



**Regular Meeting of the Historic  
Districts Review Board  
May 13, 2025 at 5:30 PM  
Council Chambers, City Hall  
200 Lincoln Avenue**

---

**Meeting Minutes**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hvbjsVPJedg>

**Call to Order**

Chair Rios 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

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair  
Mr. John Bienvenu, Vice Chair  
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid  
Ms. Madelein Aguilar Medrano  
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan  
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent

Ms. Amanda Mather (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  
Ms. Amanda Romero, Senior Planner  
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner  
Mr. Paul Duran, Senior Planner  
Ms. Mariah Kavanaugh, Planner Technician

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 and can be requested from the Historic Preservation Division.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Historic Districts Review Board  
May 13, 2025  
Page 1 of 21

Mr. Moquino stated that Item 12: the next hearing on May 27<sup>th</sup> will be in the convention center in ballroom B at 201 W Marcy.

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

### **3. Approval of Minutes**

a. April 8, 2025

Member Bienvenu requested that on page 15 one-third of the way down with the paragraph that begins “Acting Chair Bienvenu”, the second sentence states “even if property is not publicly visible it is still considered part of the streetscape” add the words “district and” before the word streetscape. He also requested, in the next sentence which reads “the status does not determine what can or cannot be done” to add the word “conclusively” between not and determine, so that it reads “the status does not conclusively determine what can or cannot be done”.

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the minutes as amended. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

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

a. 2024-009479-HDRB 710 Canyon Rd. (December 10, 2024)

No changes were made to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for December 10, 2024.

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **5. Matters from the Public**

Stefanie Beninato requested a report on St. Catherines Indian School rezoning. She also stated that the materials approved for use in the 925 Acequia Madre “portal” set a bad precedence and that there was no discussion about if it constituted as a portal which by her understanding of the definition of portal that structure is not a portal. She asked about enforcement of visible rooftop appurtenances, especially regarding the HVAC at 300 Galisteo, the Georgia O’Keefe Museum, and the address on Canyon Road.

Rick Martinez stated that the cameras on the bandstand at the plaza are back up with no review and wanted to know how to get them removed and he would like to see the HDRB have more review of the acequias.

Director Lamboy stated she will find out about the cameras and announced that the department is working on an update to the Acequias document that was written by David Snow.

Elizabeth West shared her experience in reading article 2.6(B) regarding the delegation to the Historic Districts Review Board.

Richard Martinez stated that the application schedule at only one time per month is an issue for applicants because it can take months to get to the Board and asked that it go back to twice per month. He also pointed out that the HDRB is required to have a seat filled by an architect because the architect understands the submittal differently than the other Board members and could help with clarification regarding aspects of the case.

#### **6. Staff Communications**

Attorney Ruybalid gave a short summary of the appeal for the 2021, 65' cell tower requested at St. John's College. The appeal was filed by the neighborhood. The appeal was sent to the district court who remanded it back to the Governing Body. The deal between the college and the cell company has not been renewed and the tower will no longer be sought as previously designed. If the request for another cell tower comes in, it will need to start with a new application to HDRB.

Planner Manager Moquino announced that the 2025 heritage preservation awards were taking place on Thursday, May 15<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 p.m. at the San Miguel Chapel and the reception will be held after at El Zaguán.

Director Lamboy issued an update on the appeal at 614 Paseo de Peralta stating the hearing is postponed to the June 25<sup>th</sup> City Council hearing.

Director Lamboy announced that there would be a green code update announcement at the next hearing. She also gave a short update on the code rewrite and announced that a disposition report outlining the changes to the code has been issued. Will be introduced to the city council on May 28<sup>th</sup> and will come to HDRB for comment on June 10<sup>th</sup> the adoption date due to the need to be reviewed by Boards and committees will be July 30<sup>th</sup>. She stated that she and Maggie Moore are now spearheading the project because Daniel Alvarado has left the city. The anticipated start date for phase two will be concurrent with the update of the Santa Fe Forward General Plan and the first open house for the Santa Fe forward general plan is scheduled from 10am to 2p.m. on June 14<sup>th</sup> at the Midtown Higher Education Center.

#### **7. Old Business**

No items were listed under Old Business.

#### **8. New Business**

- a. **2025-010291-HDRB, 815 Dunlap St**, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, non-contributing, Christopher Purvis, agent for Michael Zimmer, owner, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a residential structure and two accessory structures.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the residential structure be upgraded to contributing with the south, west and east facades of the original residence as primary, excluding the non-historic materials and excluding the greenhouse, the garage structure be designated as non-contributing, and the storage structure be designated as non-contributing per 14-5.2(C)(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Christopher Purvis, 518 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Mr. Purvis stated that the report was complete and agreed with the staff's recommendation.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. She agreed with the staff report and felt that it would be a good decision to preserve this building.

