



**Historic Districts Review Board
and Archaeological Review
Committee Joint Meeting
October 14, 2025, at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue**

Meeting Minutes

View meeting on City YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQYdcHWYL1I>

Call to Order

Chair Rios called the joint meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board and the Archaeological Review Committee to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Historic District Review Board Members Present

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

Archaeological Review Committee Members Present

Mr. David C. Eck, Chair
Ms. Gayla Bechtol
Mr. Tom Treece

Others Present

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

Note: All items in the Board packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Board packet is available on Civic Clerk and can be requested from the Historic Preservation Division.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Gary Moquino advised that the following items were postponed to October 28, 2025:

- a. Under Staff Communications: 8 Item a, 715 Camino Lejo.
- b. Under Old Business: 9 Item a, Case 2025-010495-HDRB, 439 Camino del Monte Sol Lot 1-A.
- c. Under New Business: 10 Items a to j.

Member Degnan moved to approve the agenda as amended. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (6-0).

3. **Approval of Minutes**

There were no minutes to approve.

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

- a. 2024-008628-HDRB, 216 Old Santa Fe Trail (February 25, 2025).
- b. 2025-009941-HDRB, 416 Sosaya Ln., (March 25, 2025).
- c. 2025-009947-HDRB, 214 Old Santa Fe Trail (March 25, 2025).
- d. 2025-009916-HDRB, 1010 Camino San Acacio (April 8, 2025).
- e. 2025-009943-HDRB, 925 Acequia Madre (April 8, 2025).
- f. 2025-010124-HDRB, 248 Rodriguez St. (April 8, 2025).
- g. 2025-010291-HDRB, 815 Dunlap St. (May 13, 2025).
- h. 2025-010339-HDRB, 629 Camino Del Monte Sol (May 13, 2025).
- i. 2025-010351-HDRB, 629 Camino Del Monte Sol (May 13, 2025).
- j. 2025-010292-HDRB, 345 Garcia St. (May 13, 2025).

Member Mather moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as submitted. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (6-0).

5. **Matters from the Public**

Gayla Bechtol, an architect in Santa Fe and a member of the Archaeology Review Committee (ARC), expressed concern about the current composition of the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB), noting that according to the city code, the Board must comprise an architect, a historian, a construction industry representative, a business owner from a historic district, a member of the Old Santa Fe Association, and two members at large. However, the Board has operated for several months without an architect, and it is unclear whether the Board's recent decisions are valid in light of the noncompliance. Meetings should be paused until a properly composed Board is

established. At least one architect has applied to serve, but there has been no progress on their application.

Richard Martinez, also an architect, echoed Gayla Beals' comments, noting that two architects have been nominated, but no action has been taken.

On another matter, the procedural burdens placed on applicants, particularly concerning submittal requirements and scheduling, were highlighted, noting that in the past, applicants could prepare and refine their plans within a month. The process has become more complicated since submittals now require a completed and signed Preliminary Zoning Review (PZR) before submission. Obtaining a PZR can take weeks, and since submittals are now accepted only once a month instead of twice, missing a deadline can delay a project by at least another month. Drawings are often finalized four to five weeks before submission, and project hearings can occur six weeks to two months after due to Board scheduling limitations. The significant delays hinder project progress, prolong construction, and disrupt client timelines. It is understood that staff are overworked, but solutions should be considered, such as increasing staff capacity, increasing Board membership, holding meetings weekly, or establishing separate boards for different historic districts.

Stephanie Beninato agreed with the previous comments regarding the appointment of an architect to the Board, noting that the current landscape architect position does not satisfy the ordinance's requirement. Each Board member could identify which seat they occupy to improve transparency. Concern was raised, however, regarding Mr. Martinez's proposal to double the size of the Board or divide it by district, due to possible inconsistency. Regardless, the review process must be streamlined to reduce delays. A case was referenced involving coyote fencing, and it was noted that despite extensive efforts to gather historical documentation, staff already possessed records that had been missed. Staff should review their files before requiring applicants to provide documentation. It took more than six months for a planner to be assigned to that case.

