



**Regular Meeting of the Historic  
Districts Review Board  
May 27, 2025 at 5:30 PM  
Council Chambers, City Hall  
200 Lincoln Avenue**

---

**Meeting Minutes**

<https://www.youtube.com/live/vumgQFWxqZ0?si=S3jzG-FiveScv8pl>

**Call to Order**

Chair Rios called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board to order at approximately 5:30 pm in the Santa Fe Community Convention Center, Sweeny Ball Room B, 201 West Marcy Street, Santa Fe, New Mexico. (Call to Order time stamp is 1:30:30)

**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. Amanda Mather  
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan  
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent

Ms. Madelein Aguilar Medrano (excused)

Others Present

Ms. Heather Lamboy, Planning and Land Use Director  
Mr. Kevin Nault, Assistant City Attorney  
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner  
Mr. Paul Duran, Senior Planner  
Ms. Amanda Romero, 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 and can be requested from the Historic Preservation Division.

## 2. **Approval of Agenda**

Director Lamboy stated that item 7(b), the informational session for 515 Paseo de Peralta has been postponed to an unknown date and Item number 10(a) is postponed to the next hearing on June 10, 2025.

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

## 3. **Approval of Minutes**

### a. May 13, 2025

Member Bienvenu requested changes to the minutes of May 13, 2025. He requested that on page four under the board action that in the first sentence which reads “Member Bienvenu moved that the recommendations of the staff be adopted as findings...” add a comma to separate that from the rest of the sentence and further down where it says, “an ideal work” change the word “work” to “world”. Also, on page five in the middle of the first full paragraph after the word “Cleofes” add the word “Romero” and change in the next sentence “Shia” to “Shaya”. He also asked that on page 12 in the fourth full paragraph, on the second line where it says, “divided light windows is appropriate” to add the word “not” so that it reads “divided light windows is not appropriate in this district”.

Member Bienvenu moved to approve the minutes as amended. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

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

- a. 2024-009653-HDRB 1010 Camino San Acacio (January 14, 2025)
- b. 2024-009611-HDRB 1226 Cerro Gordo Rd. (January 14, 2025)
- c. 2024-009323-HDRB 312 Pino Rd. (January 14, 2025)
- d. 2024-009651-HDRB 423 Camino Don Miguel (January 14, 2025)
- e. 2024-009612-HDRB 1126 Camino Delora (January 14, 2025)
- f. 2024-008779-HDRB 428 San Antonio St. (January 14, 2025)
- g. 2024-009652-HDRB 829 A W. Manhattan Ave. (January 14, 2025)
- h. 2024-009615-HDRB 715 Gregory Ln. (January 14, 2025)
- i. 2024-009616-HDRB 1302 Canyon Rd. (January 14, 2025)

No changes were made to any of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Member Biedscheid moved to approve all nine Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

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

A constituent asked that the Board repeat what was said about item 10 (a) and (b) from the agenda in reference to the Santa Fe forward general plan update and the land development code update for phase one.

Director Lamboy explained that item 10(a) the Santa Fe forward general plan update is postponed to a later hearing and that item 10(b) the land development code update for phase one will be discussed later tonight.

Stefanie Beninato wanted to make one other remark about 925 Acequia Madre and the idea that it's not visible. She stated that with Google Streets aerial views that are current, and anybody can see anybody's property whether it's visible from the street or not. So, this non-portal non-ramada is going to be visible aurally. Her concern was that people will know it's there and they'll come in stating "well you allowed this". This is a bad precedent for Acequia Madre and the district allowing a structure that is neither a ramada nor a portal with very poor material for a roof.

## 6. **Staff Communications**

Ms. Lamboy made an announcement that on June 14<sup>th</sup> there will be the first open house for the general plan update at the Higher Education Center at Midtown at 10 am to 2 pm.

Ms. Lamboy stated there is also a site with Midtown Arts Alliance in the afternoon on June 14<sup>th</sup> and invited everyone to stop by there as well.

- a. Santa Fe Green Building Code Update Presentation - Stephen Onstad, Founder EverGreen Building Solutions, Santa Fe Code Compliance & IECC Residential Energy Inspector/Plans Examiner and Doug Pushard, Founder, HarvestH2o and KuelWater.org, and Tom Graham, AIA, Assistant Land Use Director, City of Santa Fe.

Steve Onstead and Doug Pushard introduced the team, gave a history of the green code development, explained HERS rating, and emphasized the planned changes to the green code, especially regarding residential buildings and how it will affect those buildings which are in overlay districts, such as the Historic Districts. (1:37:17-2:15:11)

## 7. **Old Business**

No items were listed under Old Business.

## 8. **New Business**

- a. **2025-010295-HDRB, 234 Irvine St**, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing, Samantha Greenberg, agent for Edan Kark, owner, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a residential structure and requests a status downgrade for an accessory structure.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the residential structure be retained as contributing with the primary façades designated as the north, east, and south facades (facades 5, 6, and 7 respectively). While some modifications have been made, these three (3) facades hold the original footprint and historic details of the residence, including the inset wood windows with lead lozenge patterns and the original roof line of the building. Staff recommended excluding the non-historic doors and windows and the non-historic east elevation porch from the designation. Staff recommended that the accessory structure be designated/downgraded to non-contributing. There are inconsistencies in the designation record of the accessory structure. In a 2010 case file, the accessory structure is listed as non-contributing, and yet the city's map of historic properties lists the accessory structure as contributing. Staff could not identify any case files to support the contributing designation. Staff also recommended that the yard wall be designated as non-contributing due to age per 14-5.2(C)(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Chair Rios asked are indicating that the only primary facade is the south façade?