**Board Action:**

Member Bienvenu moved that the recommendations of the staff be adopted as findings that the residential structure be upgraded to contributing with the south, west, and east facades which are designated 4, 5, and 6 of the residence as primary excluding the non-historic materials and excluding the greenhouse, the door opening which appears to be non-historic and in an ideal work if the greenhouse were to be removed would be returned to a window to reestablish the original symmetry of the street facing facade, the garage structure be designated as non-contributing and the storage structure be designated as non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- b. **2025-010331-HDRB, 137 E. Santa Fe Ave.**, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, Contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Paige Prescott and Robert Merker, owners, request a status review and primary façade designation(s) if applicable for residence, garage and yard wall.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the main residential structure be upgraded to significant status, excluding the mudroom addition on the north facade, the garage to maintain contributing status with the south façade designated as primary excluding the garage doors, and the east yard wall designated as contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Chair Rios requested clarification on the recommendation for the house.

Ms. Romero stated the recommendation is significant excluding the mudroom addition.

Member Bienvenu commented that one of the things that stands out in looking at this property, is the building's significance, not referring so much to the technical definition in the code, but just it's a significant building. It clearly has incredible historic integrity. There is no question that it should be protected but, is it a significant building with some exclusions which is somewhat unusual or is it a contributing building with all of the facades designated as primary except for the back addition that staff excluded from the significant status recommendation? He felt either way would be fine and would accomplish the purpose but in looking back again at the HCPI he felt it was more appropriate to do what staff recommended which is the significant status because it is significant not only for its presence as an extremely well preserved building from that era but, also it has significance with its associations with the people that lived in it particularly Cleofes, who was an important figure in New Mexico history. His family, either him or a child, built the house and then there was the Shia family that owned it are also part of the business history of Santa Fe with their jewelry stores in town. Therefore, Member Bienvenu felt he would be inclined to accept the recommendation of significant for the associations in addition to the fact that the building is a contributing building with lots of elevations worthy of preservation. He added that the color is also important to protect though it is not the original color but there is oral evidence that it is from the 50s which would mean that it has been present for 75 years with that very distinctive color. The code recognizes that changes to a historic property that have become historic in their own right should also be protected so he requested that if the Board follows staff's recommendations that the Board call out in particular the color as well as the asphalt roof which is harmonious with the neighborhood and the district. He also stated that there is some importance to this building in the way it interacts with the building directly to the east which appears to be constructed probably at the same time by the same builder and has very similar details and also has incredible historic integrity and is extremely well preserved there is a synergy between them that's very important to protect as well.

Chair Rios stated that this is a wonderful example of a bungalow craftsman style building. It really is and as those who live in Santa Fe know that in this neighborhood there are many of those style buildings which are very different than the Pueblo Revival buildings. The different style buildings denote a certain period in time, and this is a very good example. She agreed with Vice Chair Bienvenu's comments.

Member Biedscheid commented that she shared Member Bienvenu's thoughts about a significant structure with exclusions. She pointed out that there are other bungalow style buildings with mud rooms on the back, some even on this street, and questioned if staff had researched the status of those structures because she felt that the designations should be consistent.

Ms. Romero stated that there was no information immediately available regarding the other properties, but the mudroom was built approximately in the late 1940s to early 1950s. So, the mudroom is also historic. The request for the significant status is in part due to the people who built the home, and who lived in the home not just the structures architectural features.

Chair Rios pointed out that age means the mudroom can actually be included in the significant status.

Director Lamboy stated that in reference to the mudroom there are a couple of things at play. The mudroom itself does not exemplify the architecture of the bungalow style it was purely utilitarian and therefore it was not seen. Although it is historic it is not a defining characteristic of the house and really doesn't relate architecturally to the house at all. There are other cases on Santa Fe Avenue where the mudroom has been removed and approved by the Board, especially along Don Gaspar the twin houses there was situation where a mudroom was allowed to be changed. The street of Santa Fe Avenue itself is primarily contributing properties with two bungalows designated as significant.

Member Cherry, having worked on significant homes with exclusions, shared that while it is atypical to have the exclusion, his understanding is that the significant structure has been unmodified, however, this mudroom is kind of unique because it is basically an addition on to the original and presumably brick wall behind it. So, the significant portion of the structure still exists. This building is really important and worthy of preservation and the space around it is really important as well. So, an addition, even on the rear would remove some of the integrity of the historic nature of the building as well as the space around it. The wall is also important, unique, authentic and well preserved. The question here would be if the building were designated contributing would that open that rear, non-primary façade to removal of the mudroom and opening of the area or even to an addition that would close the area.

