

**From:** [City of Santa Fe](#)  
**To:** [Governing Body Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** New submission from your Governing Body Public Comment form  
**Date:** Monday, June 23, 2025 1:04:37 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on: Monday, June 23, 2025 at 1:04pm

- First Name: Stefanie
- Last Name: Beninato
- Your Email Address: [REDACTED]
- Your District: District 2
- Meeting Date: 06/25/2025
- Section of Agenda you would like to comment on: Public Comment
- Your Comment: 10 June 2025

#### COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGE TO LAND USE CODE

It was disappointing that the HDRB did not allow time for public comment when there was a study session on the proposed changes to the land use code

I do wonder if the LUD has made the suggested changes before it goes to the Governing Body or how she will inform the GB of the HDRB's concerns.

I agree with the Board members who expressed dismay that there were substantive changes when it was just supposed to be a reordering/cleanup.

I don't think the descriptions of the architecture in the various districts is helpful for decision making. The code needs more and better definitions. Example: Current: An appellant one who appeals a decision. Proposed A person whether a party, a party's agent or a public participant who disagrees with a quasi judicial decision and requests review at the next administrative or judicial level or disagrees with the land use director's decision and requests review by the appropriate administrative board or governing body.

I thought I heard that the LUD staff can override the HDRB's decision re: replacement of historic material if the staff feels that sustainability is more important. I would be adamantly opposed to that.

Lowering Parking requirements: This recommendation is based on a projected number of commuters using bikes. The Bike Advisory Committee has reported that the city is no

where close to that percentage (30%?) and that it will not even begin to reach that target by the projected date. We already have parking issues in many parts of town.

Affordable housing changes: No bonus units for those who choose fee in lieu of—at the small amount the developer has to pay for this fee, it is a boondoggle. Also if the GB is going to allow bonuses for affordable housing, I think it should be limited to 1 extra unit per affordable housing unit built—not 1.5 and that the units must remain affordable for the life of the building or 50 years whichever is greater.

A permit should not be issued if there is an appeal to city council until the time period for appeal to district court runs.

Bring back 14-5.2 A 6 nonconformity ordinance. It is clearly written and helpful in making decisions.

No doggie day cares as of right. They can be disruptive in residential neighborhoods or adjacent to residential neighborhoods. And the people using them seem to think only of themselves and their dogs—not neighbors, not traffic.

Stefanie Beninato 