



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
June 10, 2025, at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue**

Meeting Minutes

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=coqmFd7koLg>

Call to Order

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

1. Roll Call

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present

Mr. John Bienvenu, Acting Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Ms. Amanda Mather
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair (excused)
Ms. Madelein Aguilar Medrano (excused)

Others Present

Ms. Heather Lamboy, Planning and Land Use Director
Mr. Gary Moquino, Planner Manager, Historic Preservation Division
Mr. Frank Ruybalid, 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

Mr. Moquino stated that in section 9. New Business item d. 2025-010489-HDRB at 539 Garcia Street is postponed to the date certain of June 24, 2025, and item e. 2025-010492-HDRB at 964 Acequia Madre has been withdrawn.

Member Biedscheid moved to approve the agenda as amended. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (4-0).

3. Approval of Minutes

No minutes were presented with this agenda.

4. Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

No Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were presented with this agenda.

5. Matters from the Public

Stefanie Beninato stated that at the study session regarding the code at the last hearing (May 27, 2025), there were no public comments. She thought there would be some allowance for public comment. She wanted to know how the Land Use Director would change to reflect the Board's comments and how the Governing Body would know what the feelings of the Board were. She agreed that the descriptions of the different districts were not well done would like to see more and better definitions. She gave the example of the current definition of the word appellant as an example of a poor definition. She was also concerned because she understood someone to have said that the staff could override Board decisions based on sustainability issues. She also had concerns about the decrease in parking, bicycle parking, and affordable housing requirements.

Camilla Cluett presented concerns regarding the acequia trail and drinking fountains, and pedestrian crossing in front of the El Rey Court Hotel on Cerrillos Road.

Director Lamboy let the constituent know that her comments were important and invited her to the bicycle advisory committee meeting on Thursday, and offered to forward the comments to Public Works as well.

6. Staff Communications

No staff communications were provided.

7. Old Business

No items were listed under Old Business.

8. New Business

- a. **2025-010494-HDRB, 206 McKenzie St., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Bradyn Furry, agent for Mindy Hale and FC3 Ltd. Co., owner, requests approval to replace all the doors and windows which requires an**

Historic Districts Review Board

June 10, 2025

Page 2 of 26

exception to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for the removal of historic material; construct a new detached steel carport to a height of 8'-8" with roof-mounted solar units within the existing auto court which requires an exception to 14-5.2(D)(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards; an increase in height by 3'-3" of a previously approved parapet on the McKenzie St. façade which requires an exception to 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) additions are not permitted unless set back 10' from primary facade, and install roof top HVAC units, and a new pedestrian gate on the McKenzie St. adjacent to the vehicle entrance.

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 and the exception criteria have been met for all exception requests except for the request for the addition and increase in height to the primary south elevation facade. The applicant should find other design options for that addition, including lowering the parapet to be subservient to the adjacent historic parapet.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that he could not find Ra Patterson's assessment in the packet.

Mr. Duran confirmed it was not in the packet and offered to make copies for the Board.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked for the list of current items being requested because there are a significant number of issues.

Mr. Duran offered that they are on page 11 of the staff report.

Director Lamoy suggested that, to give the Board time to review the documents that Mr. Duran is offering that the Board table the discussion of the case to the end of the agenda.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved to table the discussion to the end of the agenda after item (i). Member Mather seconded. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (4-0)

b. **2025-010488-HDRB, 140 Romero St.**, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, non-contributing, Camilla Kennedy, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure and a yard wall.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the residential structure be retained as non-contributing due to the alteration and window replacements which diminish the historic character of the structure, and the yard wall be designated as contributing due to the character which has remain

unchanged since the 1960s and is consistent with the Romero streetscape dominated by low yard walls and fences per section 14-5.2(C)(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked for clarification on the non-contributing status.

Ms. McCulley explained it was most likely designated as part of the adoption of the district in 1983, since there were no cases to verify.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated he did not agree that it was non-contributing because it was a quintessential example of the type of modest vernacular adobe that exists in that neighborhood and on that very streetscape, including across the street. It is extremely simple but almost defines the streetscape. It was built in either the 30s or the 40s of Adobe. It's got most of its existing footprint. The changes are primarily in the rear not on the street, the only real alterations on the street facing frontage were the window and door, not the opening door and window themselves, and what used to be a carport looks like it was enclosed at sometime after 1985 according to the HCPI so that is not historic, but it is set back 10 ft from the front street facing facade and it's in the same footprint from the previous carport. The HCPI recommendation was non-contributing, and perhaps staff agreed with this because of the alterations and because it is a modest structure, but the modesty of the structure is the very thing that makes it contributing to that district, and the alterations do not seem apparent to the public.

Camilla Kennedy, 140 Romero Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Kennedy stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation for the residence, though it could be considered contributing because the modesty of it is very special, and it has some unique characteristics, such as the carved wood over the door. She stated that the window and door openings had not been changed, just the door and the window. However, she disagreed with the wall being recommended as contributing because it was constructed in 1985 and stuccoed to appear to be historic, and that this would create a false sense of historic development.

Member Mather asked if she understood that the applicant would designate the house contributing and the yard wall non-contributing.

Ms. Kennedy confirmed that was what she meant.

Member Cherry clarified that the wall shows as cinder block in the 1985 HCPI, but it shows existing in the 1960s, which makes it over 50 years old and therefore historic.

Ms. Kennedy agreed that it was historic, but it was not stuccoed until after 1985.

