Chapel at 5:30pm on May 15th and she still needed volunteers for the presenting of the awards.
- b. Preliminary Design presentation for the proposed additions to Marian Hall and Drury Hotel. 224 and 228 E. Palace Ave. HDRB members' comments are requested.

Tiho Dimitrov of Dimitrov Design Studio presented a short history of Marian Hall and the Drury Hotel with a summary of the adaptive reuse of Marian Hall as an extension to the Drury Hotel.

Acting Chair Bienvenu thought that the applicant had shown a great deal of sensitivity to each of the two structures and that it was obvious that the applicant was trying to abide by all the appropriate standards for allowing reuse of this property. Adaptive reuse a very important part of preservation. The fact that this building is empty and would be occupied is important to everyone in ensuring that these kinds of buildings don't deteriorate and that they're able to maintain a presence in the community. So, all of that is very well taken. He thought that the alterations presented were very modest changes. He requested a couple of points of clarification that the Marian Hall is a significant building with all facades primary and the St. Vincent Hospital that's contributing and the façade of the connection is a primary façade.

Director Lamboy confirmed the status and primary facades. She also stated that there is an opportunity to avoid an exception here, if the connection from Marian Hall to the Drury mimicked the John Gaw Meem designed connection from the 1950s the approval could be granted without an exception to the code because there is a provision in the code for the restoration of historic features.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that Ms. Lamboy was making the point that the Board frequently makes, which is the Board wants to differentiate the new from the old, but that's not necessarily applicable in this case because this would not be a speculative restoration. This could be a reproduction of what was mistakenly taken away in recent years so, under both the code and under general preservation standards it is perfectly acceptable to reproduce what was lost.

Mr. Dimitrov stated that the team had considered replacing the corridor with a design similar to the original connecting corridor, but the original had two connection points creating a “U” shape and the applicant is not proposing to connect in two places. However, if it is the wish of the Board to see a mimic of the Meem iteration then the applicant stated they would be happy to move in that direction.

Acting Chair Bienvenu said it was good to know because that may be the best solution and will satisfy all the applicants’ concerns at the same time.

Director Lamboy stated that the exception for the window lites greater than 30” could also be eliminated if the design mimicked Meem’s design which had the larger window lites as well.

Member Aguilar Medrano echoed the thoughtful approach to the design and felt the current designed connection, while not mimicking Meem’s design could also be approved. She preferred that the glass did not go all the way to the ground but felt either design would be approved.

Member Biedscheid stated she was in favor of recreating Meem’s connection. She confirmed that the connection abuts the balcony on the Drury but does not remove the balcony.

Mr. Dimitrov confirmed it did not remove the balcony.

Member Mather asked why the original connection was demolished to start with.

Mr. Dimitrov shared that the corridors did not work with the initial development plan for the property and the drive connection for the initially planned underground parking garage. However, that plan did change later.

Member Degnan asked for clarification on the design as planned without the mimicking of the Meem connection.

Mr. Dimitrov clarified that the connecting hall structure is currently designed of brick with large windows that match the non-historic windows of the Drury Hotel, while Meem’s connecting hall had larger floor to ceiling windows with steel frames.

Member Cherry stated he was in favor of either corridor.

Mr. Dimitrov stated he was thinking less glass was a better option, but he would consider mimicking Meem’s original design.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that glass was appropriate in this case.

Public Comment:

Stefanie Beninato stated she was happy the building was going to be used. She liked the mimicking of Meem's connection better than the current design. The stair well connection makes sense, and the project should be approved. She also felt it would be better if there were no exceptions to the request.

Catherine Varela stated she works in the area and people who walk by the building talk about the building holding a lot of memories. She is pleased that it will be used because the next most frequent comment she hears is that people are wondering what is going on with the building.