Ms. McCulley stated as on the map it is five, six, and seven, which includes the south, north, and east.

Chair Rios asked with the wall if staff indicated that it is not historic.

Ms. McCulley confirmed the wall is not historic.

Chair Rios asked if the porch is not historic.

Ms. McCulley confirmed the porch is not historic.

Chair Rios asked for confirmation that in the main residence some windows or portions of windows are also not historic.

Ms. McCulley confirmed that some windows or portions of windows are also not historic.

Samantha Greenberg, 234 Irvine Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Greenberg agreed with the staff's recommendation and was available for questions.

**Public Comment:**

Norma Montoya, 102 Entrada La Cienega, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Montoya wanted to know what contributing and non-contributing meant and how that might affect the property values in the area. Especially as it relates to her neighboring home at 233 Irvine Street.

Chair Rios explained that the property values might be indirectly related only because a status review often leads to a remodel case and remodeling improves an individual property value which in turn may help with the neighboring lots. She encouraged the neighbor to continue to review agendas online to keep an eye on any remodel that may be requested later.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico was sworn in, again found it unfortunate that people get to add on without permits and that there does not seem to be any consequence. She felt the house had been greatly altered with a failure to follow code. She pointed out that the fact that there's an outstanding violation from 2019 without any consequence by the city such as taking the owners to court is troubling because the city does not treat people equally in terms of notice of violations. She supported the staff's recommendation of the three facades being primary and the house staying contributing. She wondered if some part of the wall existed before it was raised up to 90 inches and what the actual average height of a wall is in that area. She also addressed Ms. Montoya's question that she felt it depended on whether someone believes having a historic designation makes their property more or less valuable because some people might think it's a burden while other people are willing and eager to have that kind of designation. Also, since the Board is only addressing one property rather than all properties on the street so what happens to this property is unique to this property and does not necessarily affect anybody else's property.

**Board Action:**

Member Cherry moved in case 2025-010295-HDRB for 234 Irvine Street in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District that per staff's recommendation that the residence be retained as contributing with facades five, six, and seven as the primary facades excluding the non-historic elements which includes non-historic doors and windows and the non-historic east elevation porch, that the accessory structure be downgraded to non-contributing and the yard wall be designated as non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

- b. **2024-010293-HDRB, 345 Garcia St**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Robert Holleyman and Bill Keller, owners, propose to construct a freestanding 436 sq. ft. guest house with garage and a 481 sq. ft. carport to a height of 10'-0" where the maximum allowable is 15'-5". On the main residence construct a 108 sq. ft. portal, enlarge the existing 382

sq. ft. portal to 621 sq. ft., replace windows and doors, change the size of several non-primary façade windows including converting several into doors, infill windows, construct two exterior fireplaces, alter the layout of the driveway resulting in a realignment of the fence and removal of 2 linear feet of the contributing wall. Three exceptions are requested to 14-5.2 (D)(5)(a)(iii) to infill a window on a primary façade, 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) to enlarge the portal within 10' of the primary façade, and 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for removing part of the contributing wall.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation Staff's analysis of the proposed project identified 3 exceptions to the design standards of the Historic District overlay. The following recommendations summarize the staff's analysis of the exception criteria for each request. For section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii) *No existing openings shall be closed*, for the proposed closing of the north facing window on the west primary elevation, staff finds that the criteria have been met and recommends approval of the exception request. For section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) *Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary facade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of structures instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion*, for the proposed extension of the south portal, staff finds that the exception criteria have not been met and recommends denial of the exception request. For section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) *The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited*, for the removal of two linear feet from the contributing yard wall, staff finds that the criteria have been met and recommends approval of the exception request. Staff recommend approval of the other elements of the application that do not require exceptions as they comply with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Chair Rios requested clarification that the windows and doors that are being proposed to be replaced are non-historic windows and doors

Ms. McCulley explained that the windows are all non-historic as there are no historic windows on the property.

Member Bienvenu stated that though there are quite a few things being brought before the Board, it sounds like staff is generally in agreement with all the requests except for one and that is with respect to the portal removal and reconstruction in a different configuration. He asked if he understood correctly.

Ms. McCulley stated that this was accurate because the portal would be changing size.

Member Bienvenu stated that there are various proposals for the south portal with the first proposal that came before us in the packet was that would be entirely removed and rebuilt.

Ms. McCulley stated she understood it was technically being repaired and that the entire structure was not coming down, but it is being reconfigured for better water flow.

Member Bienvenu ask if the vigas and the posts will all remain as they are today

Ms. McCulley stated parts of those are being replaced

Member Bienvenu asked if the west elevation is the primary façade, would that include the west side of the portal, is that fair to say?

Ms. McCulley stated yes, and that Member Bienvenu brought it up on the field trip, this morning, and it does seem like that it would be part of the primary façade.

Member Bienvenu stated he agreed because on the west facade the upper parapet of the portal is even with and blends in with the entire elevation on that side of the house. So, he thought this is not just an addition within 10 ft of a primary facade but on the primary façade and requested confirmation that could be accurate.

Ms. McCulley stated it could be.

Member Bienvenu confirmed that for the alternative plan part of that facade to remain with a 10 feet setback and then an additional two feet towards the south being built out.

Ms. McCulley confirmed that this was her understanding of the concept that the first 10 feet of the portal would be retained in its current configuration and then the remaining length of it would be widened.