Concerns were also raised about the bridge project near the Supreme Court building, noting that the project was expedited earlier in the year due to funding deadlines. A subcommittee, comprising Chair Rios and Member Cherry, was assigned to monitor it. An update on the project's status was requested, particularly regarding the replication of original stone materials.

Regarding the upcoming discussion of the General Plan, it was requested that the approximately 40 substantive changes be clearly identified and explained for transparency and proper review.

6. Discussion and Action to Make Recommendations on Legislation

- a. Consideration of Bill No. 2024-17. Adoption of Ordinance No. 2025-(yet to be determined). (Mayor Alan Webber and Councilor Jamie Cassutt)

Historic Districts Review Board and Archaeological Review Committee Joint Meeting

October 14, 2025

Page 3 of 17

A Bill Repealing and Replacing SFCC 1987 Chapter 14 (“Land Development Code”); Clarifying and Consolidating Various References to Code Violations Into the One Violations Section; Specifying that the Applicant or the Property Owner Have the Burden of Proof for Establishing Legal Non-Conformities; Reducing the Early Neighborhood Notification Requirement for City Capital Improvement Projects to those Exceeding Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars; Renaming “Special Use Permit” to “Conditional Use Permit”; Removing Historic District Review Board’s (“HDRB”) Authority to Recommend Personal Property Acquisitions; Requiring Archaeologists to Hold a New Mexico State Burial Excavation Permit for Certain Work; Removing Waivers of Qualifications for Archaeologists by Archaeological Review Committee; Increasing Permitted Building Heights for Residential Districts and Non-Residential Development; Establishing Densities and Height By Right for Certain Residential Zones Exceeding Ten Units Per Acre; Creating a Parks and Open Space Zoning District; Permitting Additional Flexibility for Certain Structures and Situations Regarding Setbacks; Eliminating Residential Suite Hotel/Motel and Ecological Resource Protection Overlay Zoning Districts; Reducing the Length at Which an Archaeological Clearance Permit is Required for Sewer and Utility Main Construction; Removing Alcohol Sale Regulations in the Airport Road Overlay; Identifying a Strategy to Review and Approve Land Uses Not Specifically Listed in the “Summary Table of Allowed Uses”; Clarifying that Duplexes, Triplexes, Townhomes, and Residential Complexes are Permitted Uses; Creating Use Categories and Subcategories and Reorganizing Some Existing Uses Into New Categories within the Table of Allowed Uses; Requiring Trees to be Integrated Into Stormwater Infrastructure in the Airport Road Overlay District; Removing Certain Prohibitions for Vehicle Parking at Residences; Allowing Accessory Dwelling Units to be the Maximum Allowable Height of the Zoning District; Establishing Design and Dimensional Standards for Residential Compound Development; Regulating In-Ground and Above-Ground Pools; Regulating Agricultural Home Occupations; Reassigning the Use, “Laboratory, Research, or Testing” From Industrial to Commercial; Regulating Outdoor Dining; Updating Telecommunication Facilities Code to be Consistent with Federal Standards; Establishing New Subdistrict Regulations in the Historic District Overlays; Specifying Primary Facades for Significant Structures and the Strategy for Identifying Primary Facades On Contributing Structures; Updating Definitions For Façade and Elevation; Prohibiting Enclosure Of Existing Porches and Portals on Primary Facades of Contributing Structures; Requiring Window Depth and Other Characteristics of Windows and Doors be Preserved in Historic Districts; Increasing Affordability Incentives, Including Administrative Review and Density Bonuses; Specifying that Open Space Requirements in the C-2 District are Per Dwelling Unit; Expanding Options to Reduce On-Site Parking and

Exempting the Business Capital District from Parking Requirements in Table 7-4; Reducing Required Off-Street Parking Spaces; Requiring Electric Vehicle Charging Stations for All New Developments; Distinguishing Parking Regulations Applicable to Bicycles from those Applicable to Vehicles, and Requiring Long-Term Bicycle Storage and Parking; Eliminating Content-Based Sign Restrictions; Imposing a Variety of New Regulations Protecting the City's Terrain and Stormwater Management; Imposing New Landscaping Standards for Plants and Trees; Eliminating Allowance for High- and Low-Pressure Sodium Lamps and Mercury Vapor, Adding Led as the Permitted Lamp Type, and Decreasing the Permitted Incandescent Watts from 160 to 150; Sunsetting the Business Capitol District Design Review Committee and Long Range Planning Subcommittee; Defining Numerous Terms; Imbedding Graphical Depictions of Processes; and Making Non-Substantive Chapter Organizational Changes.