Member Cherry pointed out the color aerial from 1969, where the house and the yard wall were the same color.

Member Biedscheid agreed with the applicant's assessment of the yard wall as non-contributing because it has a style that has been changed over time and is inconsistent with the vernacular style of the house. There have been some good points about the front façade of the residence, especially that the door and window openings and location have not changed over time. Character-defining details would include the carving above the front door; however, the windows are not sympathetic, but replacing them with something more in keeping with the original would enhance the façade.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. Ms. Beninato appreciated the Board's direction of designating the residence contributing to the front façade as primary. Romero Street is exactly as described, with small vernacular homes. However, she had concerns because CMU has historically been used since the 1930s, and it is difficult in 1985 to tell if the wall was being repaired or just stuccoed, but in 1985, it would have been non-conforming if it had never been stuccoed. Since the applicant brought it up, a 5 high fence would not be appropriate because it would significantly change the streetscape and the effect of the house and view from the streetscape.

Acting Chair Bienvenu summarized that the wall is historic, dating back to the early to mid-1960s, it was always constructed of CMU block, and at some time after 1985, it was stuccoed and the corners were rounded. He asked the staff to explain their reasoning for the contributing status.

Ms. McCulley stated that the wall matches the house as it was built, and it is indicative of the streetscape. And the low wall matches the house and streetscape, and this is why it is recommended to contribute.

Ms. McCulley shared the façade diagram.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved to upgrade the residence to contributing and designate facades 4,5,6,7 as primary, excluding the non-historic windows and door and the plywood garage door. Member Degnan seconded. Member Biedscheid asked for elaboration on the other primary façade recommendations because there had not been any discussion of them, and she would like to know what the character-defining features were. Member Cherry offered that they include the age of the structure, the roof design of the enclosed carport, and that the facades are intact and visible, and indicative of the contributing nature of the structure and neighborhood. Member Biedscheid pointed out that with this size of building, the number of primary facades should be limited. The motion passed by roll call vote with Members Cherry, Mather, and Degnan voting for and Member Biedscheid against.

c. **2025-010506-HDRB, 626 Canyon Rd.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Santa Elena Properties, LLC, owner, requests status review and primary façade designation.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the structure be maintained as contributing, per Section 14-5.2(C)(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Non-contributing Status Within Historic Districts, with facades 1,2,4,5, 8, and 9 as primary. Staff recommended the front yard wall as a contributing.

Member Cherry asked when the windows were replaced and the stucco applied.

Ms. Romero was unknown. There was a case in 2022 requesting window changes that never came before the Board for approval.

Richard Martinez, PO Box 925, Santa Fe, NM, was sworn in. Mr. Martinez stated he did not know when the building was last modified. The current owners purchased it as it is and have not made any modifications. He agreed that the structure should remain contributing due to its interesting history. However, he felt that facades 1, 7, 9, 1A, and 7A were more character-defining. He explained that portions of the items that staff listed as character-defining no longer exist because they were removed in the last remodel of the property. These items included wood windows and a stained-glass window. Several of the facades that staff recommended are not visible, so they cannot contribute to a streetscape. The front yard wall should be contributing. His concern was that the recommended primaries were located on each of the four directions of the house; 1 is on the north, 2 is on the east, 4 is on the east, 5 is on the south, and 8 and 9 on the west.

The façade map did not call out the second-floor facades; therefore, the Board called them out as 1A for the north façade of the second floor and 7A for the west façade second floor.

Member Cherry agreed that facade number seven is one of the most important facades because it is character-defining and it is very visible from the street. However, he disagreed that the purpose of preserving the structures by the Board is only for the publicly visible facades. It can still have significance and not be visible. There are more than four sides of the buildings since there are eleven facades. Unfortunately, the work that was done on the building that was not permitted created some preservation degradation to the building by the remodeling that was done between 2021 and now. When a building is designated contributing, all sides are primary, and most of them have non-visible sides worthy of preservation. He did not feel that facades 4 and 5 were worthy of preservation, but facades 1, 7, 8, and 9, and the yard wall are contributing. However, façade 2 has some visibility, but don't believe it is primary. This would exclude the newer portal.

Mr. Martinez explained that the two-story section of the building was no longer two stories. The interior was remodeled so that it is a single story with a high ceiling; however, the doors are still set up as if the exterior stairs were present, so it is awkward accessing the building. He recommended that the second floor north and west be primary as well, since they are character-defining and visible.

Ms. Romero stated that the staff decided on façade 7 due to its lack of architectural features.

Member Biedscheid asked for clarification on what staff is recommending versus what the applicant is recommended.

It was clarified that staff were recommending facades 1,2,4,5, 8, and 9 as primary, and the applicant was suggesting facades 1, 7, 9, 1A, and 7A.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, found the case and report confusing. She agreed with Member Cherry that not everything that is designated as primary must be publicly visible. She questioned what the application from 2022 consisted of and shared that she agreed with Mr. Martinez that façade 7 should be primary because the massive walls are characteristic. She questioned whether the Board could require the replacement of the stained-glass window.

Mr. Martinez reminded the Board that when they designate a primary façade that it is like designating the 10' of the neighboring façade since it is not allowed to build within 10' of a primary façade.

Member Biedscheid thanked Mr. Martinez for his participation in the façade discussion. She appreciated several points he made.