Member Bienvenu stated that the staff report focused rightfully on the most obvious aspect of what is in issue here with the portal, which is the 10-foot rule, but it seemed that there were some additional issues where this proposal would violate the code provisions. One is the provision that was mentioned which is found in 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) that *the removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status, which here is contributing, shall be prohibited*. He stated that this proposal would alter the spaces and architectural features that embody the status of the contributing status for this structure if it gets changed. However, if it stays as it is built no other

provision would be in question for the portal. However, section 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) which states that for *all facades of significant contributing and landmark structures architectural finish features finishes and details other than doors and windows shall be repaired rather than replaced* that seems apply in this case as well and would require an exception. I do agree with the staff's recommendations.

Chair Rios asked what the existing depth of the portal is and what the depth of the proposed portal would be.

Ms. McCulley stated it is currently eight feet deep, and it was being extended a couple of feet to ten feet deep.

Chair Rios asked what the dimensions were for the removal of the portion of the historic wall.

Ms. McCulley stated that on the right-hand side of the driveway when you're entering there is that one section of the wall that was constructed between 1966 and 1973 and the proposal is to remove two feet of that section of the wall to widen the entry for the driveway.

Chair Rios thanked Ms. Bechtol and the applicants for the drawings that were on display at the field trip. She felt it was very helpful to have the existing and proposed drawings available.

Gayla Bechtol, 320 Aztec Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Bechtol stated she did not feel the portal was part of the west elevation primary façade because it was not mentioned in the conversation about the façade during the November hearing and that was in part because the portal was added much later. She felt if she understood that this was the case, that the design would be different. She felt including this west side of the portal as part of the primary façade was an overreach. The staff's recommendation was for the three exceptions not for five and she was prepared to discuss those three exceptions. Regarding the first exception to infill the window on the primary facade which again is perpendicular to what was designated as the primary façade, but it is within range the applicant agrees with staff's recommendation and the rationale for granting this exception as restated that all the windows were replaced in 1987 and are not historic. Also, it does not match the other windows and as it is not original to the structure nor is it historic it will not damage the streetscape to remove this window. The second exception for the removal of the two feet of the contributing yard wall at the driveway is unsafe because the current wall opening onto Garcia Street is quite narrow. It is the third narrowest driveway on Garcia right now. By removing two feet of that yard wall, it will substantially enhance the safety of backing into traffic on Garcia Street. As evidenced by the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) and staff reports, the wall and its openings have had many changes over time. So, the applicants agree with the conclusion that the exception criteria

have been met because this design minimizes the impact on the neighborhood and the district and is designed to help with safety with ingress and egress of the property therefore decreasing risk of injury to the applicant, other vehicles, and pedestrians. Regarding the third exception to enlarge the portal, it is being widened to twelve on the southern facade of the residence. This committee made a designation in November 2024 that this facade is not a primary facade based on this designation and our need to rebuild the portal due to deterioration, it is proposed to enlarge the portal from the current eight-foot depth to a depth of twelve feet. This will improve the functional use of the space and is designed with materials that are in keeping with the structure in the historic district. The exception proposed is to allow the enlargement to extend to the board's designated primary facade on the west which faces Garcia Street since this is an open and transparent portal. Granting the exception is appropriate. Staff take the position that the exception criterion is not met as it modifies the character of the primary west Garcia Street facade and communicates a false sense of history. However, the request is exceedingly modest and since it is an open portal and not an addition in the conventional sense, the portal will be rebuilt with new materials, and this is a good use of resources that are consistent with the preservation of the building and its contributing status. The Board noted that there is plan B offered where the west façade of the portal could be rebuilt with the eight-foot depth for the first ten feet of the elevation and then widen to twelve feet. This design would not require an exception since it is set back from the primary façade by ten feet. The portal is a more modest addition than the ones most often considered and approved by the board. It is largely open and transparent, and it is not an added room or rooms. Portal designs with a 12-foot depth are consistent with historic district designs and proportions for these reasons and because the materials and design standards are met, the applicant urges the board's approval of plan B if it determines that plan A is an exception that they do not want to grant.

Director Lamboy shared the slides for the Plan B design on the screen.

Ms. Bechtol felt that the perspectives for both plan A and plan B very clearly the minimal change being proposed to the portal. She felt plan B impacted the house more than the plan A design. She pointed out that the portal is 50 feet long and that is really where the character of the structure as the board determined in November when they determined that the south façade was not a primary façade that embodied most of the character in part because it was constructed later and was just barely 50 years old; however it is the character of the streetscape and the character of the historic nature of this house with the 50-foot length is a defining feature.

Ms. Bechtol stated plan A has the minimal effect on the streetscape because the primary impact has to do with the 50-foot length of the portal. She also stated it is a tear down and reconstruction with no repair because the wood is rotted from water intrusion. She pointed out that the perspective drawings show the view from the streetscape. This is less than 200 feet of additional square footage versus the 1,300 that is allowed to be added

to this home. The 200 square feet that is being added to the portal is modest and will make the house more livable.

The portal was not assigned primary with the historic characteristics of this house it was the west elevation and the northwest corner. She also noted that plan B, which affects the portal greater, would be acceptable but it does impact the portal more. The idea is to widen the portal to make it more livable for the owners.

Ms. Bechtol confirmed that this case would not have been presented in this way if the portal was thought to be part of the primary façade.