Ms. Heather Lamboy advised that, per Section 14-2.7, when a case is under review by both the HDRB and the ARC, a joint meeting may be held.

Ms. Lamboy explained that the Land Development Code (LDC) update was originally designed as a three-phase project. Phase 1, the current focus, involves cleaning up and reorganizing the code. The last comprehensive adoption of the LDC occurred in 1987, and numerous amendments have been completed since. These incremental updates have led to inconsistencies and conflicts within the code. The goal of this phase is to address these inconsistencies and streamline the document.

Phase 2 will focus on the substantive policy updates, addressing key issues identified during Phase 1 and through community outreach. An initial assessment to identify critical areas in need of modernization was conducted, and a report summarizing those findings will be provided to the Board.

Phase 3 will ensure that the LDC aligns with the updated General Plan, which is currently being revised.

Substantive changes in the Phase 1 draft include the consolidation and reorganization of all zoning-related information, with clearer references to setbacks, building height, and dimensional standards. Tables were simplified and reduced, and new graphics and illustrations were added. Phase 1 also aims to promote affordable housing through a tiered incentive system that rewards developers. Revisions also support infill development by permitting smaller lots and accessory dwelling units throughout the city.

A Parks and Open Space zoning category was created in response to community concerns, and updates to overlay zoning districts now include maps identifying locations and boundaries. Specific prohibitions that previously discouraged development were

removed. The revised code also removes architectural character descriptions and public view limitation clauses. Additionally, new land uses, such as dog daycare centers, were added, and permissions were updated to support sustainable construction practices.

Additional updates include revised landscaping, wall, bicycle parking, and fence standards, and updates to parking regulations and signage. Parking requirements for senior housing were reduced, and those in the downtown area were eliminated.

The ordinance adds a requirement for a New Mexico State burial excavation permit, establishes procedures for handling human remains, and introduces emergency action protocols and artifact custody requirements. The waiver of archaeologist qualifications has been removed to ensure professional standards are maintained.

Ms. Lamboy explained the Governing Body process, noting that the public testimony period primarily focused on affordable housing. The next steps will include a meeting with the Planning Commission, followed by review and discussion at council subcommittees. The Governing Body will then receive the recommendations for final decision.

These updates are also intended to honor the First Peoples and earlier cultures, with recognition that Tribes such as Tesuque Pueblo have participated in the process and archaeological analyses.

Public Comment:

Dr. Steven Post, 3924 Old Santa Fe Trail, noted that several of the proposed revisions are substantive, particularly the shortening of utility line disturbance lengths within the archaeological districts, which raises concerns of additional burdens on landowners and utility companies. Mr. Post questioned how the disturbance length decision was made and how site boundaries would be determined for applying the new archaeological buffer rules, given the limitations of existing mapping tools.

Care is needed when defining site boundaries, especially in the Rivers and Trails and Suburban Archaeological Districts. Future committees and staff require clear guidance on overlapping site buffers and determining when archaeological studies are required.

Member Treece responded that the revised distances and thresholds were based on real-world observations from recent ARC meetings. There are increasing instances of projects located very close to archaeological sites, where developers were not fully accounting for their proximity to protected areas. With the rise in underground utility work, there is now greater potential to disturb archaeological materials. Some companies segment projects to avoid triggering review requirements.

Member Eck explained that the reduction in allowable trench lengths was intended to also ensure that individual homeowners would not be disproportionately affected by the new requirements. Routine home maintenance or line replacements should not automatically

trigger a review. When an application falls within the buffer limits, a case-by-case evaluation will be conducted to determine whether an archaeological review is warranted.