Ms. Romero clarified that the front yard wall was the only one being designated. The tall side yard wall is not under consideration for contributing status. The façade map number 7 should only be the structure wall.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved to retain the building as contributing and designate facades 1, 7, 9, 1A, and 7A as primary, excluding the portal on façade 9, and to designate the front yard wall as contributing. Member Degan seconded. Member Cherry offered a friendly amendment to include façade 8 for the stained-glass window, which is publicly visible. The amendment was not accepted because that character-defining feature is no longer present. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified with the attorney that the Board is not approving the work after the fact, that is, only considering the status.

d. **2025-010508-HDRB, 511 E. Palace Ave**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Betty Holmes, owner, requests replacement of vehicular and pedestrian gates.

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.

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified that there were three items before the Board: a garage door, a pedestrian gate, and a vehicle gate, and that the garage door would be painted, not replaced.

Ms. Romero confirmed.

Acting Chair Bienvenu mentioned that the wall and fence guidelines specifically address that gates should be encouraged to be fenestrated rather than solid and since the pedestrian gate is solid with either at Tibetan or Indian appearance rather than the local designs this does not comply since the guidelines specify that the design needs to complement the wall treatment containing the gates concerning scale, height, material, texture, and color.

Member Cherry asked about the history of the existing gate.

Ms. Romero was unsure outside of the notations regarding it in the 1980s HCPI.

Fredrick Brian, 5021 Saratoga Road, Langley, WA, and owner of 511 East Palace Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Brian clarified that the plan for the garage door is to paint it.

Member Cherry asked if the applicant was amenable to fenestrations in the vehicle gate.

Mr. Brian stated that they could do something similar to what exists.

Member Biedscheid asked for clarification regarding the mailbox and its relocation.

Mr. Brian clarified that the mailbox would be on a post just to the left of the vehicle gate, but not in front of the garage.

Member Biedscheid commented that the gate style is attractive to a lot of people, but it is not in keeping with traditional Santa Fe style, and asked if the applicant was amenable to another gate.

Mr. Brian stated that his wife had her heart set on this gate, but he felt they could be amenable to a change if that is the recommendation of the Board.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that there is a misconception that this design is the right design for Santa Fe because the gates are older, rusty metal, frequently aged wood, and carvings, but they are inappropriate in the Historic Districts.

Member Cherry clarified that the mailbox located in the yard wall had already been removed and the wall filled in, and asked if the new mailbox location was an encroachment on the city's right-of-way.

Mr. Brian clarified the location of the post for the mailbox and confirmed it did not encroach.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, appreciated the applicants' simple requests to redo the gates and the garage door paint, and vehicle gate fenestration. She pointed out that the gates from Seret and Son's that are proposed are similar to one on Camino Escondido that the Board approved previously, and that this gate was more handsome than the existing wood gate.

Member Cherry confirmed that the color of the paint, "Clinton Brown," was in kind to the color of the existing garage door, and the lightest teal color in the packet is the proposed color for the window trim, and the vehicle gate would have no finish and be raw wood.

Member Degnan confirmed that the applicant would be willing to put fenestrations on the vehicle gate.

Mr. Brian confirmed the colors and that he was amenable to the fenestrations.

Board Action:

Member Degnan moved to approve the application with the condition that the pedestrian gate be redesigned in a New Mexico traditional style with some fenestration, and the vehicle gate be redesigned in the same manner, and the new designs be submitted to staff for approval and approve the garage and trim color as submitted. Member Mather seconded. Member Mather recommended that the mailbox design be approved. Member Cherry recommended that the new vehicle gate fenestrations match the existing vehicle gate fenestrations. Both friendly amendments were accepted. Member Biedscheid recommended using naturally aged wood for both gates as a material, but did not make

it a recommended amendment to the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

e. **2025-010490-HDRB, 815 E. Alameda St. Unit 8**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, William Kleinschmidt, agent for Nancy Abruzzo Holdings LLC, owner, proposes to construct a 2,204 sq. ft. freestanding residence to the maximum allowable height of 14'-5" and a 6'-0" high yard wall with 8' high gate enclosures where the maximum allowable height is 4'-6". An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(ii)(C) to exceed the maximum allowable height of the yard wall.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria had not been met and recommended denial of the 6'0" high yard wall and gates, staff also found that the 3'0" high publicly visible metal planter wall that extends for approximately half of the east elevation facade does not comply with the materials standards under section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic Districts standards as metal cannot simulate the appearance of adobe construction and recommended denial of the metal planter. Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application 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.

Acting Chair Bienvenu pointed out that the story poles were not on site at the time of the field trip site visit, and it makes it difficult to visualize how this residence will be sandwiched onto the lot without them.

Ms. McCulley stated that the applicant was requested to put up the poles, and it was noted that they were not up at the field trip, but that staff did not have the opportunity to discuss them with the applicant before the hearing.

Bill Kleinschmidt, 1919 5th Street, Suite D, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Kleinschmidt apologized about the story poles, stating he did not have time to put them up. He pointed out that Alameda is a very busy street, and it is narrow at the location of this property. Speeding vehicles cause excessive noise and safety issues, so the reason for the higher yard wall is for noise mitigation and safety from vehicles. He pointed out that staffs' recommendation is because the six-foot wall does not strengthen the heterogeneous character of the city but weakens it and that it goes against the open feeling of the streetscape which has shorter yard walls and that staff provided measurements along the streetscape which vary from 35" up to 75" so there are taller walls than the 4'6" average. He stated he redid the calculation, and when he added the proposed wall height to the combination on the height calculation, it only raised the average by half an inch. He disagreed that the yard wall detracts from the streetscape. He stated that the compound was very open with its 3' to 4' high walls versus some of the neighboring lots. Regarding the steel planter, if an alternative material, such as coyote fence or stucco, is acceptable, the material could be changed.