7. Old Business

- a. 2025-009916-HDRB, 1010 Camino San Acacio**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing. Daniel Strongwater, agent for Jeremy and Caroline Rohrich, owners, propose to construct a 175 sq. ft. closet addition on the east elevation and enclose a portal on the south elevation and requests exceptions to 14-5.2(D)(4) to enclose an existing portal and 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) for an addition to the west primary façade.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended conditional approval of the proposed project requesting the skylight on the east façade addition be non-publicly visible and found that the exception criterion have been met and comply with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the big change since the last hearing was that the second-story addition to the carport had been taken off the plans. The rear portal needs an exception per code. However, the covered area between the two buildings is on a primary facade and is more of a porch than a portal.

Mr. Duran stated it was more of a breezeway.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated it may be covered in the exception, but it doesn't really seem to be a feature that the code provision prohibits enclosing portals and porches is really designed to address. It is a design issue that should be addressed, maybe separately.

Member Biedscheid asked that the since the Board usually requires cement stucco on contributing and significant structures and the HCPI states that this building already has elastomeric stucco, is the stucco something that should be addressed.

Mr. Duran stated, staff would move to have the applicant change to cement if the Board would prefer it.

Director Lamboy stated that elastomeric stucco does not hold up and cement stucco would be the preference of the staff.

Mr. Duran stated that the applicant is not putting stucco on the entire house, just the additions and they are constructed of frame so the elastomeric stucco could be used.

Member Cherry asked that since the color was proposed as El Rey's "ash" is the product proposed as cement or elastomeric.

Mr. Duran understood that it was cement stucco.

Member Aguilar Medrano pointed out that grey as proposed on the garage door and wood stain is not usually allowed in the district or the streetscape so she would like to have a second option offered.

Daniel Strongwater, 2 Camino Pequeno, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Mr. Strongwater stated he was unsure of the type of stucco but that the additions are frame and elastomeric should be used. It was not discussed in the proposal if it would be cement. The color is a match not the product but would like to match the existing product. The garage door is semitransparent so that one can see the wood grain through the product color. He felt it harmonizes with the steel and dark grey window trim and the product is more durable than fully transparent. He also clarified that they tried to address the concerns from the last hearing. He also clarified about the breezeway/porch is very deep at eight feet. He also pointed out that the builders dealt with the elevation on site and the entrances to both houses and to get to the ground floor.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that there was something attractive about the currently open breezeway, with opening in the back as an interesting feature and it is not very visible from the street. So, he was not sure that there would be much lost by enclosing it.

Mr. Strongwater stated this breezeway gives a nice view of the backyard before entering the house. That opening will be a glass door so when we approach there will still be that experience. We did work to design this based off comments from the previous hearing.

Acting Chair Bienvenu pointed out that the applicant addressed some concerns by removing the addition on the garage but what the Board looking for was some minor tweaks to the design.

Mr. Strongwater understood that request, but they found there were other constraints with that portion of the project.

Member Cherry pointed out that the applicant was proposing to use the block rock at the parking area. While he is not a fan of block rock he does like it here. It distinguishes between Historic and new and asked for specifics on how the applicant was going to lower the garage floor without damaging the structure.

Mr. Strongwater stated that it would be up to the structural engineer.

Member Cherry questioned if the rock is mimicking the existing rock and the intent of the extension.

Mr. Strongwater stated that the plan is to clad it in the rock.

Director Lamboy stated that the applicant should know the process of the lowering of the garage because it is part of the purview of the Historic Districts Review Board.

Member Biedscheid stated that the recommendation from staff was to add a condition that the skylight is not publicly visible. Has this been met?

Mr. Duran stated, staff believes it is still visible, and that staff would like to have the condition and suggested that the applicant lower the 8" skylight to 4". He stated they also noticed on the property today that there is now HVAC on the addition and latillas in the rear that are new without approvals. So, there will be some conversation regarding those not being approved and needing further review, but the skylight is visible and cannot be visible. So, staff would appreciate the Board having a condition of approval for the skylight.

Member Biedscheid stated she was not clear on how to make the condition with this type of flat roof with no parapet because only very flat skylight might not be visible.

Mr. Duran stated there was discussion regarding other options for the district such as flatter skylight than proposed or a solar tube option. Whatever is decided cannot be publicly visible. However, staff cannot design the building for the applicant. The applicant did provide a document showing that the skylight would not be visible on the street by a six-foot-tall person walking down the street.