Director Lamboy clarified that if the building was contributing and not all facades were designated as primary then it does open it up but there are exceptions to the code as well so the applicant could request an exception for any primary facade to do an addition. Of course, this is up to the Board as to whether to determine if that is consistent with the keeping of the character of the building and the intent of the ordinance or not. Any addition could happen on all façade presuming they meet the zoning standards.

Member Cherry stated he has also worked on homes that have had one designation and had other components as non-contributing, specifically materials for instance in this building there is vinyl siding on the addition, a vinyl soffit, vinyl coverings over the fascia material and it has mini-split lines exposed to the exterior. Is it possible to give it a designation and exclude those elements of materials?

Director Lamboy answered that the overall intent is a significant building given that all four facades are considered primary and it's sort of similar in the vein of you know a primary facade given that this north facade is going to be primary if this is designated significant then just like we did in the case on Dunlap we excluded the greenhouse this would be a similar situation and you're right the materials um and the changes on that I mean are not speaking to the overall history of the house and character.

Gayla Bechtol, 320 Aztec, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. Ms. Bechtol stated that for a structure to be designated as significant it must retain a high level of historic integrity. When she saw the designation that was recommended by staff, she thought to herself, wait a minute the eaves are vinyl. In the photograph of the property next door which is very similar architecture the exposed rafters on the eaves, the eaves were quite important to the original architecture of this structure in addition to the vinyl siding and the changed window on the porch. The front porch beadboard that was part of the original eave, and one can imagine how glorious this house would have been with the eave and the beadboard decking much like what is seen next door. Reading the definition contributing, *"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 unique it is not unique in itself."* This can be seen at the neighbor and other parts of the neighborhood *"it adds to the historic associations or historical architectural design qualities"* so, the contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains. Based on the definitions in the code that this house is absolutely contributing but it is not a significant structure because the eave is altered greatly based on its character and the rafters are not visible, the vinyl siding and the front window door facing the porch are very important parts of this structure and have been altered. She further stated that she agreed with the wall, and the garage. Though the garage is an absolutely wonderful structure, it is not significant.

**Public Comment:**

Mr. Daniel Pino, 141 East Santa Fe Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. Mr. Pino shared that he is the fourth generation of the family in the residence at 141 East Santa Fe Avenue and he is here to offer brief comments regarding the historical context of the 137 East Santa Fe Avenue building and equally important its sister companion property at 141 East Santa Fe Avenue which contains a historic divider stone wall and the eastern wall of the garage. As the representative of his family, he shared that the corner residence, 141 East Santa Fe Avenue along with 137 are historically known as the Romero town home residences both residences were constructed by the Romero family of Las Vegas, New Mexico in the early 1900s within what was then known as the Solomon Division. His family is a part of the living descendants, and they grew up at 141 East Santa Fe Avenue. The area led Mr. Pino to study art and art and architectural history in France at Oberlin College and also at the University of Texas at Austin where he focused on the Beaux-Arts from the Equal De Beaux-Arts movement also arts and crafts movements within the United States and the UK and also the American Craftsman bungalow styles

which both of these homes are. This is the style that was chosen for these homes. So our family has been part of Santa Fe Avenue from its earliest days and his family intend to continue as stewards of this legacy for generations to come and they agree that the divider stone wall which is located on the property at 141 East Santa Fe Avenue is historic and that the eastern garage wall located on the same property should be considered as contributing to Santa Fe's history and his family will preserve and maintain it as they always have.

Chair Rios stated that she appreciated Mr. Pino coming forward, because as a long time Santa Fean, born and raised here with her mother's side going way back, is very interested in hearing from multigenerational people that have lived in their family homes for a long time. She asked if the brick home in the picture was where Mr. Pino lived.

Mr. Pino stated that he is the fourth generation and that he grew up with was the Shea home and he knew them very well. They tried to convince his family to paint their house green in the same color. The family resisted, they also resisted changing the wall, so it is the exact same. It has only been maintained and there are no plans to change it. Mr. Pino had submitted some pictures of his father standing by the garage in the 50s when the wall went all the way back to the rear of both properties to Pino Arroyo named after his family along with Pino Road across from these properties on Weber Street. In the early 50s the garage already existed but Mr. Shae wanted to enlarge the garage, and he extended onto the 141 East Santa Fe Avenue property. The Pino family has since maintained the eastern wall of that garage including the re-stuccoing it two years ago. He stated it is important that it is a Pueblo Revival style personally and as part of the family's national heritage.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. Ms. Beninato agreed with the staff's recommendations of significant for the main structure and contributing on the wall and the garage even though the garage doors should definitely be excluded. She reminded the Board that the mudroom, while an addition was historic and the ordinance does say that changes are allowed the residence can continue to be lived in and that seems to be something the owners found to be necessary at the time. Therefore, she did not feel it should be excluded from the significant façade. She also reminded them that across the street there on west Santa Fe Avenue there's a house that was owned by the oil and gas company for a while and it was and still is designated as significant even though oil and gas added on an addition that covered about 10 ft of the back facade which was primary and it was white sided and then the Board allowed the couple from Louisiana who bought it to add on a bathroom on with the possibility that they might need an accessibility bathroom that was constructed to conform to the addition from the oil and gas company as opposed to being harmonious with the original significant house. She mentioned she had previously requested that the status of that building to downgraded to contributing because that back facade has totally changed. However, on the property there is a very small mudroom that is historic and that was utilitarian as described that does not detract from labeling the whole building as significant. There have