Member Bienvenu clarified that they understood about the primary facade in the sense that they had the same question which is why they requested to see the façade diagram because it wasn't clear whether that was specifically called out. It does not sound like it was excluded. It seems to be a visual part of the façade because the stucco is consistent on the façade.

Ms. Bechtol stated that they are not flush, the portal steps in by 6" or greater.

Ms. Bechtol asked if there was no façade diagram from the November case since, they seem to be standard with status reviews.

Ms. McCulley clarified there was no façade diagram.

Member Bienvenu clarified that if the portal is set back that would mean that it would not be part of that facade so that would resolve that issue. It is possible that is why it wasn't discussed at the time whereas today the discussion revolved around the fact that on the site visit it appeared to be completely flush and part of that entire elevation. Regardless, prior to tonight, no exception was requested for it. The point in bringing it up is more to talk about how we address the exception criteria that is being sought, which is the 10-ft setback and that goes with the removal of historic material or the repair and restoration of existing architectural features even on non- primary facades. That should inform the discussion here tonight in deciding whether the exception criteria have been met.

Member Bienvenu stated that plan B would be out of the question because it would destroy the most important characteristic of the portal, which is its length across the entire elevation. He felt that if the portal needed to be reconstructed because it cannot be saved then reconstructing it with a relatively minor extension may not have as large of an aesthetic impact but could have a livability benefit.

Ms. Bechtol confirmed that the existing portal cannot be saved. Only a couple of the corbels are repairable, the decking, beams and columns are all rotten from the water

damage. She said she had the wood assessed by another builder who confirmed this for her.

Member Biedscheid stated that when reviewing the history of this case, the original recommendation of staff was to status this house as non-contributing. So, the Board had a difference of opinion and designated the west façade as primary. On the south, according to the HCPI has the most changes of any facade on this structure there's some indication that if it were an original part of the house, it would have been a territorial style, but it shows a Pueblo Revival style, so this is not the import of the case. The removal of the two linear feet on the contributing wall which was never in question is maybe more of a topic of conversation. While the safety features of the suggested change sort of outweigh the need to preserve that wall as it is, it is a very common difficulty in our modern situation with cars and driveways. If these changes are going to happen, they must be made in a sensitive way so that those two feet of the wall are not missed. As for the extension of the portal as recommended in the original proposal, for an additional four feet of depth as a single depth rather than staggered is the way to go. It is a beautiful and very light touch in terms of the look of the property. It seems to be a recreation of what is there with some additional space and fits the house as constructed today.

Director Lamboy stated she was able to review the minutes from the November 26<sup>th</sup> status review and staff recommended a non-contributing status at that hearing but the decision of the Board was to retain it as contributing. She read the motion into the record, "Member Bienvenu moved that in case number 2024-009369-HDRB at 345 Garcia Street for the reasons stated on the record earlier i move that the historic status of the main residential structure to be maintained as contributing with the west elevation and northwest corner, the area around the chimney, as the primary facades as recommended in the HCPI and that the status of the accessory structure be downgraded to non-contributing and that the front wall be designated as contributing". She stated that it was approved unanimously by the Board. There are some things we must accommodate for in historic preservation, that is why staff didn't have concern with the contributing wall being widened a little bit. The concern in reference to the portal is that it changes the character of the front of the building to have such an increase in depth. The proposed portal is going to have a shed roof.

Ms. Bechtol commented the roof is currently flat, that's one of the reasons why it's failed over the last 50 years. There has to be six inches of slope, therefore it's technically a shed roof.

Director Lamboy stated the view from the street will be the same, but the roof is a shed a shed roof. So, staffs' objection to that was the change in the overall appearance to the front façade or west façade.

Ms. Bechtol stated that there would be a bit more thickness on the roof so there would be metal flashing above the decking to hide the slope.

Member Cherry asked if the pitch was going to run the length of the portal rather than the width.

Ms. Bechtol confirmed the slope is from west to east rather than the north to south to avoid the need for a gutter and the fascia will hide the slope of the roof because the fascia is consistent across the south of the portal.

Robert Holleyman, 345 Garcia Street, Santa Fe was sworn in. Mr. Holleyman thanked the Board for coming to the house today and for considering the case. He stated that they have wanted to live in Santa Fe and in this house. He and his husband Bill Keller have had a home in Santa Fe for about 20 years. They moved here full-time from Washington DC a little over a year ago because they found this house and because they knew they wanted to be here. So, they sped up their plans to be here full-time. They deeply care about this house. It was built about 90 years ago when Mr. Holleyman's father from South Louisiana first came to New Mexico to go to high school in Roswell. Mr. Holleyman was a janitor in his first summer job out of high school 52 years ago here in Santa Fe and he had a dream to live in Santa Fe one day. He said that everything they are trying to do with this house is to do the right thing for the city and the historic district by using the lightest touch possible while still adapting it for their use. Increasing that driveway entrance a little bit, the garage and accessory dwelling unit among other things is so that they can age in place with assisted living capacity by providing any providers with the guest house to reside in. He stated that he and Bill are committed to being good stewards of the house to doing things that not only uphold its status as a contributing structure, but ideally ones that enhance the ability of the overall historic district.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated that something that has not been considered on the portal is to keep the 8-foot depth. She did not hear anyone speak about the hardship which is a criterion for getting an exception. This is not an interior space which is necessary for livability, it is a bonus space so the portal could be kept at an 8-foot depth. The entire length for the slope is a quarter inch per foot so that is a foot slope on 50 feet which would be quite adequate to get things to drain. She stated that keeping it flat from south to north seems problematic because it will pool on that roof. She reminded the Board that they adopted the staff's position on 614 Paseo de Peralta that said that safety is not something unique to any property and that safety is something that everybody must deal with. So, regarding taking out two feet of the wall, there are other options like a way to turn around in the property so that you can come out facing the street as opposed to backing out or perhaps back in as opposed to backing out. Especially since it is the smaller part of the wall it should be a huge concern to remove that part. To be consistent with what staff has recommended in the past about safety if it's not unique and it's something that many people have to deal with such as narrow driveways which are

not visible, which is a constant across the city and as portals are not necessary they're just a desire and an 8-foot portal should be quite livable quite usable and it is a solution that doesn't interfere with the primary facade because it keeps the existing depth.