Nancy Abruzzo, 515 Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Abruzzo stated that the yard wall is designed for safety and noise mitigation because of the layout of the homes in the compound. She asked for consideration of the planter's sidewall. It is intended as a car stop to protect the house from the parking spaces, but the area is narrow, which is why a metal planter was planned.

Acting Chair Bienvenu pointed out that the height for the yard wall is addressed in the code, and that is to take an average of the streetscape, and that becomes the maximum allowable height. It is not about permitting a higher height in a specific instance would raise the average. It is more than it creates a precedent for anyone living on the same road to be able to make the same argument that they should have a higher height. The road is busy, but the Board would be undoing a rule and an ordinance that the Governing Body has already addressed and passed. It is a Governing Body issue to make those determinations in the absence of specific facts that apply to a specific property that are sufficient to carry the relatively high burden of being able to justify an exception, and it was mentioned that the curve right there, and this would apply to several other properties as well.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated her concern was how close to the street the residence would be, with a general guideline of a 7' front setback, it does not seem harmonious to the larger setbacks of the other residences and the yard walls in the compound are lower as well so, a 6' high yard wall is not harmonious with the compound either. She felt a 4'6" high yard wall would protect the property the same as a taller yard wall. She stated the streetscape is open in this area, and she hoped the Board would not approve the height. She appreciated that the applicant was willing to change the material of the planter.

Ms. Abruzzo clarified that a stucco wall would not be feasible for the planter and that the coyote fence would be better given the limited space. She stated that they could also put railroad ties, but they had hoped for a planting strip.

There was some discussion about whether the story poles were required or if the Board had enough information to determine the case.

Member Cherry felt there was enough information for the Board to decide.

Member Biedscheid felt that the story poles would be helpful to the public to see the distance from the street to the residence.

Director Lamboy clarified that this was part of an approved development plan and that the residence is planned within the permitted height that was also vetted through the Planning

Commission. She confirmed that the setbacks are pre-established for the compound, but the Board still has jurisdiction.

Ms. McCulley pointed out that the front setback is 10' for the residence and that the yard wall would be at the sidewalk.

Member Biedscheid asked to see the floor plan of the house to confirm it was a single-family residence. She confirmed if the planter was freestanding.

Mr. Kleinschmidt clarified the planter's location and design and the reasoning for the metal design. He also stated the house is at the 7' setback, which is about 3' from the sidewalk, and the sidewalk is about 3-4', so the house is about 14' from the street.

Member Cherry clarified that that would mean the yard wall was outside of the property line.

Director Lamboy clarified that the yard wall would not be permitted in the proposed location. Due to the trees on the property, the yard wall would need to be constructed on the interior of the property line or the property line. So, the Board could either act on the house but not the yard wall, or postpone the project for corrections.

Member Cherry asked the applicant their preference for the ruling.

Ms. Abruzzo explained that they have had several delays, and they would prefer not to be further delayed by the unintentional location of the yard wall.

Attorney Ruybalid pointed out that it is not consistent with procedures to approve a part of a project and postpone another. It would be difficult to write findings of fact and conclusions of law for that type of action. By denying the wall, it can come back with a new design for approval, or the Board could approve with some sort of condition with respect to the wall.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated they would be happy to come back with the yard wall later if the residence could be approved, so they could move forward with permitting.

Member Biedscheid stated that it would be helpful to have a complete packet that shows the wall in relation to the building and in relation to the existing buildings. The buildings are close together and have a relationship with each other as per the development plan, so it would be better to see the full packet with the adjusted wall shown on the elevations and floor plan. The floor plan illuminated several things that were not in the rest of the packet, so it would be nice to have a complete packet come back to the Board, especially for this prominent part of Alameda.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved to approve the house as submitted and deny the planter and yard wall. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed by roll call vote with Members Mather, Degnan, and Cherry voting for and Member Biedscheid against.

- f. **2025-010495-HDRB, 439 Camino del Monte Sol Lot 1-A**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Hoopes Architects, agent for Chris Greulich and Mathew Boland, owners, request approval to construct a 504 sq. ft. detached garage and breezeway to a height of 10'-3" where the max allowable is 14'.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that he was surprised to find that the status of the structure was contributing rather than significant. The structure seems very well preserved from its original design and erection, and it was Mary Austin's house. It was designed by John Gaw Meem. He asked if staff had any thoughts on whether or not the designation is appropriate.

Mr. Duran commented that the structure is significant to the streetscape and the compound. However, the additions throughout time have impacted that significant status, and it is currently listed as contributing to the windows, doors, and vigas, giving a significant feel to the building.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that it was constructed in 1925, it is adobe and has an association with important figures in Santa Fe history, especially since Austin basically started the preservation movement in Santa Fe at the time this was being built and designed by John Gaw Meem. He added further that the HCPI indicated it has not been altered much, so he was not clear how this would not have been designated as a significant building.

Mr. Duran stated it is the purview of the Board to make that determination.

Acting Chair Bienvenu confirmed that the case would need to be postponed, and the status review case would need to be noticed and brought back at a later date.

Mr. Duran confirmed that it was correct.

Director Lamboy stated that the last HCPI was done in 1991, so if it is the preference of the Board to have further investigation on the property, they may request it.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated the interior was massively altered, but the exterior looks quite similar to what was originally constructed.