Member Biedscheid agreed with Member Aguilar Medrano regarding the grey color of garage stain and how it should match the other woodwork of the house such as the corbels.

Mr. Strongwater stated the color was meant to match the grey of the aged wood and the window trim.

Member Cherry asked staff what the staff uses as the distance down the street that constitutes as public way and reminded that the drawings are two dimensional so the drawing may not be able to establish public visibility.

Director Lamboy explained that public visibility is 300' each direction on the public right of way and the low-profile flat skylight as drawn will not be visible.

Mr. Strongwater clarified that skylights need to be up from the structure with sealant to prevent water leaks. He stated he would like to construct it with modern detailing so that it harmonizes well with the galvanized drip edge round the surrounds of the addition and roof.

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified publicly visible, and that the inspector can deny inspection post construction.

Member Degnan felt it could be low profile but stated she was not clear what the height of the person had to do with visibility it has never been based off height in any code. She asked for clarification on how it was addressed with the slope of the east portion of the road being higher than the rest.

Mr. Moquino explained the process from the perspective of an inspector.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. She stated that she had no problem with the enclosure of the portal on the south side, but a closet doesn't need a skylight. She has concerns more with garage door lowering, glad no addition would be on top the garage. The breezeway door doesn't look like glass in the drawings and enclosing that breezeway changes the approach of the house. The rock at the driveway is not there currently so it would be better to be left out and the doors should have openings to give an open appearance and not look like a blank wall. Ms. Beninato provided a document regarding her issues with the project. This is provided at the end of the minutes.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved to approve the project as proposed with the condition that the wall door "A" is moved back to retain the setback and differentiated. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded with a friendly amendment that a sample of the grey stain be shared with staff to ensure that it is an acceptable color and the skylight not be publicly visible. Member Cherry accepted the friendly amendments. Member Biedscheid offered a friendly amendment to have the applicant submit revised drawings to reflect the conditions of approval to staff prior to filing for a permit. Member Cherry accepted the friendly amendment. Member Aguilar Medrano accepted the friendly amendment. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Member Mather left the meeting at 7:15pm prior to the Board action on the case.

- b. 2025-009943-HDRB, 925 Acequia Madre**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing. Gregory Waits, agent for A. Jason Flanagan, owner, proposes to construct a 178 sq. ft. portal on the north façade of the main structure to a height of 9’.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found 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.

Acting Chair Bienvenu requested clarification of what the specific request the Board had at the last hearing.

Mr. Duran stated that the applicant was to provide at least one construction detail on the roof profile to indicate the translucent material edge that will not be publicly visible.

There were concerns with the roofing material given that it was a translucent polycarbonate material that's not frequently used in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

This portal construction is somewhat undefined in that it's not connected to either a casita or the main residence. It stands alone such as a pergola, but it's roofed with this polycarbonate material and encased in such a manner that it gives a “portalesque” feeling to the area and location where it's being proposed and so he had provided this detailed drawing and the applicant could share more about it and have a better explanation of how this material is not being publicly visible but still providing the owners the light that they're requesting.

Well, we'll see if the board finds this information to be what it needs.

Gregory Waits, 925 Calle Arco, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Mr. Waits stated that the translucent material would not be publicly visible. It is like a standing seam material with a flashing which will cover the roof. Mr. Waits explained the drainage from the roof.

Member Cherry asked if the applicant had the product for polycarbonate.

Mr. Waits said yes, it's a Hercules roof. It is specked from that roof, and it is a standing seam. It's a very thin material but I think the standing seam ensures that basically it's watertight.

Member Cherry stated the applicant did not specify a color for flashing.

Mr. Waits said he was receptive to what the Board felt appropriate, but he thought he would like to use a copper that will patina over time and blend in with things like the iron fence at the front of the property.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn, stated she was offended by the project because it was noticed as a portal. It does not meet the definition of a portal because it is not attached to a structure, but it does meet the definition of a pavilion. It does not match the property because it is not the same materials as the rest of property. It does not harmonize. The plexiglass material should not go to the edge. There is no reason stated for the structure and should have materials that harmonize with the rest of the property. She also noted that the Board does not generally approve copper.