**Board Action:**

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the application as submitted noting that the exception criteria for the rebuilding of the portal within 10 feet of the primary facade have been met. With respect to the first criteria which staff recommended was not met which is “do not damage the character of the streetscape”, despite the additional 4 feet of depth the key elements of the existing portal are retained. It's an open and transparent structure maintaining the 50-foot length consistent with the existing portal and the south facade of the building. With respect to criterion two “to prevent a hardship to the applicant or injury to the public welfare”, the current hardship associated with the deterioration of the portal requiring its rebuild and the limited functionality of the narrow depth is remedied by this solution. The function of the narrow portal is not sufficient to prevent the front door from being drenched in rain and this addresses that hardship, noting that we agree with the staff's recommendation on the other elements and that all exception criteria have been met for those. Chair Rios offered if Member Biedscheid wanted to specifically indicate in reference to the exception criteria what that is like the infill of the window. Member Biedscheid did not feel it was necessary since the motion was to follow staff's recommendation on those two elements. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

c. **2025-010341-HDRB, 248 Rodriguez St.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing, Jennifer Salimbene, agent for Steven Barrett, property owner, proposes to demolish a 104 sq. ft. shed 9'-4" in height.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-3.14 Demolition of Historic or Landmark Structure.

Jennifer Salimbene, 125 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Salimbene agreed with the staff's recommendation and was available for questions.

**Public Comment:**

There were comments from the public.

**Board Action:**

Member Cherry moved to approve the application for demolition as submitted. Member Degan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

d. **2025-010343-HDRB, 248 Rodriguez St.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Jennifer Salimbene, agent for Steven Barrett, property owner, proposes to construct a 1507 sq. ft. residence to a height of 14'-0", where the maximum allowable is 14'-4".

Amanda Romero 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 asked staff to indicate exactly where the home is going to be in reference to the shed that is going to be removed since there is an arroyo in this area.

Ms. Romero offered the proposed site plan and pointed out the location of the shed in comparison to the planned residence.

Jennifer Salimbene, previously sworn in, was available for questions.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Leslie Larson, 238 Rodriguez Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Larson was confused how a 100 sq. ft. shed footprint could be increased to over 1,000 sq. ft. since there is an arroyo bed.

Chair Rios explained it will be in the same location as the shed since the Board had just approved the removal of the shed and the home will be approximately 1,507 sq. ft. and will start where the location of the shed was and go across the property not down into the arroyo.

Ms. Larsen stated that there is a retaining wall along the property line at the neighboring driveway, and the tiny shed, and then the arroyo so it is unclear where the building is going to be located.

Ms. Romero stated the retaining wall will not be moved but the house will run along the retaining wall starting at the shed and moving back. She pointed this out on the slides.

Ms. Larsen stated that the owners of the property have a landscape business and there's a lot of activity with deliveries and hundreds of bags of potting soil or bark And supplies and it was not clear how they could fit the residence, and the landscaping business supplies on the lot.

Chair Rios pointed out the property use, and business is not under the purview of the Board.

Ms. Larsen wanted to know how the property was going to be used because this is a big change in a very limited space.

Chair Rios explained that the applicant also gets approvals through other city departments including zoning which will make sure that the building meets the code requirements.

Ms. Romero reminded the Board that the applicant has already gotten preliminary zoning review for the proposal, and it is approved for a new residential structure.

Director Lamboy pointed out that lot coverage is a zoning criterion and that criterion is being met. Zoning reviews the plan set prior to the Board hearing. In reference to any business being run out of the house and their concern with storage, concerned constituents can contact the city's constituent services, Amanda, or Ms. Lamboy, to discuss it. There are home occupations where somebody can have a home office but typically materials and other types of storage are required to be in a commercial area. So, if there are concerns about how a person conducts business at a residence, please contact the city.

Member Biedscheid stated that it looks like from the Casita roof plan that there are solar panels proposed and asked if there could be confirmation that they will not be visible from the street and that they will be behind a parapet or other screen.

Ms. Salimbene confirmed that the parapet would screen the solar panels from public visibility.

**Board Action:**

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the application as submitted. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

- e. **2025-010348-HDRB, 557 San Antonio St.**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing, Ju Tan, agent for Clayton and Maggie Miles, owners, propose to construct a 402 sq. ft. portal addition on the main structure, a 240 sq. ft. addition with a 40 sq. ft. portal on the studio structure, and window and door replacements on the main and studio structures.

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 asked if the applicant was proposing to have two colors on all windows within the house or was it in a certain portion of the house.

Mr. Duran stated that proposal is for all windows and doors to have color, either the crimson or the grayish teal color and that while each color is acceptable individually, staff does not recommend the combination.

Chair Rios clarified with the large expanse of single pane glass and a lot of divided lite windows on the home being proposed and what the public visibility of the bank of windows was.