been some material changes such as the eaves but when was that change was it historic, was it necessary because the eaves were deteriorating? She pointed out that the Board does not know it should not make the building contributing as opposed to significant. She hoped the Board would preserve the main house as significant not only because of its integrity but also because of its history. She also appreciated Mr. Pino's presentation on the neighborhood and their care for the structures.

Member Cherry asked who owns the yard wall.

Mr. Pino responded that the wall going back to the 1915 or 1910 Solomon Plat has always been part of 141 East Santa Fe Avenue. Both homes were built by the Romero family as town homes they lived in them. They were ranchers and merchants as well and these two homes were their residences when they needed to come into town and work with the government and it also led to family members becoming part of local government as well. That wall extended all the way to the Pino Arroyo which still exists it was called the Acequia de Los Pinos Pino Road runs along that acequia and that wall ran all the way back to the arroyo, so the Pino family has always maintained that wall and they maintain the eastern garage wall because it's still on their property.

Chair Rios asked clarification if the wall is being reviewed since it belongs to the neighbor rather than the property that is before the Board.

Ms. Romero confirmed that the wall is before the Board for review and that staff is recommending contributing status. She stated ownership is a civil matter, but the wall is being reviewed regardless of ownership

Director Lamboy stated that she was looking at the legal lot of record for this tract and the rock wall appears to straddle a property line and a portion of it does go into the 137 East Santa Fe Avenue property. She suggested that maybe the Board could postpone consideration of that element to make sure that there's an agreement with the adjacent property owner to for these folks to act on their behalf for the designation of the rock wall since there is a portion that does go on to the adjacent property.

Member Bienvenu stated that based on the discussion that has been held amongst the board about this issue of how to handle the mudroom he is not comfortable with the concept of a structure that's significant and contributing at the same time. Logically a significant structure is not just an extra special contributing structure. It is significant as an entirety and, in this case, that is true even though the Board recognizes that there are some accretive changes that have been made, some of which are perhaps less important, but it does not make them contributing versus significant. This residence has larger significance in its association with the people that built it and lived in it, its' association on the streetscape, the entire subdivision, the house directly adjacent to it, the acequia that

runs behind it, and the entire district that it is located in and particularly this section of that district.

**Board Action:**

Member Bienvenu moved that findings be entered that the residence satisfies the definition of a significant structure under the ordinance for the reasons stated, while recognizing for future purposes that the mudroom addition in the back was a separate addition at a later time though it is still historic, and that, factor may be taken into account in any request for exceptions that may come before the board in the future, and secondarily that the garage maintain its contributing status with the south facade designated as primary excluding the garage doors and that the east yard wall be designated as contributing if in fact it's on this property and if in fact we have the authority to make that designation here noting that if it is not on this property the notice procedure may not have been um adequate for a designation of that wall, but if it is then designate the wall as contributing as well. Member Degnan seconded. Member Cherry offered a friendly amendment to exclude the vinyl siding, fascia, soffits, HVAC lines. The friendly amendment was accepted and Member Bienvenu added that the window on the north under the poral is not original, though historic but is still part of the designation.

Member Biedscheid stated that the nature of this conversation where there are so many questions about what was original and what wasn't and what should be included or excluded just indicates that maybe this does not rise to the level of historic integrity that is normally associated with a significant structure. The argument about the eaves is particularly compelling but this would be more in favorable if designated as contributing with three facades designated as primary. There are changes to three of the four facades and one of the changes obscures one of the facades in a way that does not rise to the highest level of integrity.

The motion passed by roll call vote with Members, Degnan, Bienvenu, Aguilar Medrano, and Cherry voting for and Member Biedscheid against.

- c. **2025-010339-HDRB, 629 Camino del Monte Sol**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for David Garrity, owner, requests status review with primary façade designation(s) if applicable.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the structure be maintained as non-contributing, per 14-5.2(C)(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status within Historic Districts.

Gayla Bechtol previously sworn in, agreed with the staff's recommendation.