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico, expressed concern over the substantive nature of some of the proposed revisions and their implications. It is unclear how staff can rely on restricted documents, as much of their work is part of the public record, and when the public would be able to provide feedback. While there appears to be public participation throughout the process, it may not influence the outcome.

It is questionable whether members would allocate sufficient time to the lengthy document, and it may be approved without sufficient public debate. At the October 9, 2025, hearing, many of the participants appeared to represent development and housing interests, rather than the general public or preservation community.

While the ordinance overhaul was presented as an effort to simplify and clarify the land use code, the proposed archaeological sections complicate the process.

Board Action:

Member Bechtol moved to approve the recommendation of the Phase 1 revisions to the governing body. Member Eck seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (3-0).

The ARC was excused.

Ms. Lamboy noted that the updates were necessary to ensure fairness, improve clarity, support affordable housing goals, and simplify the development process. Technical working groups and a subcommittee contributed to shaping the refinements. Regarding process and structure updates, sections were renumbered for clarity. Diagrams and graphics were added to outline Board processes, as were demolition reviews and decision-making steps.

The design guidelines were reorganized to be more precise and consistent across all districts, utilizing standardized headings and focusing on defining qualities rather than subjective styles. The ordinance now acknowledges Northern New Mexico vernacular architecture alongside Pueblo and Territorial Revival styles, broadening the scope of what is recognized as historically appropriate.

Updates aim to make the ordinance more accessible and inclusive while maintaining preservation goals and now allow flexibility for contemporary interpretations that respect the district's character.

The Subcommittee, comprising Board members, preservation experts, architects, and community representatives, endorsed the staff's recommendations following multiple review rounds.

Member Aguilar Medrano expressed concern, as while she had received the updated draft earlier in the week, the last Subcommittee meeting was held in August 2024. Most of the discussion at that meeting focused on later phases, and the version under review was noticeably different. Including member names in the new version implies that the Board approved the changes.

Ms. Lamboy clarified that there had been one additional Subcommittee meeting after August 2024. The process was delayed by a comprehensive legal and technical review conducted by the city attorney's office, which examined approximately 700 pages.

Member Cherry agreed with Member Aguilar Medrano's comments, noting that he did not formally agree to substantive changes.

Matt Goebel, Clarion Associates, explained that Santa Fe has undergone multiple iterations of the historic ordinance, with prior efforts involving extensive stakeholder input but yielding no changes. Separating housekeeping from substantive changes is common in municipal code updates, as it allows more straightforward implementation and builds momentum for more complex updates. Determining the line between minor and substantive changes can be challenging, and some minor changes were intentionally included as they reflected community priorities or straightforward improvements. A new assessment report will be released for Phase 2.

Member Bienvenu acknowledged the significant undertaking of the project but noted that he believed the changes were minor and expressed concern about some of the proposed changes, particularly in the Downtown East Side historic district, which seemed extreme. The district has been governed by consistent rules since 1957. The district character description is confusing as it references historic styles no longer permitted.

The process was presented as a hygienic cleanup with no substantive changes. Yet, substantive changes were introduced in May 2025, and the Board's objections have not been fully addressed. The revised draft made only minor adjustments and largely mirrored the original version. The accelerated timeline risks insufficient public and Board consideration, potentially undermining preservation standards.

Regarding the removal of longstanding review standards, language in the existing ordinance requiring the Board to evaluate proposed changes for harmony with adjacent buildings, preservation of historical qualities, and conformity to architectural style has been removed.

Regarding permitted architectural styles, the draft eliminates the existing Old Santa Fe and Recent Santa Fe styles and replaces them with Pueblo Spanish Revival, Territorial Revival, and Northern New Mexico Vernacular subtypes of Santa Fe style. The new styles are undefined, creating ambiguity.

Regarding consistency and materials, current standards require harmony in materials, color, proportion, and details, ensuring that new construction in the district maintains the appearance of adobe construction. The draft appears to remove this requirement.