Mr. Duran stated the public visibility would be minimal because on the main structure on that south facade the windows would be underneath the portal and on the western facade on the casita with the divided lites, they would be visible.

Member Biedscheid asked which facades would have the divided lites and which were publicly visible.

Mr. Duran clarified that the western facade on the casita is publicly visible and will have divided lites. The southern facade of the casita is partially publicly visible; these windows are not divided lite. The eastern facade of the casita is not divided lite windows and is partially visible from the trail. At the main residence the western facade has divided lite, this faces the street, so they are publicly visible. The south facade will be underneath the portal and not publicly visible, and the clerestory windows are publicly visible. The eastern and northern facades of the main residence are not publicly visible. He stated that there will be two different styles from the publicly visible facades.

Ju Tan, 1219 Cerro Gordo Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Tan gave clarification that the casita is a studio not a casita and the proposal is an addition with a utility and bathroom and that the homeowners have signed the accessory structure affidavit as required by the permitting office. Regarding the windows, the windows that are currently divided lites will be replaced with divided lites and those that are single panes will be replaced with single panes. The two new windows on the north façade of the main residence will not have divided lites in keeping with the north façade motif. The studio has no windows, just wooden fabrication that are boarded up with cut outs, so they will be replaced with divided lite windows to match the other windows of the studio. So, this is an in-kind replacement for what is presently in the home. The visibility is partially obscured by the 6'0" high yard wall that steps up with the slope of the street going south.

Chair Rios asked for clarification of the steel frame gate.

Mr. Tan explained that the intent is to replace the existing gate with a steel frame gate clad with steel plates with a cut-out motif that is to be determined.

Mr. Duran explained that a steel gate would need an exception request from the Board. So, the steel gate cannot be a part of this request. However, if it were kept in-kind and the Board is comfortable with it being a steel frame with coyote fencing, which was previously approved in 2014, the Board could act on it.

Clayton Miles, 557 San Antonio Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Miles shared that the plan was to have a solid rusty steel gate with a simple laser cut that cannot be seen through and make it a sliding gate because the current gate opens into the parking spaces.

Attorney Nault noted that the notice in the agenda includes the portal addition, the addition to the studio structure, and the window and door replacements but it does not mention the gate. So, it cannot be considered at this meeting it would need to be continued to another meeting.

Chair Rios confirmed with the applicant that they will need to work with staff for the gate approval by coming back to the Board later.

**Public Comment:**

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in. Ms. Beninato stated that windows that are publicly visible should be replaced with divided lites especially on the south side. She was not sure that the area of the bank of windows could be considered a portal, but she thought the single panes were more for commercial building than residential buildings.

Mr. Duran pointed out that the applicants are requesting “desert rose” colored stucco which needs board approval.

Director Lamboy clarified that according to the guidelines adopted by the Board the “desert rose” color is up to the discretion of the board. It is not considered outright permitted.

Mr. Miles explained that while out of state the color was chosen online by comparing visually to what the surrounding houses had and that is why the “desert rose”, but if the Board would prefer another color, then they would accept it if it matched the other houses.

Maggie Miles, 557 San Antonio Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mrs. Miles explained that the color combination was chosen to put color and character in the property. The blue color was chosen to match the historic museum that and there is the governor residence is the inspiration for the two-color window treatment. The colors define the

character of Santa Fe, and this is to incorporate this character and beauty of Santa Fe to the house.

Mr. Duran shared the color palette that was being discussed.

**Board Action:**

Member Bienvenu moved to approve the application with the conditions that the stucco color of all structures be one of the approved colors on the staff's list rather than the submitted color, that the lites of the windows be divided except for the windows under the portal which are permitted to be undivided at the discretion of the applicant, that the color of the windows and doors be one of the two options that was presented by the applicant but not both or in the alternative white, that the gate be replaced with a design similar to the one existing and not made of steel, and that revised drawings be submitted to staff for approval. Member Cherry asked for clarification regarding the color of the windows, if the color of the trim or any of the wood adjacent to the windows should be addressed. Member Bienvenu stated that motion includes all the above as being one color or white. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

Chair Rios asked if the red color is on the chosen palette and is approvable.

Mr. Duran confirmed that the color is acceptable in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

- f. **2025-010350-HDRB, 907 Don Miguel Pl.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Jeffrey Seres, agent for Steve Bardwell and Sarah Kennington, owners, propose alterations to the main residence, and the following additions: a new 48 sq. ft. entry portal on the west primary façade, a new detached 118 sq. ft. storage room with a 181 sq. ft. portal, and a new detached 185 sq. ft. garage.

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.

Member Bienvenu shared that at the field trip there was discussion about the portal, while the new design is an improvement there are technical difficulties because this is a primary façade and no additions are allowed on a primary façade. While not attached it is not considered an addition but there should be caution allowing structures within inches of a primary façade because it defeats the intent of the provision in the ordinance. It is interesting that the existing portal seems to be detached though the historic remnants above it imply that it was attached at some point with some kind of roofing material. Could

the applicant clarify if they want the portal attached or if they want the portal with the gap above the door because it avoids the need for an exception. Could this be considered without an exception since it is replacement of an existing condition of a portion of the façade that was excluded as part of the primary façade designation, and it seems the portal used to be attached.

Mr. Duran stated that staff were trying to draw the same conclusion since the portal is in the same space as the 48 sq. ft. that's already established, and no additional square footage could be considered.

Member Cherry pointed out that the existing shade structure is 7'6" long by 4'0" wide and the proposed is 12'0" by 4' wide long on the elevations.