Chair Rios asked that the applicants pay close attention to where they post signs for the Board because a project can be postponed if that sign is not seen by the public or is not

in the property place per staff guidelines. This posting was able to be seen but it was a bit away from the right of way, but it was determined to be publicly visible.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated that she found the history of this building to be or buildings to be a little bit confusing. She understood it became condos in 1988 but then there was something about 1992 but then additions in the 21st century and she wondered if the owners actually came in and got permits for those additions or changes because it was not discussed and she was concerned about the loss of buildings because things do get changed without permits and then too much time goes by without them being noticed. This is a beautiful building the way it exists, and it is unfortunate that there's ambiguity about the building's additions and construction and whether permits were applied for and approved.

Ms. Patti Stivers, 623 Camino del Monte Sol, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in. She stated she has lived in this compound for 33 years and she has seen the carport being built and the additions and everybody did get permits. She stated they also came before the historical board. The property at 629 Camino del Monte Sol came for the carport and a bedroom was added. She could not remember the date but then in 2014 or 2015 the 625 Camino del Monte Sol came before the Board regarding windows and exterior elements. She felt it important to confirm this information.

**Board Action:**

Member Aguilar Medrano moved to retain status of residence as non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

- d. **2025-010351-HDRB, 629 Camino del Monte Sol**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for David Garrity, owner, proposes to construct a 60 sq. ft. mechanical room and window and door replacements on the main structure.

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.

Chair Rios pointed out that some of the true divided lite window pattern is east to west instead of north south which has been in the past has not been given the stamp of approval and in reference to the window pattern that there are horizontal and then vertical. This is the only place where three windows are in the horizontal pattern.

Mr. Duran stated that on this northern facade is the only location for horizontal pattern throughout the rest of the structure the windows will be true divided lite.

Chair Rios stated with this style of home it's more common to have it north to south.

Member Cherry clarified that north to south meant vertical as opposed to horizontal.

Member Bienvenu stated he agreed with Chair Rios that the horizontal orientation for divided lite windows is appropriate in this district nor the kind of variation of different styles of divided lites and horizontal and vertical orientations that are shown on the plan. The orientation should be consistent, and it is great that the windows are actual divided lites, but they should be square individually paneled or oriented vertically rather than horizontally. He asked if the applicant had a reason for the orientation or if they would reorient the divided lites.

David Garrett, 629 Camino del Monte Sol, Santa Fe, NM. Was sworn in. Mr. Garrett stated that they had changed from the horizontal and this may have been missed on the façade, but the façade is not publicly visible, almost to the point of being a secondary space in the whole unit. It faces the wall next door to the property and that was why the room was placed in this location. There is no work planned on the primary facade. The window sizes vary and there are issues with the code for egress so this is why the windows look this way in the drawing, but the applicant will be happy to go with the Boards' recommendation for vertical divided lite windows. He also asked that due to cost, would the Board allow for simulated divided lites rather than true divided lites.

Chair Rios confirmed that these windows are not publicly visible.

Mr. Garrett stated the windows are not publicly visible and that the building is not publicly visible. It is behind the gate and facing away from the so none of it is visible. He also pointed out that many of the other units do not have divided lites and this will be the first consistent unit.

Member Cherry stated that the simulated divided lites are totally acceptable with the status of the structure and because the windows are not publicly visible. It is not like this is a replacement in-kind. The window currently has no division.

Chair Rios asked for clarification regarding true divided lites and simulated divided lites.

Member Cherry explained that the simulated have a spacer bar but would not have an applied lattice on front of the glass, it would have mutton bars interior and exterior and then a spacer bar in between the mutton bars but it would be one continuous sheet of glass. It is difficult to distinguish between true divided lite and simulated at more than 10 ft away.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated she appreciated the members' comments about the horizontal divided lights. She felt they should be consistent within the building and in this zone. They are vertical not horizontal so the Board should require that they match the other divided lites being proposed.

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe, NM was sworn in. Ms. West appreciated the distinction that Member Cherry made, and that distinction is important so that it is clear to people listening because there is real difference between the simulated version that is well done and those that are not. She said heard some people who came in front of the Board several years ago said "Well we've already ordered all the windows, and we can't afford the ones you want us to put in." They made two mistakes; one in ordering ahead of time and two not clarifying what they needed to do the right thing. Given the status that you've agreed upon and the location and where the windows are on the building it seems that the design would be okay. However, if she understood better, she would disagree because better light would come from the true divided lite. She was not sure her argument was strong enough but since this was non-contributing maybe simulated was okay.

**Board Action:**

Member Cherry moved to approve as submitted allowing for either vertical or horizontal muntin bars. Member Biedscheid seconded with a friendly amendment to allow for simulated divided lites. The friendly amendment was accepted. The motion failed by roll call vote with Members Cherry and Biedscheid voting for and Members Bienvenu, Degnan and Aguilar Medrano against.

