



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
February 10, 2026, at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue**

Meeting Minutes

View meeting on City YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=toXV-e32Fpk>

Call to Order

Chair Rios called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board to order at 5:31 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:

Members Present

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

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
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

Mr. Moquino noted that cases 2026-011831-HDRB, 1489 Upper Canyon Road; and 2026-011825-HDRB, 619 West Alameda Street; under New Business, have been postponed.

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

3. Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

4. Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

There were no findings and conclusions to approve.

5. Matters from the Public

Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, Santa Fe, expressed disappointment via teleconference that City Council did not uphold the Board's decision in a recent case regarding windows and suggested that the Board clarify and maintain its rules regarding windows that are over or under 40% degraded.

6. Staff Communications

- a. **HDRB Workshop:** An HDRB workshop is tentatively scheduled for March 17, 2026, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Council chambers. Board members were asked to indicate their availability.
- b. **Changes in Code:** Mr. Moquino noted that some of the cases to be presented would fall under the new code, and staff would indicate them. Staff will email Board members a PDF copy of the new code.
- c. **2026 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Awards:** Board members were encouraged to participate in the nomination process by February 27, 2026. Staff will send the Board a list of completed projects that have received their final inspections.
- d. **February 24, 2026, Meeting Start Time:** The February 24, 2026, HDRB meeting will start at 6:00 p.m. due to a special Governing Body meeting.

7. Old Business

There were no cases under Old Business.

8. New Business

- a. **2025-011246-HDRB. 532 Calle Corvo, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing,** John A. Padilla, agent for Susan McShane Salomone, owner, requests approval to construct a 620-square-foot addition to the main house and a 518-square-foot addition to the garage. Four exceptions are requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i), removal of windows and doors of a contributing structure, and Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d), additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the

Historic Districts Review Board

February 10, 2026

Page 2 of 15

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 façade.

Chair Rios noted that applicants are free to dispute the Board's ruling before the City Council, with the assistance of staff, and that public comment would be limited to two minutes.

Ms. Lamboy presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria to Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) have not been met for the proposed alterations to the contributing garage structure, but the Board may find that they have upon further testimony from the applicant. Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the exception request for Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) to narrow a window opening on the primary façade of a contributing structure, and the other proposed alterations that do not require an exception request to the main structure, as they comply with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Chair Rios requested confirmation that the project involved wholesale replacement of windows and doors and that the openings are historic, but the windows are not.

Ms. Lamboy responded that this is correct. The deep recesses are consistent throughout the building, but the windows are not historic. Their proposed replacements are wood-clad divided light windows.

Member Biedscheid asked whether staff considered the 1966 addition to be part of the historic footprint when assessing whether the proposed addition would exceed 50%.

Ms. Lamboy responded that the addition is to the garage in this case. The two buildings are calculated separately. If an addition were proposed to the main residence, staff would calculate based on 50% of its existing footprint, including the 1966 addition.

Chair Rios asked whether staff feels that the applicant has met the exception criteria.

Ms. Lamboy responded that, regarding the garage structure, staff does not feel the exception criteria have been met and does not recommend approval. Regarding the infill of the window on the primary façade, staff is seeking additional information from the applicant.

Al Salomone, the owner, and John Padilla, addresses inaudible, Santa Fe, were sworn in. Mr. Salomone and his wife have maintained homes in New Mexico for over 23 years. They plan to spend more time in Santa Fe as they approach retirement. They chose the home in question with the intention of adding a room for additional family members and

enlarging the detached garage in a manner that incorporates historic pueblo revival style. He intends to incorporate strictly historical elements. He shared images of improvements made by previous owners and noted that the proposed addition is shielded by mature trees, only one of which will require careful relocation. The garage, which does not accommodate modern vehicles, will be converted into a bedroom. The proposed garage addition and door are not publicly visible. He provided letters of support for the project from two immediate neighbors and other neighbors in the Eastside Historic District.

Mr. Padilla noted that the Salomones intend to make the home in question their permanent residence and that, in order for them to do that, they need to remodel it to accommodate their family, as has been historically common for homes in the area. The house currently has a small footprint. Regarding the window on the primary façade, it sits lower than that of the dining nook window next to it. The owner would like to lengthen the kitchen counter, which would require reducing the existing window opening by a few inches. He noted that the garage addition was proposed to accommodate family, not for use as a rental or an Airbnb. He noted that the proposed addition is 444 square feet, not 518; because the existing structure is 360 square feet, the addition would result in the structure being 264 square feet larger than the 50% rule allows.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the appearance of the proposed garage door and whether the garage would still be identified as a garage.

Mr. Padilla responded that the garage will still be visible, but the addition will not be. The non-historic garage door will be replaced by a window in the same opening.

Member Degnan noted that a window of the same dimensions of the garage door would resemble a glass wall.

Mr. Padilla responded that the window would provide light and air circulation.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She expressed appreciation to the architect and owner for maintaining sensitivity to the area in the proposed design, noting that it was a positive innovation that could influence other buildings. She expressed support for owner-occupied, short-term rentals though the owner does not intend to rent the garage in this case.

Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she expressed disapproval that exceptions were sought for family members who would visit for a couple of weeks per year. She expressed opposition to the proposed window in the garage door opening and suggested that a garage door with windows be installed instead. She noted that one bedroom in the main house was removed to create a larger dining room and that the setback should be more than two feet.