Jeff Seres, 122 Lorenzo Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Seres stated that the homeowners Sarah Kennington and Steve Bardwell were here as well. He stated that the challenge on this project has been to address the issues that are deficient primarily the lack of energy efficiency in the roof, walls, and windows with the minimum number of changes that would potentially jeopardize the status of the structure so the intent was to make the residence habitable and add outside amenities such as seen on the garage and the storage room and portals creating a courtyard in between the structures. The west portal is detached but if the Boards' decision is to attach it and rebuild in kind meaning the same size as existing that would be acceptable. He clarified that it is not intended to be attached to the residence.

Member Cherry stated there are reasons for not having the gap like the weather protection of the door, a sleeker design with only two posts, but the existing one is most likely a homeowner built to provide some cover.

Director Lamboy wanted to map out the path forward depending upon what decision the Board might want to make. What's at hand here technically does not require an exception because it is detached albeit just by a few inches, but it is detached. There could be wholesale replacement of the existing portal but not attached because that's existing even though the view from the streetscape is relatively the same because you can't really discern that separation. To attach it to the primary facade would require an exception and that exception would have to be noticed and so that decision could not be made tonight.

Director Lamboy added that the extending of the parapet, in many cases for contributing and significant buildings we do allow for things like green building purposes such as additional rooftop features like solar, but it cannot change the overall character of the building. The challenge with this building is it's only about eight feet tall and so the character of the facade is a bit different. The Board needs to discern whether a one foot four inch change would change the character enough to warrant an exception.

Mr. Seres clarified that the applicant would like the portal to be detached.

Director Lamboy clarified that the distinction is that there must be a structural attachment to be considered an attached structure.

Member Degnan questioned staff when a freestanding shade structure becomes a portal.

Mr. Duran stated a freestanding structure becomes a portal when it is attached structurally to the façade.

Steve Bardwell, PO Box 644, Pioneer Town, California was sworn in. Mr. Bardwell stated that they were trying to be very respectful of the existing building by not attaching anything to the existing building. This is in part to avoid exceptions, but we also thought that in the future at some point one could remove this portal and not damage the existing building. He stated that they would like to keep it just as close to the existing as possible and that they have been there when it has rained like crazy and only a small amount of water comes down in the gap. We could consider running a piece of flashing that maybe gets right up close to the building, but they would like to keep the gap.

**Public Comment:**

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street in the South Capitol, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. West shared that she thinks this is a great example of the details and sensitivity with which the Board must work, and she really followed Member Bienvenu's approach but then heard the applicants say that there's a possibility they might want to take it away at some point. She thought well that's another angle. She is unclear what is attaching the portal to the building. She has enjoyed this immensely, that's mostly why she is here, however it is sort of serious, and she loves that it's being taken seriously. She points out that it looks as if it were trying to be attached in an informal way and thought the Board was dealing with it quite well. She was curious about the statement about if it is not attached that means someday it would be easier to take it away altogether and how that adds another dynamic. She thanked the Board for the fun.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, felt extending the shade structure changes the character of the façade, but allowing it in its current footprint would be fine. She said it looks a bunch of roofing paper that was mastic over it that attaches it to the house. She suggested putting a header into the wall to attach it to the house and felt the header would prevent it from being difficult to remove from the residence later and it would make maintenance easier in the meantime. It is game playing to avoid the exception with a four-inch separation because it still impacts the primary façade because it appears to be attached. She appreciated the clarification that the "portal" on the garage was serving as a carport because otherwise it did not fit the structure.

Member Biedscheid noticed that it's not simply a rebuilding of the same style portal, it is larger and that does change the character of the façade because the square posts are being replaced with round posts that are tapered at the top which the Board has tried to avoid in the past. It represents a departure from what's there if that's the objective of the applicants to sort of keep it simple and mimic what is there with more integrity I do think this is a bit of a departure.

Chair Rios asked if the homeowners would be willing to keep the shade structure the same size with the square posts rather than the proposed round posts.

Mr. Seres confirmed that if we need to rebuild this portal exactly the way it is that it is acceptable.

Mr. Bardwell stated they are willing to rebuild the structure in the same footprint that now exists and utilizing square columns, but they wouldn't rebuild it exactly as it is. They would try to make it a little more attractive, perhaps square columns with some chamfered edges, but they would be perfectly happy with doing that keeping it the same size and rebuilding it right in the same that it is.

**Board Action:**

Member Bienvenu clarified that separating structures by an inch or two from a primary facade should not automatically make the project not have an exception in all cases, because it would defeat the intent of the ordinance. However, in this case the applicant is replacing an existing structure that is already separated from the primary façade, and with that in mind, Member Bienvenu moved to approve the application as submitted with the alteration and condition that the portal over the main entrance be reconstructed in kind with some minor modifications, but generally in the existing footprint and existing style with revised plans submitted to staff for approval. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously by roll call vote (5-0).