Member Biedscheid stated that 1991 was a long time ago and if there have not been alterations in that time, it should be reviewed because placing the garage in line with the front of the house is potentially impactful because it appears to be on the same plane even though there is a 10-foot separation for the breezeway. If it is significant, then we would want to rethink the design. She stated she is always in favor of a new HCPI.

Member Mather agreed that 1991 was a long time ago and that a new HCPI and status review should be considered.

Member Degnan asked for clarification on whether the status was upgraded and how it would affect the proposal approval.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the proposal would not be approved as designed because the addition would then be on a primary façade if the building were considered significant.

Director Lamboy stated that if the Board does not have enough information, they can postpone the case and request additional information and provide directions to the applicant.

Attorney Ruybalid confirmed it would not be approved, or because the code does allow for exceptions, so an exception would be required, and the case could still be approved with an exception if the exception criteria were met.

Member Cherry asked what the standard is for staff to request a status review, such as a timeline of 10 or 20 years.

Mr. Moquino stated that the HCPI should be more current than the year 2000, but if it has adequate information on the HCPI, then it can continue to be used; if additional information is needed, then a new HCPI is required.

Member Cherry confirmed that this 1991 HCPI should have been revised with a status review.

Director Lamboy stated that in this case, the HCPI was comprehensive, and staff made the determination that a new one was not required. However, the Board could require more information if needed.

Craig Hoopes, 333 Montezuma Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Hoopes stated that this building was a gallery for a long time, it is now being used as a residence, and the east elevation shows that there has been extensive work on the building. The area is not indicative of John Gaw Meem, and it is where the addition is going. But to call it significant

is wrong because there is nothing left that represents the 1925 construction or is significant to Santa Fe.

Member Chery asked if the doors and windows that are in the area where the breezeway is going, do you know the era of those windows?

Mr. Hoopes believed all of the windows on that façade to be original to the structure. The door, however, is most likely not, but the windows and doors are being preserved.

Mr. Hoopes explained that the addition meets the code for additions by being at least 10 feet from the primary façade and then crossing the yard for 10' so that the garage does not come out in front of the primary façade. It is a Pueblo-style garage. The new windows are simulated divided lite and match the windows within the existing house, the garage is lower than the house by 6", and the breezeway is lower by another 9". This is in conformance with the historic guidelines for the property and we are adding on to a façade where it has been altered over time so there is no harm to the residence.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated it is nice to see that the applicant is trying to do something harmonious with the house, but it is troubling that the drawing gives the appearance that this was always the design of the house. There is this beautiful long façade on that north elevation, and then a somewhat setback breezeway, and then the garage that is flush with the house itself and essentially the same height. It gives the impression that this was all part of the original design, which is concerning because there needs to be a differentiation from the original building. Then the window looks out of place on the garage's north elevation. It could only be inserted in that spot if it were a framed structure, so it makes it clear that it is not Adobe.

Mr. Hoopes stated that the garage front wall is thickened to a foot deep to duplicate the feeling of the true adobe.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that it was great that it is recessed, but the problem is that the three-foot corner rule.

Mr. Hoopes stated he would get rid of that window because there are windows on the south for light.

Member Cherry stated it does distinguish the garage from the adobe structure, but the question is if there was an exception request for the three-foot corner rule, and if it applies here.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated the rule applies when the window is publicly visible.

Mr. Hoopes confirmed it does not meet the three-foot corner rule.

Member Biedscheid wondered if there was any consideration of a detached garage because the breezeway implies that this is an addition to the house, since it is all connected, and asked if a detached garage had been considered.

Mr. Hoopes stated it was looked at the beginning of the design process, two doors open to the area of the garage, and it seemed natural to connect the garage to the house through the breezeway.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if the apricot tree would be removed.

Hoopes confirmed the tree would be removed.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, agreed with Member Biedscheid that the breezeway should be designed to look more like a breezeway and less like an enclosed space, and wondered if it might be better to rotate the garage 90 degrees so that the entry was facing east for the entry to the garage. That way, the garage doors would not be prominently visible, and it would look less like a garage upon approach.

Mr. Hoopes commented that it would be physically impossible to enter the garage at that angle, given the driveway slope and angle.

Member Cherry asked for clarification on the preservation of the window to the south of the breezeway.

Mr. Hoopes explained the wide mullion between the door and window and access to the courtyard.

Member Biedscheid asked staff about the proposed location of the breezeway and if the wall was within 3' of the door on the building, and if this was an issue with the requirement.

Director Lamboy stated that the regulation is for publicly visible doors and windows, and she was not sure if this was publicly visible.

Mr. Hoopes confirmed the house is perpendicular to the road and the breezeway is set back from that façade, so the breezeway would not be publicly visible from Camino del Monte Sol.

Member Biedscheid felt it detracted from the contributing home, making it more modern with an attached garage, and it is not how the home was designed. It would be more appropriate to have a detached garage. The breezeway alters the function of the house to something more modern.

Mr. Hoopes pointed out that John Gaw Meem designed many homes with attached garages, so this is not in conflict with what he did in other situations.

Member Cherry compared the breezeway to the recent case regarding a causeway at the Drury and while the cases were different because the Drury had a previously existing condition designed by John Gaw Meem that the Board approved replacing it similar design to the original., the design of this breezeway was similar in design to that causeway.

Member Biedscheid asked if the fascia above the breezeway was to be painted to match the window trim. The color accentuated the concern over the breezeway.