Member Bienvenu explained that he voted against only it sets a bad precedent in this district to allow for the horizontal divided lights.

Member Bienvenu moved to adopt the findings as recommended by staff and approve the application with the condition that the windows be consistent in their divided lite patterns with either a square or vertical pattern as agreed to by the applicant tonight and that simulated divided lites be allowed at the applicant's discretion. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- e. **2025-010292-HDRB, 345 Garcia St**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Robert Holleyman and Bill Keller, owners, proposes to demolish an accessory dwelling unit and carport.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the demolition criteria were met and recommended approval of the proposed demolition finding that the application complies with Section 14-3.14 Demolition of Historic or Landmark Structures, and Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts.

Gayla Bechtol previously sworn in agreed with staff's recommendation and gave more detail about the structure including the lack of insulation and that what is seen on the outside is what's also on the inside, the 3/4 inch of board is what this building is made of, so she agreed with staff.

**Public Comment:**

There were no comments from the public.

**Board Action:**

Member Cherry moved to approve the staff's recommendation to demolish the building. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. Member Bienvenu offered a friendly amendment to include in the motion that all applicable demolition criteria have been met for the reasons set forth in the staff report. The friendly amendment was accepted. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- f. **2025-010349-HDRB, 821 Acequia Madre**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Mary and Elaine Alarid, owners, propose to remodel the existing garage with a 496 sq. ft. living addition, 538 sq. ft. new garage, and 135 sq. ft. portal addition to a maximum height of 16'-8" where the maximum allowable is 16'-11".

Chair Rios recused herself from the case. She did remain in the room.

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.

Gayla Bechtol, previously sworn in, made clarifications that the applicant is holding back the addition from the existing wall so that the original west wall can be read and they are repairing this window not replacing that window. These doors on the west were previously on their grandparents' house across the driveway and when that house was redone these doors were moved over here. So, they are historic doors from their grandparents' house across the driveway, and this is a homage to their grandparents. The driveway is only for service and it's not an active driveway. The active entry for this house is connected to the main house and it's in the little place next to the house; there's a portal between the garage door and the other doors. There is a step up so we're stepping up the new house also. It will add accessibility to plumbing but will also have a full basement underneath the house. The portal on the north is the rear portal and is for private open space.

Mary Alarid Enright portal, 1206 Stafford Drive, (inaudible), California, was sworn in. Ms. Alarid Enright stated the portal on the east was not built in 1994. It was built probably in

the late 1960s when the current owners, Mary and her sister Elaine Alarid, were children in the home. She shared the purpose of the remodel and their long-term objectives for the property. Acequia Madre in this area is a heritage neighborhood for the Alarid family starting at 710 Canyon Road which was recently an item on the Historic Districts Review Board agenda was the home of their great-grandfather Sepharino Alarid and Pavalina Alarid who raised their family there. In addition, Mary and Elaine's father was brought up in that home when he was younger. The property at 710 Canyon is adjacent to 777 Acequia Madre which is directly behind it, and it is the neighbor to 821 Acequia Madre. At 777 Acequia Madre is where Mary and Elaine's grandparents built their home with additions and has since been remodeled and sold twice since they were the original owners. That property was owned by Ben Alarid and Josephite Alarid who are Mary and Elaine's grandparents, and they raised their seven children there. Mary and Elaine had many family activities in that home with their many cousins. So, it's an important part of Mary and Elaine's property. Mary and Elaine's parents purchased the property adjacent at 821 Acequia Madre on the east side. Mary mentioned when the status of the property was under consideration, it was really a community project to build the home. The adobes for the home were built by the excavated material from the underlayment of the home and it was really a community project to do the finished carpentry. Mary and Elaine's dad, his father and even great-grandfather were involved in laying the joist, laying the floor and putting the house together. In that neighborhood, most of the homes have been sold but Mary and Elaine want to bring to the Boards attention the nature of the entire neighborhood and its impact on the Alarid family. As Mary mentioned, 710 Canyon Road was sold to the Seth Gallery when Mary and Elaine were quite young and as a result Mary and Elaine's great-grandmother, who Mary and Elaine called Dwella, moved next door to 777 Acequia Madre and her sister, Mary and Elaine's Tia Luce moved next door. So, when Mary and Elaine were growing up, they had their great-grandmother, her sister, their grandparents and their family all in the neighborhood adjacent to this property. On the east side is another set of Alarid family who is in a different lineage, but Mary and Elaine were close to them like aunts, uncles, and cousins. They all went to school together. They rode our bikes together. It was a place to play, and they were just like family. Many people have sold their property in the area, but Elaine and I want to keep this property for their family. It is the only parcel left that's contributing to their Alarid family heritage. Mary and Elaine feel it is their family's legacy, and they want their family, who would be their children, and their children's children and grandchildren, to continue with the family traditions that they loved so much in the area. These are things such as watering our yard in the summer from the Acequia Madre on Monday mornings, putting up the farolitos and lighting in the entire neighborhood, enjoying walks to town and to church and enjoying the beauty of Santa Fe and all the seasons. Elaine and Mary currently live outside of Santa Fe, but they visit often, and plan to return to Santa Fe. They do not intend to sell this property. As they approach retirement they spend more and more time in the house. However, to make this property meet their needs and essentially having