Additional inconsistencies in the draft include applying Adobe-style requirements only to Pueblo Spanish Revival buildings and only for publicly visible portions. All original language regarding Adobe construction should be retained for all districts until Phase 2. Many districts, including the Historic Review District and Westside Guadalupe, have confusing descriptions.

Implementing these changes now would create an interim period with multiple sets of standards for the same districts, potentially lasting a few years and risking the undermining of long-established preservation norms.

Member Biedscheid clarified that she is not an architect, as stated in Maggie Moore's memo. Support was expressed for the previous member comments, and it was noted that the Technical Advisory Working Group was not involved in the proposed revision process. Instead, the group focused on community priorities such as the affordable housing initiative. Changes should help professionals, applicants, and staff navigate the code more effectively, improve review timeliness, and reduce confusion.

Support was expressed for introducing more measurable criteria to replace vague qualitative standards, to improve consistency and preserve the Santa Fe style. Adopting federally recognized approaches, such as defining a period of significance for districts or structures, would be more effective than referencing undefined styles.

The existing guidance documents could be used to test and refine new definitions before being formally added to the code. Gathering feedback through these documents could strengthen Phase 2 revisions and ensure the language is more clearly understood.

Member Cherry expressed concern over adopting the Phase 1 changes, which would become code until Phase 2 is adopted. The approach could create a moving target as the code would continue to evolve. The Subcommittee's primary goal was to preserve the integrity of historic structures and districts, and the purpose of the revisions should be to clarify and simplify the code by reducing ambiguity and clearly outlining what is and is not permitted.

Public Comment:

Frank Katz, 1300 Canyon Road, Board member of the Old Santa Fe Association, expressed concern over the changes, noting that Santa Fe's historic district was the result of decades of effort beginning in 1912 and culminating in the 1957 ordinance. Introducing modern designs is inconsistent with the traditional aesthetic, and maintaining the city's distinctive character is essential. The Board was urged to reject the changes.

Jerry Richardson, a resident of the Guadalupe Historic District, strongly opposed the revisions. The public was granted only a week to review a nearly 700-page document with no clear indication of what had changed. The Subcommittee did not finalize recommendations, yet city staff drafted new language. The agenda's description of the updates as non-substantive is misleading. The Board was urged to reject the proposal.

Daniel Warwa, a member of the Community Advisory Working Group, supported the affordable housing incentives included in Phase 1, as the current code hinders this type of development. Affordability measures would ensure that local workers can live within the city. Aesthetic preservation must operate in tandem with the preservation of community diversity and culture.

Johanna Gilligan, also a member of the Citizens Advisory Working Group and a professional in affordable housing, urged the Board to approve the Phase 1 updates. The code revisions have been underway for over three years and have included substantial community input. Further postponement would harm low- and moderate-income residents.

Jenny Parks, 141 Sereno Drive, Senior Vice President at the Anchorum Health Foundation, noted the link between housing and public health. Communities are struggling with affordable and workforce housing shortages. Santa Fe's lengthy and complex permitting process discourages affordable housing developers. The four incentive components: density bonuses, dimensional flexibility, fee waivers, and administrative review, must be adopted together. The Board was urged not to delay implementation of these provisions due to disputes over historic preservation.

Robin Gavin, a 50-year Santa Fe resident, expressed concern about the lack of inclusion and transparency in the process. While Chapter 14 needs updating, affordable housing and historic preservation can coexist. Greater collaboration between the preservation and housing communities is required.

Anne Watkins, 2138 Candelero Street, a member of the Community Development Commission, supported the updates, noting that outdated code provisions are a significant obstacle to creating new and innovative housing.

Dante Gonzalez, representing Generation Elevate New Mexico, noted the severe affordability crisis and the long commutes by local workers. The Board was urged to support Phase 1 and the Creating Affordability Now initiative, which are crucial for enabling younger residents and workers to remain in the community.

Anthony Guida, an architect, President of Friends of Architecture Santa Fe, and former HDRB member, strongly supported adopting the Phase 1 draft. While imperfect, the rewrite modernizes and clarifies outdated language, making the code more accessible and consistent. Fears that modern architecture will overtake historic areas are unfounded,

and the proposed updates better define historic character while also addressing the city's housing inequities. The affordable housing incentives support inclusion, sustainability, and cultural continuity.