Mr. Hoopes confirmed it matches the window color, but it could be changed to a Pueblo style if the Board chose. He shared that the idea was that if someone wanted to remove the breezeway and garage later, the building would keep its historic fabric without damage.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved to approve the application submitted. Motion died due to a lack of a second.

Member Cherry moved to approve the application with the condition that the window on the north side of the garage be removed. Motion died due to a lack of a second.

Member Biedscheid stated she would like to move for a detached garage, but asked the applicant what their opinion would be. She felt that the current design may not serve the building, where the Board seems to believe that a new HCPI and status should be considered.

Mr. Hoopes stated that this is the only residence without a garage, and the preference would be an attached garage.

Member Biedscheid moved to postpone this case and have the applicant provide a new historic cultural properties inventory for the property and have a status review before hearing this design request. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with Members Biedscheid, Degnan, and Mather voting for and Member Cherry voting against.

- g. **2025-010510-HDRB, 911 Old Santa Fe Trail**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Frank Morrison, agent for Arthur & Susan Cordova, owners, proposes to construct a new 4,781 sq. ft. residence, including a garage and exterior portals, to a maximum height of 15'-6", where the maximum allowable is 15'-10".

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.

Member Biedscheid pointed out that the applicants' letter indicates that all windows are vinyl and that they have snap-in grids to replicate divided lite, and asked for confirmation.

Ms. Romero confirmed that it was correct.

Member Biedscheid confirmed that the letter says vinyl in a taupe color, and the street-facing windows will have a crossbridge pattern insert to meet the Santa Fe standards, and then some of the windows that are not publicly visible do not have the inserts. So, they are not divided lite.

Ms. Romero confirmed that it was true for the east elevation.

Member Biedscheid questioned if vinyl was allowed because she did not believe that the Board had ever approved vinyl windows or the type of insert that can be removed, as well as the inconsistency with the windows on a single property, such as partially divided, partially single-pane windows.

Ms. Romero confirmed she spoke with the applicant, and they are willing to consider other window types.

Francisco Morrison, 9425 Woodland Avenue NE, Albuquerque, was sworn in. Mr. Morrison explained that they were with Twilight Homes, and they are working with Mr. Cordova to build a new residence. The applicant is willing to change the window type to meet the recommendations of the Board.

Member Cherry asked what the construction of the proposed garage door was.

Mr. Morrison said it is a metal door with a wood grain finish to it, and then the windows would be clear windows above. So, the door will appear as wood and glass, but it is metal with windows.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. She appreciated that the windows would be simulated divided lite, but did not like the vinyl for the windows. She had concerns with the larger single pane windows and asked if they had divided lites. She asked how publicly visible the garage was because it consumes the facade, which is not appropriate in the Recent Santa Fe Style. She appreciated that the metal door would appear to be wood.

Member Degnan asked if metal garage doors were able to be approved or have a history of being approved in the historic districts.

Director Lamboy stated that, to her knowledge, they were not in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Member Degnan asked the applicant why the garage door needed to be metal.

Mr. Morrison confirmed that this is standard in Twilight homes outside of the historic districts, so that is why this design is for the door, but they are willing to make a change if it is necessary.

Member Degnan asked if the applicant was willing to install a wooden garage door.

There was discussion on how to make the motion.

Board Action:

Member Degnan moved to approve the application with the condition that the garage door be wood, the windows be true or simulated divided lites and not vinyl, but aluminum clad so that they are consistent throughout the house, and to work with staff to get the approval. Member Mather seconded. Member Cherry requested a friendly amendment that the lite pattern on the garage doors not have the curve, the ellipse, because the style is not normal in the district, so regular rectangular windows would be appropriate. Member Biedscheid recommended a friendly amendment that the color of the windows be white or another staff-approved color in keeping with this streetscape, but not the taupe. Both friendly amendments were accepted. The motion passed by roll call vote with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Ms. Romero clarified that windows under the portal are not required to be divided lites and asked if the windows under the portal were to be divided lites.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the motion was that the windows need to be divided lites to be consistent with the entire house.

Attorney Ruybalid confirmed that simulated divided lights were acceptable.

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified the terminology that true divided lites are individual panes of glass with an actual wooden structure separating those panes of glass whereas simulated divided lites are a wooden lattice structure that is part of the frame that separates the glass visually as opposed to snap in separation dividers and spacers in between those wooden pieces to give the appearance that they are individual. So that is simulated divided lites with spacers or actual wood muttons. It would be nice to have this type of definition in writing, so it does not need to be explained each time it is discussed.

h. **2025-010494-HDRB, 206 McKenzie St.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Bradyn Furry, agent for Mindy Hale and FC3 Ltd. Co., owner, requests approval to replace all the doors and windows which requires an exception to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for the removal of historic material; construct a new detached steel carport to a height of 8'-8" with roof-mounted solar units within the existing auto court which requires an exception to 14-5.2(D)(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards; an increase in height by 3'-3" of a previously approved parapet on the McKenzie St. façade which requires an exception to 14-5.2(D)(2)(c) additions are not permitted unless set back 10' from primary facade, and install roof top HVAC units, and a new pedestrian gate on the McKenzie St. adjacent to the vehicle entrance.

The Board reopened the case for consideration.

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 and the exception criteria have been met for all exception requests except for the request for the addition and increase in height to the primary south elevation facade. The applicant should find other design options for that addition, including lowering the parapet to be subservient to the adjacent historic parapet.

Member Biedscheid asked if all of the windows and doors were being replaced, and staff agreed that they all were.