Member Biedscheid pointed out she was not at the previous hearing and questioned why there was no exception for the material.

Mr. Duran stated there were concerns about the square footage given that it is a historic contributing structure, and the 178 sq. ft. may cause future additions to exceed square footage the residential structure but not for the material. He explained that on a site visit they saw another structure had the same material as the portal. While the material is not seen very often, it is used therefore staff did not require an exception for the material.

Director Lamboy stated that as a freestanding structure it does not need an exception for materials, however, if it were attached to the contributing structure, it would require an exception.

Member Biedscheid asked if other options for letting light into a pergola were considered because she felt she would deny this material because it is not consistent with historic materials in the area or with the contributing house. She recommended skylights and solid portions of wood.

Mr. Waits stated that material visibility was the discussion at the previous hearing and his understanding for this hearing was the consideration of public visibility of this polycarbonate material.

Member Biedscheid asked for clarification of the considerations from the last hearing from other Board members.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated that there had been extensive discussion about the connection between the buildings, and the appropriateness of the material. However, she felt that it was all still open for discussion. There was also a question regarding the use of the structure.

Mr. Waits stated that the homeowner's adult children reside in the casita and the portal use will be for them.

Member Aguilar Medrano felt now that there was no concern regarding the placement or type of structure but more regarding the materials being used.

Mr. Waits pointed out that the material is used in greenhouse structures in the area.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated that this is not a greenhouse so that is not an appropriate comparison.

Member Cherry also shared with Member Biedscheid that the last hearing discussed options such as skylights and it was determined that because of the curve of skylights would be publicly visible. The Board requested the construction details to ensure the edge of this product would be covered and not publicly visible such as with the flashing.

Member Biedscheid stated that from her experience this material is less permanent.

Mr. Waits felt it was congruent to Santa Fe style architecture.

Acting Chair Bienvenue stated it was sort of implied approval if the applicant could prove the material would not be publicly visible, but it had not been ultimately decided.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the project with the conditions that the flashing be galvanized steel. Member Cherry seconded with the friendly amendment that the temporary roofing material be approved. Member Biedscheid accepted the friendly amendment. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

8. New Business

- a. **2025-010124-HDRB, 248 Rodriguez St.**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, noncontributing, Jennifer Salimbene, agent for Steven Barrett, property owner, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the structure be maintained as non-contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Jennifer Salimbene, 125 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Ms. Salimbene supported the staff's recommendations and was available for any questions.

Public Comment:

No public comments were offered.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Madrano moved to retain the non-contributing status consistent with staff's recommendation. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Ms. Romero asked a clarifying question if a demolition request was forthcoming, would the Board prefer the demolition and new construction request at the same time?

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated there was no preference.

Member Cherry recommended seeing both at the same time.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated they do like to see how the streetscape will be impacted by the replacement when deciding if a demolition is warranted.

Attorney Ruybalid stated that demolition and new construction have been separate cases in the past but there was no reason not to have both cases heard on the same agenda.

Director Lamboy stated now that it has a designation of non-contributing the process may be different than if it had been stasured differently.

- b. **2025-010102-HDRB, 423 W. San Francisco St. ½ Unit: A**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing. Ellen Yarrell, owner, requests status review and primary façade designation(s) if applicable.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the main residential structure and garage be upgraded to contributing with the main structure's east and south facades and garage's west façade designated as primary identified in the Primary Façade Diagram as numbers two and three (main structure) and four (garage), per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked for clarification on the difference between Mr. Murphy's recommendation on the HCPI and Staffs' recommendations.

Mr. Duran explained that staff were recommending an additional primary of the eastern elevation labeled as façade two with the three over one wood window.

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified that on the other elevation that the recommendation for primary was excluding the window changes and the portal.

Mr. Duran confirmed that the non-historic material was excluded from the recommendation.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if the portal was non-historic.