Historic Districts Review Board

May 13, 2025

Page 15 of 21

two families with their children, they need the extra space of the casita. They also need safe storage for their car which they keep there and other household items and this remodel really provides these amenities. Today as the Board visited the home, Mary and Elaine hoped the Board members saw that gate on the northwest corner. These garage doors were built by Mary and Elaine's grandfather and probably with his father as part of a small building that was in the corner, they called it the cortito, it was for storage of things. Mary and Elaine asked the board to consider the importance of the historic families in the neighborhood and allow them to expand the house in a respectful way and to maintain the history and personal value of the neighborhood. Mary and Elaine thanked the Board for their consideration.

Member Bienvenu stated that he recalled that when the applicant first came before the Board for the status review they gave the history of the property at that time and how important it was to maintain it in the family and how that affected the board members. This property and what has been described highlights that the Board is not just here to protect structures but to protect legacies and heritage and that is often embodied in the structure but it's greater than the structure and without the people living in them that that lived through those experiences and carry them on from their parents, grandparents, and great grandparents that lived through them in the same location. Once that is gone the structures lose so much of their significance. He appreciated what the applicant is doing to keep this in the family. He stated that the application meets all the criteria in the ordinance and that the applicant is not seeking any exceptions. It is completely within the design standards. He told the applicant that it was commendable that they took the Boards' concerns about the height of the structure into account and came back with a completely revised design that still meets the applicants' needs and can accomplish the purposes that they had in mind without the obtrusiveness of the previous design.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Elizabeth West, previously sworn in, wanted to know why more people don't set aside Tuesdays to attend the Board hearings. She felt the Board, the family, and architect was so friendly and accommodating.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated it was heartening to hear that at least a segment of a property, or properties that were owned by a family for a long period of time, are still in the family and hopefully their children will continue that heritage. She asked how many square feet the lot was, and the square footage of the addition compared to the main house. She did not believe that both could be main houses because it is a single lot. She also asked for clarity about the gates that look like they were constructed of barnwood if they were being retained.

**Board Action:**

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the application as submitted. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously in a roll call vote (4-0).

- g. **2025-010093-HDRB, 224 and 228 E. Palace Ave.**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Significant and Contributing, Dimitrov Design Studio LLC, Tiho Dimitrov, agent for Drury Southwest Santa Fe Inc., owner, reestablishing the walkway connecting Marian Hall (significant) to the Drury Hotel (contributing), construct a 92 sq. ft. second and third floor addition, change a window to a door and infill windows on a primary facade, replace non-historic windows and doors, exterior lighting, and other renovations. Three exceptions are requested for Marian Hall to 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) for constructing an addition on a primary facade, 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) changing a window to a door on a primary facade, and 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii) for infilling windows on a primary facade.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that for the exception to section 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) found that the exception criteria had been met and recommended approval of the exception, section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) staff found that the criteria have been met and recommended approval of the exception and section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii) staff found that the criteria have not been met and recommended denial of the exception. Staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application that did not require exceptions as they complied with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Chair Rios stated that the color of the brick was being replaced in kind and asked about the color of the brick.

Ms. McCulley confirmed it is the "tower tan".

Chair Rios confirmed the windows will be replaced in-kind with insulated windows and asked if a window assessment was done.

Ms. McCulley stated a window assessment was not required because all of the windows were replaced in 1984 and are not historic.

Member Bienvenu confirmed that the windows that are subject to the exception request number three to be infilled were not original window openings.

Ms. McCulley confirmed that the small addition they are in is not original but is historic in its own right because it was constructed in 1954.

Member Bienvenu asked how the proposed color compared to the current color.

Ms. McCulley stated the colors match.

Tiho Dimitrov, 227 East Palace Avenue Suite C, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Mr. Dimitrov. Stated the tower tan color proposed is very similar to the current color, the goal is to be similar to the hotel building without matching. It is not set in stone, so the applicant is willing to accept the requested changes.

Member Bienvenu asked if the sections of stucco on the structure were to be retained as stucco.

Mr. Dimitrov stated it is a primary façade and there is no proposed change to it. The plan is to keep the color existing but again is willing to take suggestions if there are objections to the existing color.