Miles Conway, a housing advocate and Executive Officer of the state's Homebuilders Association, emphasized that preservation and affordability are compatible. The Board was encouraged to retain language it deems necessary for preservation oversight, while supporting the core housing provisions in the update. The proposed reforms align with national best practices for addressing housing affordability.

John Eddy, representing the Old Santa Fe Association, distributed a document for the record and noted that historic preservation and affordable housing are not opposing goals. Adopting the entire Phase 1 draft as a single document would risk undermining the preservation code.

Carlos Gamora, a housing reform advocate and member of the Technical Advisory Working Group, noted that the Phase 1 proposal originated in earlier collaboration among preservation and housing stakeholders, including members of the Old Santa Fe Association, and was delayed by the pandemic. While the historic overlay revision concerns are valid, prolonged delays would create stagnation in needed policy reforms. The Board was urged to adopt feasible historic overlay updates now while reserving more complex debates for Phase 2.

Stefanie Beninato, a longtime Santa Fe resident and preservation historian, member of the Old Santa Fe Association and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, who has lived in multiple historic neighborhoods since 1975, noted that she co-led the first architectural survey of the West Side, which resulted in its historic district designation.

Concern was expressed about the lack of public involvement in the process, noting that meetings were closed to the public and were primarily composed of members with development interests rather than preservation backgrounds. While supporting affordable housing, it is unclear whether the proposed density bonuses would achieve affordability, as many R-1 neighborhoods have restrictive covenants that prevent additional density. Small, affordable condominium units on existing properties could be a more effective path to local homeownership.

Santa Fe's historic architecture is what attracts visitors and sustains its cultural identity, and allowing incompatible modern designs in historic districts would undermine that authenticity.

The conversion of former schools into hotels, the proliferation of short-term rentals downtown, and the lack of regulation to limit their spread were also presented as concerns. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the proposed density and parking reductions

would improve affordability or transportation, as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee's data show only 2% of commuters bike to work.

The Board was urged to investigate the approval process for some recent architectural approvals within historic areas, citing a large dormer-style roof at 433 Camino Del Monte Sol, which is inconsistent with the surrounding historic character.

Chair Rios read part of a letter from the Co-Executive Director of the Santa Fe Association, strongly urging the Board to reject the updates.

Member Degnan noted that the city's historic character was one of the reasons she moved here and advised of her past involvement in the affordable housing space. While an important issue, it should be addressed separately from complex preservation code updates. Santa Fe is recognized for its historic and cultural value, and National Geographic recently ranked the city number one in the country.

There has been insufficient time to review the 600–700-page document, and it would be irresponsible to vote without doing so.

Ms. Lamboy confirmed that the Board's decision regarding the parts of the code within its purview could unintentionally affect other sections. Still, the Board could provide suggestions to the Governing Body.

Member Biedscheid expressed support for adopting the Phase 1 changes, with the recommendation that a committee including at least two members of the HDRB be formed to refine the portions of the code that remain unclear. Phase 2 will provide an opportunity to refine and correct code based on lessons learned.

Member Bienvenu agreed that the Board's concerns should not prevent the Governing Body from making a decision. The concerns raised should be easy to remedy.

Member Bienvenu:

Whereas the draft code presented to the Board this evening contains substantive revisions that were expected to be analyzed and discussed during Phase 2;

Whereas the Board previously recommended, at its May 2025 hearing, that such substantive revisions were inappropriate for inclusion in Phase 1 and should be deferred to Phase 2;

Whereas these substantive revisions alter existing style and preservation standards in ways that could negatively impact Santa Fe's historic districts and therefore warrant more careful review;

Moved to provide the Governing Body with the recommendation to reject the specific substantive revisions outlined in the memorandum dated October 14, 2025, which has been entered into the record. The Board supports the remaining revisions to Chapter 14 as they pertain to the Historic Preservation Ordinance in the current draft and offers no opinion on portions of the code outside its jurisdiction. The Board further believes that the

draft code could be revised accordingly and still proceed for approval under the governing body's current schedule. Member Medrano seconded.