Mr. Duran confirmed it was constructed in the 1990s and was non-historic.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the garages' north façade was distinctive with a deep-set window of indeterminate age, but it seems the opening is original from the 1948 construction. He asked what material the garage was constructed from.

Mr. Duran stated it was adobe.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if the window openings and the windows themselves could be from that era since they are sash windows. He asked if that had been taken into consideration.

Mr. Duran acknowledged that per the conversation on the field trip that the northern façade is also character defining same as the west façade.

Member Biedscheid felt that Mr. Murphy's recommendation and staff's recommendations were very different. She read a portion of the HCPI into the record: "Given the central block may date from the 1880s and represent a building form and the door and window pattern typical of that period it seems fitting to designate the south elevation of this section room 4 as the primary facade." He says, "While the lesser appendages are of age and reflect a creative growth they do not hold the same level of significance as the central block." She stated that she thought he was recommending just the tall portion that sticks out about four feet from the other portions as the primary façade.

Mr. Duran agreed with her assessment and stated that Mr. Murphy made his recommendation for that southern rectangular block section of the main structure. However, staff found that all the additions are nearly a hundred years old from the 1930s and are built out of Adobe and these additions hold the character defining features that are congruent with the downtown and eastside historic design standards. So, given their age, the location and how they harmonize with this structure staff finds that they meet the code criteria.

Member Biedscheid stated that John Murphy makes that point that the whole structure is in place by 1958, not quite 100 years old but he says that even though it meets the criteria for age he doesn't think that it rises to the level of character defining.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated it is important to note that it is a distinction and agreed with staff that separating out the two wings from the main structure as being lesser of significance because it is obviously such a pattern of a Santa Fe adobe and the way they

grow and this has a great aesthetic quality and are character defining and they are significant as a characteristic of Santa Fe architecture.

Member Cherry requested a point of clarification that the window sashes are storm sashes not the window sashes.

Mr. Duran confirmed that he meant storm sashes were installed in the 1990s. The windows themselves are characteristic of the 1950s excluding the one window on the east façade which may be of an older date.

Ellen Yarrell, (address inaudible), was sworn in. Ms. Yarrell stated that Mr. Duran represents the county and city, and Mr. Murphy represents the architectural historical perspective. She stated she spoke for the property itself, owning it for better or for worse. She read information regarding the intent of heritage preservation and the requirements for reviewing the ordinance as it is pertinent to the historic preservation board and asked the Board to declare only the south side of central as the primary according to Mr. Murphy's report and asked that it be non-contributing. She felt blindsided by the staff recommendations. She began to explain about her intent to remodel the building.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked the applicant not to mention plans for the remodel.

Ms. Yarrell asked the Board to focus on the goals and the definitions that are included in ordinance, especially taking into consideration the word applicability. She emphasized that there was no public visibility and felt that meant that the contributing status should not be applied. She began to discuss the plans for remodel.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the Board is not discussing the remodel and asked that the applicant please not mention their intentions at this time.

Ms. Yarrell stated she was curious what the expectations were for the property and that she is committed to the property. She brought up her intent for remodel.

Acting Chair Bienvenu reiterated that the issue before the Board tonight is only the status and primary façade designation.

Ms. Yarrell stated she agrees with Mr. Murphy's suggestion that the center facade south side as primary. That the idea of retrograding seemed more like penalty box for a new owner.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that status designation does not stop renovation, it will not be discussed tonight but the applicant can come back with a remodel later.

Attorney Ruybalid clarified that the reason for reviewing status without the consideration of a remodel is that the renovation is often abandoned due to life circumstances so it is

important to avoid the Board being motivated to vote on status based on a project that may not be built. Basically, it is an expectation that is not ever fulfilled.

Mr. Duran clarified that the structure is publicly visible, especially the entire north façade which holds the mural. The concrete jungle parking lot is a public way, and the residence is visible from the concrete jungle parking lot.

Acting Chair Bienvenu explained that public visibility is not a prerequisite for status review. It is the character defining features of the building.

Ms. Yarrell stated the recommended primary façade of the south is not publicly visible.