Member Bienvenu confirmed that it is a contrast in color and asked when the color dates from.

Mr. Dimitrov pointed out the photos show the stucco but they are black and white photos so there is no way to know the date of the color.

Member Cherry asked if the texture of the stucco would be retained.

Mr. Dimitrov confirmed it would be retained.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated she did not have an issue with the enclosing of the two windows on the east since they are not original to the building and when compared to the two bays of windows above that these two kind of break that pattern so by infilling them, it will make that side of the building more symmetrical and those three openings as they are don't really match the rhythm of the windows on the very right side of that building. She stated she did not see a reason not to approve that exception as well.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated she was happy that the applicant went with the John Gaw Meem design for the walkway. She had no opposition to infilling the two windows even though they are from 1954. She added a little story about Marian Hall. At one point Tony

Anaya was elected governor, and he was going to change public building names to honor his donors and the state historian at the time Stan Hordes. Tony had one of his cronies call up the state historian to go through the list of names that they were considering changing and at one point the crony said to Stan Hordes "Well who is this Marion anyway?" And Stan who is Jewish said to him "I think you would call her the mother of God." And then there was a long pause, and the man said, "I guess we'll keep that one."

Member Degnan stated that she was very grateful to him.

Chair Rios stated she was grateful the building was being remodeled because she used to work in the building.

Member Cherry asked about the stuccoed box under the portal.

Mr. Dimitrov stated he thought it was concealing mechanical and plumbing and there was no change to the box planned but the stucco will be redone.

Member Bienvenu stated he appreciated the undertaking as it was really beneficial to the project and great for the Board and public. He was grateful to the applicant for taking into consideration the Boards comments at that hearing and mimic or reconstruct the walkways. He felt the infilling of the windows was not detrimental to the primary façade.

**Board Action:**

Member Bienvenu moved that findings be entered that all exception criteria for the three requested exceptions have been established by the applicant in the application as well as in testimony tonight for all the reasons set forth in staff's report with the additional reasoning that the exception criteria have been established with respect to the info of the two windows because on the basis that those windows were not original to the building as originally constructed and will not adversely affect the aesthetic characteristics of that façade and may even potentially improve the character of that facade and for based on those findings and the fact that the application in all other respects meets the criteria established in our ordinance that the application be approved as submitted. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

**9. Discussion Items**

Attorney Ruybalid announced that he will not be at the next hearing on May 27, 2025. Assistant City Attorney Kevin Nault will be covering for him at the meeting.

**10. Matters from the Board**

Bienvenu brought up the question about proper posting on private drives. He did not feel the posting was adequate with the posting at least 40 feet down the driveway. The point of the notice is to let the neighbors and public come to the hearing to make comments and it deprives them of this opportunity. The code asks for the posting to be prominent. He would like to see that this be better addressed in the code rewrite.

The same case had a status and remodel at same hearing. In the past these have been separate hearings to avoid influencing a decision.

Director Lamboy stated that it is correct these are usually at subsequent meetings. This case is an exception due to the need to make the HCPI part of the official record and there were sufficient changes to the building so there was no change to the status of non-contributing being requested.

Chair Rios emphasized it is important to keep the cases separate to avoid influencing the decisions of the Board.

Director Lamboy noted that the project to update the status map, which was last updated in 1997, should be ready to be approved by the Board most likely in July. This should be updated annually. The framework for the updates will need to be added into the code rewrite.

Chair Rios suggested that when a case that comes before the Board is thought that it is an amazing project worthy of an award the Board should notify the staff at that time so they can better participate in the nominations for the awards.

Member Biedscheid mentioned that several applicants felt there were undue delays in getting to the hearing and while she recognizes that staff is busy, she wondered if this is a temporary problem or if there is something that can be done to facilitate the applicants.

Mr. Moquino explained some applicants are delayed for incomplete application.

Director Lamboy further explained that the PZR is required as part of the submittal and there have been temporary delays there. A preliminary zoning is required for the application to be accepted.

Member Cherry asked if there were one or two submittal deadlines per month.

Director Lamboy explained there is currently only one and the cases are balanced between the agendas. That was a change made under Carly Piccarello a few years ago and it seemed to work better for processing the cases. There is a three-day period where additional information is requested.

Chair Rios asked about the updates to the city website.

Director Lamboy stated the City Clerk would be the ones to do this update.

Ms. Romero confirmed that the update has happened.

Chair Rios invited everyone to the Heritage Preservation Awards on Thursday.

11. **Next Meeting**

May 27, 2025, in the Convention Center at 201 W Marcy Street in Ballroom B.

12. **Adjournment**

Member Cherry moved to adjourn. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lani McCulley, Transcription

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date