Mr. Duran confirmed that this is correct because while walking around the site and looking at the assessment, the congruency of the windows will provide stability to the integrity and preservation of the structure, given that many of these doors and windows are boarded up or in disrepair, and the structure needs too much care. Window replacement may be the best way to move forward for this structure. Looking at the south façade, there are a lot of windows and doors, so this is a blanket recommendation for the exception criteria, based on the best way to move forward for the preservation of the building.

Member Biedscheid asked if the missing windows were because they were lost, or were they all covered by the assessment, or did some go missing after the assessment.

Mr. Duran stated that the windows are just missing, as in no longer in the building and not on the property for reuse. He stated that some of the windows went missing after the assessment, which covers all of the windows, because the assessment was from January.

Member Mather stated that there was an overwhelming amount of information on this project, and she would have appreciated an informational session about the plan. She

recommended an earlier time or possibly a single meeting dedicated to the case to give it the attention it deserves. She clarified that this would be a subsequent hearing.

Member Cherry stated he has questions about missing information that could help with decisions, so he felt a postponement for more information. What he would like to see is an existing and proposed site plan because this is an extremely important building that has a lot of historic material, and there are no elevations that are tied to the window assessment. It is not possible to make the correlation between what is on the window assessment right here, right now, while working on other cases. He agreed with Member Mather; however, if requesting more information, the Board should be specific with the applicant, so they know what is needed to make decisions. This is a multi-floor building with only one floor plan; there are no floor plans for each level, so it is difficult to tell from the floor plan which windows are which. So, while there is a lot of information but there is significant information that is also missing.

Member Degnan agreed that the case needs all the care and thought it deserves, and it is a lot of information, and the basics are missing, so she agreed with the idea of postponing the proposal until the information can be thoroughly analyzed.

Member Biedscheid agreed that it did not seem that the applicant was prepared to walk the Board through the project. It would be nice if there could be a walk-through of the property with a real breakdown to connect the dots.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that since they were present, it would be good to hear from the applicants to help make sense of the information and get a layout of the information that the Board is looking for, so they know what more to provide. So, let's hear from the applicant with the understanding that this may be postponed and ultimately not decided on tonight.

Bradyn Furry, P.O. Box 238, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Furry stated that when looking at the elevations, there are four sheets for elevations. The top elevation on the sheet is the existing and the bottom is the proposed elevation. The windows, for the most part, look the same because we are trying to replace them in-kind. They will look exactly like they do now. As for not referring to the window assessment, the window tags on the lower elevation have the same designations as each window and door in the assessment. These were added so there could be a correlation back and forth. There are a lot of windows and doors, but only about half of them are still historic windows. Over the years, there have been many renovations with a lot of work done on the building and the windows that have been there from when it was built or soon after, having been replaced due to damage.

Mr. Furry continued with a little history on the building. It was bought by the current owners in 2019 when they immediately set out on a renovation project with a previous contractor and architect. As of 2021, the contractor and architect were no longer a part of the project,

and Mr. Furry was brought on as the designer, and a new contractor was brought on. During the last four years on the project, a lot of shoddy workmanship and items that did not meet the code and were not permitted were discovered. So, the permit process basically started over with reverting the condition of the building back to the 2019 version. This has been a long process for the building, and as part of the assessment over the years, they discovered things like the doors and windows, and the damage to them. The windows are set right into the adobe or the pen-tile wall, and that is where the windows are failing is through the framework, which is the buck in the wall, which is the piece that would normally attach a window to the wall. To repair the historic window, it would need to be removed, which would subsequently damage the existing structure around it. So that is why the a request for the replacement of windows and doors. The idea is to have them look the same, but to stop the degradation of the building from moisture infiltration.

Mr. Furry stated that with the Carport, the applicants would like to add as much solar to this project as they can. They are trying to be very green, sustainable, and environmentally conscious. There was an assessment done for solar on the existing roof of the building. The problem is that the roofs are greatly separated from each other, and they don't have adequate square footage on each. The only answer that made a significant impact was to build a new structure in the auto-court that would be for solar panels but also provide shade and shelter for the users of the building for parking. Because the auto court is so small, doing a standard carport with wood beam posts on the corners would basically render the auto court unusable for cars and would not meet the minimum number of spaces for the size of the building. This is why the steel structure came in; it has the material that can support itself in this situation and support the solar panels and protect the cars.

Mr. Furry continued stating that there were previously installed rooftop units on the building; they were not approved, so they are on this list for approval. There was administrative approval for a screen wall to hide the HVAC, which they are keeping in the design, but they were told that when the mechanical contractors went to get the permit, it had not been approved by the historic. So that is on the list as well.

Mr. Furry mentioned that on the north, on McKenzie Street, there is a pedestrian gate right now. It has an existing steel framework that has existed for decades and that is being kept. Unfortunately, someone took out the other original gate and replaced it with a livestock fence, square wire mesh, so in the elevation, the design of the new gate matches the gates that were found on the property previously. The stucco provided from the previous contractor started to delaminate from the building, so it was falling off, so they removed it. They want to go back with new stucco that is exactly like what was approved in a previous Board hearing a few years ago.

Mr. Furry stated that the parapet extension was previously approved in a Board hearing. They want to do the same design and extend it up to three feet because they would like to put in a set of skylights behind that. Back in the early 1900s, that portion of the building

was along an alley and open to the outside. In the 1940s, it was enclosed and became an interior space. So, they would like to go back in and recreate that as best as they can while keeping it in an interior space because, after the building had been renovated to include it as interior because the interior finishes won't support it. That wall was supposed to replace a wall that was destroyed during the last construction process. So, they are rebuilding it in the traditional adobe style that goes along with the building. They just want to raise it from what was previously approved to hide the skylight behind the parapet.