A vote was not called as the conversation continued.

Ms. Lamboy explained that while a resolution can express the Board's opinion, it typically applies to non-binding matters, such as the General Plan. Since this concerns an ordinance with legal effect, the motion may not technically be a resolution.

Member Bienvenu responded that the term resolution was used based on Robert's Rules of Order, which calls any Board action a resolution, and includes the clauses that provide reasoning for the decision and results in an official document.

Ms. Lamboy confirmed the resolution does not require re-phrasing for staff purposes and that the meeting record would be included in all future presentations, including the staff report to the Planning Commission and the packet for the Governing Body. The timeline for Phase 1 is as follows: discussion at the Planning Commission on October 16, at the Public Works & Utilities Committee on October 20, at the Quality of Life Committee on October 22, at the Finance Committee on October 27, and at the Special Governing Body hearing on November 19, 2025. The vote could occur in November 2025, though the outcome could also be continued. Changes to the current motion would require Governing Body approval.

Member Degnan requested clarification on the motion, and Chair Rios responded that the motion recommends that the HDRB approve Phase 1 of the historic ordinance, while opposing the specific changes listed in the memorandum provided. The Board supports retaining the existing language for those historic provisions and takes no position on other non-historic parts of the code, as they are outside its purview.

Member Bienvenu agreed with the clarification.

Ms. Lamboy clarified the process, advising that, for presentations to other committees and commissions, staff would provide an updated version of the historic section reflecting the current design standards. This would serve as a visual reference for the Governing Body, providing an alternative version of the code consistent with the Board's motion for consideration. If the Board wishes for the motion to be presented as an ordinance, staff can make the necessary adjustments, as providing a clear version of the code is essential to understand the recommendation and ensure the record is clear and accurate.

In response to Member Cherry's request for the motion to be repeated, Member Bienvenu explained that the concept is that the Governing Body would receive an alternative version of the updated code that includes all the changes in the memorandum but retaining the Board's preferred language, in order to have a complete code to review and approve.

In response to a second request, the motion was restated as follows:

Member Bienvenue moved to approve the recommendation to the Governing Body that the proposed changes to the code identified in the October 14, 2025, memorandum not be accepted, and that the existing language of the current code for those specific provisions be retained through Phase 1, and that the remainder of the code update be considered acceptable with respect to the provisions pertaining to the historic preservation ordinance, which fall under the Board's purview, and that an alternative draft be prepared and presented to the Governing Body, reflecting the Board's recommended retention of the current language for those provisions. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed by voice vote (4-3) with Chair Rios, Vice Chair Bienvenu, Members Aguilar Madrano and Cherry in favor, and Members Biedscheid, Degnan, and Mather opposed

Member Biedscheid acknowledged that Phase 1 requires additional revisions but recommended adopting it to avoid compromising preservation efforts, as Phase 2 provides an opportunity to refine and correct the code.

Chair Rios noted that she understood the draft presented is a final product, and that its acceptance as-is means the Board recommends it to the Governing Body as final.

Ms. Lamboy confirmed Chair Rios's interpretation, noting, however, that it is within the Board's authority to propose amendments before approval. A copy of the motion will be provided to the Board for their review and feedback.

Member Cherry expressed confusion, as the motion was to reject the code. Member Bienvenu responded that the intent is not to accept the code as written today. However, with the recommended changes incorporated (as outlined in the memo), the Board supports the code.

7. **Staff Communications**

a. 715 Camino Lejo, Historic Review Historic District, Not Surveyed, Philip Weddle, agent for George Goldstein, Museum of New Mexico Board of Regents, owner, requests design review for the proposed construction of a new restroom building and small gateway structure in conjunction with the planned Children's Discovery Garden at the Santa Fe Botanical Garden. This information item will begin the collaboration procedures set forth in 14-5.2(M)(2)(a) collaboration between the state and the Historic Districts Review Board.