Acting Chair Bienvenu explained that public visibility is not part of the definition for status review and primary façade designation. Even if property is not publicly visible it is still considered part of the streetscape which is considered for the status. The status does not determine what can or cannot be done as part of the remodel which can be discussed at another hearing.

Member Biedscheid clarification the photo is labeled as a different house which no longer stands.

Public Comment:

Mr. John Eddy, 14 Avenida Campo, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. Mr. John Eddy, 14 Avenida Campo, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. Mr. Eddy stated he was thrilled that someone is going to work on this property. He wanted to know how they were going to reconcile um the parapet because he understood it was a brick coping that was plastered to create a vernacular aberration of architecture in Santa Fe. He felt on a contributing structure it was inappropriate and wanted to know if it could be returned to its' historic state with the brick coping.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if there were any records regarding the alterations from the brick coping.

Mr. Duran stated there was no documentation or known Board cases for the property. There are some older photos, but they do not show clearly any brick coping or that there could have been brick coping.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if the stucco over the brick coping could be more than 50 years old.

Mr. Duran stated that it appears as if it might have been done in the 1970s because the stucco is older.

There was a short discussion regarding one of the photos and the difference between the photo and the current building. It was determined the photo was of a previous neighboring building which no longer exists.

Member Degnan asked if there had ever been an occasion in the past where an alteration like the coping being covered was required by the Board to be reverted to the original version of the building.

Mr. Duran stated it is in the purview of the Board.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn, stated this should be upgraded contributing. It is down a driveway which is part of a pattern in the area and the historic zones of having one building connected to another so there is no visibility from the street. However, it does look like an original footprint, and it sounded like the windows were historic even if the storm windows are not. It should be easy enough to find out when it became a duplex by looking through city directories. She stated she had done some property research on Romero Street, and it had a very similar appearance at the top with a curved aspect to it. It was common for people with brick coping that were having trouble with leaks to stucco over the coping historically. So, it is a question of when it occurred and noting 1975 is 50 years old and considered historic. The Board could easily find this to be a contributing structure with the south side being designated as primary.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved to designate the main residence as contributing with the south and east facades as primary and designate the garage as contributing with the west and north as primary facades. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Augilar Medrano, Degnan and Cherry voting for and Member Biedscheid voting against.

9. Discussion Items

Director Lamboy gave a short update on the rewrite of the code and the aspects of the code that were being updated as part of phase 1.

Director Lamboy reminded the Board that the second hearing in April (April 22, 2025) was cancelled due to a lack of cases.

Director Lamboy announced that the Historic Santa Fe Foundation Symposium on Preservation in Santa Fe will be on April 26th and Gary Moquino will be presenting at the symposium.

Director Lamboy announced that the South Capital Project will be giving a presentation Thursday, April 10, 2025.

Member Aguilar Medrano left the meeting at 8:44 pm during the discussion items.

10. **Matters from the Board**

Acting Chair Bienvenu pointed out that the conversation regarding cementitious stucco made him wonder if the stucco guidance that was discussed several years ago had been adopted.

Mr. Duran stated that it is being used.

Director Lamboy stated that the stucco guidelines were adopted in 2022. The Board has changed since then and while she was sure it was on the website; she would send a copy to the current Board members.

11. **Next Meeting**

a. May 13, 2025

12. **Adjournment**

Member Degnan moved to adjourn. Member Biedscheid seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.

Lani McCulley, Transcription

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date

925 Acequia Madre

OBJECTIONS To Addition at 925 Acequia Madre

1 It has not been correctly noticed. It is not a pergola (not covered) or a portal (attached to a structure). It is a pavilion (covered pergola) *Point of Order*

2. It is not in harmony with the rest of the structures on the property since it uses plexiglass as the roofing material. The ordinance does require internal harmony on the property.

3. This structure is a want not a need and serves no purpose for an roofed walkway between the main house and the guest unit. There is no real justification for the need for this addition.

4 The idea that the owners want to save money by using this cheap material is not supported by the ordinance as a reason to allow this disharmonious material in this historic zone. If you can afford a house on Acequia Madre, you can afford to use glass.

Stefano Beninato