**9. Discussion Items**

- a. Study Session for CONSIDERATION OF BILL NO. 2025- . (Councilor Cassutt) An ordinance to repeal and replace the Land Development Code, (also known as “Chapter 14”) with the Phase 1 of 3 of the Land Development Code update. The proposed amendments include “non-substantive” changes, which do not meaningfully change the standards, regulations or procedures of the LDC, but simply clarify, organize or better illustrate existing language. Additionally, the proposed amendments include “substantive” changes, which are identified below as follows: 14-03 - 2-foot height increase for structures, 14-03.03C - Addition of a Parks and Open Space Zoning District, 14-03.02 - By-Right Density For R-10 Through R-29 Districts, 14-04 - Elimination of Unused Overlay Districts, 14-04.05A - Removal of Alcohol-Related Regulations in the Airport Rd Overlay District, 14-

07.05 - Amended Standards for Parking Lot Landscaping, 14-07.07 - Increased Flexibility In Parking Requirements, 14-07.07 - Addition of Electronic Vehicle (“EV”) Parking Requirements, 14-07.07 -Amended Bicycle Parking Requirements, 14-07.09 – Elimination of Content-based Regulation of Signs, 14-07.02 - Enhanced Affordability Incentives, and 14-04.6 - Amended Subdistrict Regulations in the Historic District.

Land Use Heather Lamboy and Assistant Land Use Director Maggie Moore presented a summary of the changes to the Land Development Code made during phase one of the rewrite of the code. The intent of the first phase was to reorganize the layout to make the code easier to use and to include items such as illustrations. There are some substantive changes to the code as well. Changes include organizing zoning districts so that the lot and building standards are together with the district, placing the height ordinance in its’ own location, more consolidated purpose statements, simplification and reduction of table notes, height changes outside of the historic districts, creation of higher density districts, park and open space changes, and so forth. There are also changes to specific overlay districts such as the removal of the ban on alcohol sales in the Airport Road Overlay District. Special use permits will now be called conditional use permits to allow businesses that were not around when the code was initiated but are common today; the example of doggy day care was given. The uses chart was expanded. Housing types were updated. Landscaping, parking, street, and bicycle, electric vehicle, and sign requirements were changed or added. There were some changes to wall and fence allowed materials. Impact fees, street design, and public access like sidewalks are separated out and expedited so the team can work with the Public Works Department for those components. A chart has been added that calls out the different Boards, their duties, the various types of projects they handle, the steps for the hearings, approval criteria, and the appeal procedures. Affordable housing incentives have been reconsidered with the possibility of more changes coming. This phase also addresses issues with conflicts within the code such as the wall and fence heights in the Business Capital District, which is more restrictive than the historic district, which causes applicants to need two approvals, one from both the Board of Adjustment and one from the Historic Districts Review Board for a wall or fence. The numbering system of the code has changed so the historic districts will no longer be 14-5.2.

Changes specific to the Historic code at this time is the reorganization and inclusion of the conflicting standards provision, giving authority to the chief building official to having the ability to make a determination that as long as the health and safety aren't impacted then a building code standard can be waved in particular cases to preserve historic buildings so the framework of the state of New Mexico code is the same, GIS mapping issues, non-conforming status, telecommunications facilities attached to a historic building, minimum maintenance standards, notice requirements, restoration of status, reporting to the governing body exceptions, heights, descriptions of architectural

character of the districts, materials, roof design, colors, shapes, solar energy systems, walls and fences, green houses and parking.

Phase two will address architectural design standards outside of the historic districts. There is some discussion at the historic district subcommittee to divide the Downtown and the Eastside Historic District into two districts. Other changes to Historic districts and archaeological districts. Other considerations would be to expand mixed use districts to allow for different types of development like neighborhood grocery stores and possibly reduce the number of overlay districts.

The general plan will also make sure that the future land use map and the zoning code match and there will be an opportunity for people to engage in that process as well.

The Boards' main concern was to the substantive revisions being made because it was made clear that phase one was to be reorganized and cleaned up only. So, items like the removal of the description of the Old Santa Fe style and recent Santa Fe styles in the Downtown and Eastside District and adding undefined styles like bungalow is a major concern. The Board felt that the substantive changes should not be the actions of a small group of volunteers, but it should be more the staff and the state and preservation professionals. There was also concern that the

The Board felt that the character descriptions that are being included here are not useful and misleading by including undefined styles, specifically the 12 listed for the Don Gaspar District. They felt that just because one exists does not mean it should be considered for the district. The Board felt the character defining sections are extremely important and they need to be drafted extremely carefully to make sure that they really capture what the Board is responsible for protecting each district. While this is important it does seem to be more than a phase two portion of the writing. This, along with accepting new styles, is a substantive change.

The Board requested that the substantive changes be removed from the approval for the phase one work for the review at Governing Body in August. The Board also requested that the order of the districts not be alphabetical but place the Downtown and Eastside first in the code because it sets the standard for all the districts.

There was a question whether it was an option to move directly into phase two based on this phase one working template rather than get approval from the Governing Body with each phase since each phase would result in a change of location of information yearly causing more confusion until the update is completed.

Phase one will be introduced to the council in June and then it will go through the various subcommittees for review and input in this type of study session. The hope is to have the

phase one adopted by August and then for phase two to start immediately since it will take a couple of years. Phase two is planned with several subphases.

The Board asked if the guidelines they have approved like the wall and fence guidelines, stucco guidelines, and concrete color guidelines would be added and if they would be part of phase one or phase two. They also questioned the definitions section of the code and if it was planned to be expanded with terms as they relate to Historic Preservation such as the use of the term in-kind and what all that entails.

It was clarified that this is a study session for comments and some feedback prior to the Governing Body review and that there would be another review after the Governing Body review.

The Land Use Director requested further comments via email. (4:57:00-5:48:24)

**10. Matters from the Board**

There were no matters from the Board.

**11. Next Meeting**

June 10, 2025

**12. Adjournment**

Member XXX moved to adjourn. Member XXX seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.

---

Lani McCulley, Transcription

---

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

---

Date