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

8. **Old Business**

a. **Case 2025-010495-HDRB, 439 Camino del Monte Sol Lot 1-A:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Significant, Hoopes Architects, agent for Chris Greulich and Mathew Boland, owners, request approval to construct a 504 sq. ft. detached garage to a height of 10'-3" where the max allowable is 14'-0". (Paul Duran).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

9. **New Business**

- a. **Case 2025-011226-HDRB, 1323 Paseo De Peralta:** Don Gaspar Area Historic District, Contributing, Santa Fe Permits, agent for Capitol Counsel and Consulting, LLC, owner, requests primary façade designation. (Lani McCulley, LJMcCulley@santafenm.gov).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- b. **Case 2025-011227-HDRB, 925 Canyon Rd.:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing, Trey Jordon, agent for John and Mary Ann Vigil and Concepcion Lujan, owners, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable. (Lani McCulley).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- c. **Case 2025-011248-HDRB, 1020 Camino San Acacio:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Henry Avila, agent for Zelma Long and Philip Freese, owners, requests status review with primary façade(s) designation if applicable. (Paul Duran) (Postponed to October 28, 2025).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- d. **Case 2025-011245-HDRB, 456 Camino Don Miguel:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing, Henry Avila, agent for William J. and Celeste K. Hughes, owners, requests approval of a new 529 sq. ft. detached garage structure in the Recent Santa Fe design style to a height of 11'-7" where the maximum allowable height is 15'-8" and new vehicular gate. (Paul Duran).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- e. **Case 2025-011228-HDRB, 927 Canyon Rd.:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing, Innovative Design Construction, agent for Joseph Gonzalez, owner, proposes to construct a 576 sq. ft. carport addition to a height of 10'-0" where the maximum allowable is 18'-1". (Lani McCulley).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- f. **Case 2025-011229-HDRB, 815 Dunlap St.:** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing, Christopher Purvis, agent for Michael Zimmer, owner, proposes to replace and repair windows, remove the greenhouse, and stucco.

An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) for replacing historic windows. (Lani McCulley).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- g. **Case 2025-011244-HDRB, 412 Camino Cabra:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Ju Tan, agent for Heather Lundine and Tom Wilmoth, owners, requests approval for window replacements, construct a coyote fence to a height of 4'-6", and yard wall to a height of 3'-9" where the maximum allowable is 5'-1". Two exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) removal of historic material and 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. (Paul Duran).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- h. **Case 2025-011246-HDRB, 532 Calle Corvo:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, John Padilla, agent for Susan McShane Salomone, owner, requests approval to construct a 624 sq. ft. addition to the main house and 442 sq. ft. addition to the garage. An exception is requested to 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. (Paul Duran).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- i. **Case 2025-011230-HDRB, 527 Agua Fria St. units 1, 2, & 3:** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Significant, Osage Design Studio, agent for Neirika, LLC, owner, proposes to construct a 36 sq. ft. addition, replace windows and doors, raise two sections of roofing, re-roof, stucco, and other repairs. Exceptions are requested to 14-5-2(D)(5)(a)(i)(ii)(iii) for replacement of windows on primary facades, 14-5-2(D)(3)(a) for raising the roof of a significant structure, 14-5-2(D)(2)(c) placing an addition on a primary façade, 14-5-2(D)(5)(b) replacing a chimney on a significant structure. (Lani McCulley).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

- j. **Case 2025-011231-HDRB, 330 Gormley Ln.:** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non- contributing, Armando Gonzalez, agent for Elizabeth Geier, owner, requests approval for a 144 sq. ft. pergola to a height of 9'-0" and a 298 sq. ft. portal to a height of 15'-4" where the maximum allowable height is 17'-5", and three pedestrian gates ranging from 5'-10" to 6'-0" where the maximum

allowable height is 6'-0" that were constructed without a permit. (Lani McCulley).

This item was postponed to October 28, 2025.

10. Matters from the Board

There were no matters from the Board.

11. Next Meeting

October 28, 2025

12. Adjournment

Member Cherry moved to adjourn. Member Mather seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Lorena Araujo of Minutes Solutions Inc.

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date

David Eck, Archaeology Review Committee Chair

Date