Mr. Furry stated it was a lot of information, but it was a general overview of the six items that are being discussed.

Member Cherry asked what the structure with the wood beams with tarps was.

Mr. Furry explained that it is a temporary roof structure for protection while they complete the permit process.

Mr. Cherry stated that it is difficult to understand the existing and proposed details when there is apparatus on the project.

Pamela Coster, 1102 Piedras Rojas, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She wanted the Board to know that they love the building, and they see themselves as stewards of the building. The first attempt with the construction broke their hearts because the building needed a lot of work, and unfortunately, under their watch, it did not get what it needed. So now they are working to restore the structure. The lens for the restoration starts at about 1850 and goes to about 1945. Three women were instrumental and were so important to this community. We want to honor them by restoring the instruction to the contractor to make this building last another 100 years. So, that's why the Adobe work is being done by a group that does Adobe restoration. The applicant did extensive interviews with the community when they bought the building because it was so important to people. The bottom floor is going to be open for many community events to give back to the community, and the company offices will be upstairs. The applicant assured the Board that they are making every decision for the building to preserve what was there.

Member Mather thanked the applicant for their information, as she felt it helped with her understanding of the project.

There was discussion on how to proceed with the case.

Acting Chair Bienvenu explained that the window assessment is not what is normally seen. He explained that there is usually a condition report that explains if each window and door is repairable or requires replacement.

Mr. Furry stated he would get more information for the assessment.

Ms. Coster explained that the windows on the north elevation at the west end are not being replaced, and a modern skylight is being installed above that area.

Member Cherry pointed out that this information is important because the request asks for all windows to be replaced; this should be clarified in the application.

Acting Chair Bienvenu added that the staff is not showing approval for the raising of the parapet, so that needs to be further addressed. He also stated that the windows need the most additional information.

Member Degnan stated she was under the impression that only some windows were being replaced since so many are historic and may not be in need of replacement.

Mr. Furry explained that there are several approvals already issued that address some of the happenings on the property.

Member Biedscheid was unclear on what information the applicant is expected to bring to the next hearing, because it seems that extensive time is being spent on it.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the window assessment needs further information, which clarifies whether each window is repairable or needs to be replaced.

Ms. Coster stated that many of the windows were broken by the previous contractor, so they are in worse condition now.

Member Biedscheid clarified that the applicant meant by replaced in-kind is in terms of pattern and material. She also clarified the stucco and its color and the height of the parapet, and the skylight design.

Mr. Furry explained that the skylights were raised by three feet so they would be publicly visible if the parapet were not raised.

Public Comment:

Mindy Hail, 1102 Pietras Rojas, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She felt that the damage to the windows was more evident on the interior of the structure because the windows are not in good condition. The level of destruction that happened under the previous contractor was astronomical. They are committed to starting over; it would be preferred not to piece-meal the windows because it will affect the integrity of the structure. The pen tile requires repairs, the window frames and structures, and so much more from the extensive damage. She did not believe there was an understanding of the extent of the damage and what would be involved in repairing it all.

Director Lamboy stated that it would be helpful if the applicant could provide some photos as additional information of the inside, where there is damage. So that it can show the Board the extent of damage.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated this could be part of the window assessment.

Member Cherry stated it would be nice to have photos of both the interior and exterior of each window. He also requested to take a tour of the building.

Ms. Coster responded, but was inaudible.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the applicant can provide anything they feel will help.

It was determined that staff would set up the tour and would provide the required notice.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, was frustrated that the previous speaker was not audible. She was glad that photos were going to be provided for each window and its corresponding damage for a better explanation of the window replacement. She did not understand the rationale for removing the windows. She thought that some of what they want is in addition to what was there historically, like the skylights, and if they cannot work without raising the parapets, then maybe they should be done away with. Skylights are a want, not a need, and are not historic, and the same is true for solar. Sustainability is important, but this is the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. So maybe you can't get everything to be solar, or you have to put them on the roof in smaller arrays rather than a steel structure downtown, especially since the Board would not allow the previous applicant to have steel garage doors. She was curious that if the applicant had permits and was having inspections as required how it was never recognized that this damage was being done.

Board Action:

Member Mather moved to postpone the case to the June 24, 2025, hearing and to have a site visit at some point before that hearing. Member Degnan seconded. Member Cherry made a friendly amendment that prior to the meeting, new documentation that was requested be provided, including photos of the interior and exterior windows, along with the 3D file (Matterport tour). The friendly amendment was accepted.

Director Lamboy stated that the additional information must be in the packet, which is published on the Friday before the Tuesday meeting. Therefore, the information needs to be given to staff no later than Wednesday, June 16, 2025, before the hearing so it can be added to the packet.

The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

9. Discussion Items

There were no discussion items.

10. Matters from the Board

Paul Duran reminded the Board of the invitation to see the site on Grant Avenue. He noted each tour is limited to ten people and they will be from 10:30 am to 11:30 am and 11:30 am to 12:30 pm on Wednesday, June 11, 2025. He requested that all signatures be given to him after the meeting so he could get them to Jenkins Gavin by the morning.

11. Next Meeting

June 24, 2025

12. Adjournment

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if there were any objections to adjourning the hearing. There were none. The hearing adjourned at approximately 9:58 p.m.



Lani McCulley, Transcription

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date