Member Biedscheid asked staff whether the garage addition would cause it to lose its contributing status.

Ms. Lamboy responded that the Board has permitted additions to historic garages, but not of the proposed size. Replacing the garage door with a window could be problematic.

Member Biedscheid noted that three exceptions were requested for the garage addition and asked whether the applicant had considered constructing a separate building on the site to avoid this.

Mr. Salomone comments inaudible.

Member Aguilar Medrano requested clarity regarding the calculations for the main residence and suggested that homeowners moving to a new community respect the local standards rather than requesting multiple exceptions. She noted that the bedroom in the garage was proposed because a secondary living room in the main structure occupied excessive square footage.

Ms. Lamboy responded that the existing portal and deck are not historic and are not included in the historic footprint. The applicant has indicated an addition of 421 square feet to the historic footprint, which is under 50% of the existing 1619 square feet.

Mr. Padilla noted that the square footage without the portal is 1,300.

Ms. Lamboy requested confirmation that the noted historic footprint of 1691 square feet includes the portal.

Mr. Padilla responded that it does.

Ms. Lamboy asked when the portal was added, noting that it may be historic, but the deck is not.

Mr. Salomone responded that the portal was added in 1966, along with the back bedroom. The next owner changed the deck.

Member Cherry noted that, in any case, the addition to the main structure is under 50%.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that the applicant consider not adding a living room to the main structure so that it can accommodate a bedroom, thereby avoiding exceptions for the garage.

Mr. Padilla responded that there are only three exceptions requested for the garage and one exception for a window on the main structure.

Member Cherry noted that the proposed addition to the garage would completely alter its appearance; further, the addition encroaches onto the driveway and changes the landscape. He noted that the garage currently has no plumbing and that there is space behind the house to add another structure that is not attached to the garage.

Mr. Padilla responded that the addition does not encroach onto the driveway, as that area is part of the developable area available to owners. He and the owner discussed several options, and the one presented was the most ideal. They have spent a lot of time on the proposal, and the case was postponed twice for reasons unconnected to them.

Mr. Salomone noted that the garage addition was designed to be completely out of public view.

Member Bienvenu noted that the job of the Board is to apply the ordinance, and the ordinance is clear. The contributing status of the garage limits what can be done to it. He expressed agreement with staff that the exception criteria were not met. He noted that additional space could be added to the garage, provided that it is under 50% of the current footprint and that the setback from the primary façade is sufficient. He noted that the garage could lose its contributing status if it no longer resembles a garage.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011246-HDRB at 532 Calle Corvo to deny the request regarding the addition to the garage, finding that the exception criteria have not been met for the reasons stated in the staff report; that the exception criteria have not been met for the alteration to the window on the primary façade, as no hardship has been demonstrated requiring a change to the historic opening, subject to further evidence that the opening is not historic, should the applicant wish to present it; and to otherwise approve the application as meeting all other requirements of the ordinance. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

At the request of the applicant, the Board clarified that the alterations to the house, with the exception of narrowing the window opening on the primary façade, were approved. Alterations to the garage were denied. The garage will need to be reconsidered, as the application did not include an indication that the applicant and owner were willing to consider alternatives. It was suggested that the applicant resubmit the paperwork regarding the garage.

- b. **2026-011831-HDRB, 1489 Upper Canyon Road, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing**, Christopher Purvis, agent for Susan Jancar, owner, requests approval for new construction of a 1,640-square-foot structure to a height of 14'-8", where the maximum allowable height is 18'-9".

This item was postponed.

- c. **2026-011829-HDRB, 408 Camino del Monte Sol, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing**, Christopher Purvis, agent for Bruce Stocks, owner, proposes to construct a 125-square-foot addition to a height of 10'-0".

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation, noting that the application falls under the 2026 code. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-4.6(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and Section 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Christopher Purvis, the applicant, 518 Old Santa Fe, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Agreed with staffs recommendations.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, stated via teleconference that the changes to the windows appear excessive but expressed approval that the shed was removed.

Ms. McCulley clarified that no window changes were proposed.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2026-011829-HDRB at 408 Camino del Monte Sol to approve the application as submitted. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- d. **2026-011825-HDRB, 619 West Alameda Street, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing**, Dura Build Construction, agent for Max Scott, owner, proposes to install a bond beam, repair historic windows, re-roof the existing residence, construct a 1,786-square-foot freestanding residence to a height of 20'-3", where the maximum allowable is 14'-10", and construct 3'-4" and 5' high yard walls. An exception is requested to Section 14-4.6(F)(2) for exceeding the maximum allowable height.

This item was postponed.

- e. **2026-011832-HDRB, 645 Garcia Street, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing**, Graham Hogan, agent for Michael Blum, owner, requests approval to construct a 657-square-foot structure to a height of 13'-0", where the maximum allowable height is 15'-10".

Mr. Moquino presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Member Aguilar Medrano noted that the Board had previously discussed the corner bullnose at length and requested that staff consult the Board's motion on the minimum radius.

Chair Rios responded that the Board had agreed on one inch at that time, as staff had already informed the applicant that a one-inch radius was acceptable.

Mr. Moquino confirmed that this was correct. Staff calculated that bullnose radiuses in the area were generally between three and six inches.

Member Bienvenu expressed disagreement with the statement in the staff report that the project conforms with design standards, as the main house was granted an exception due to confusion regarding the permitted bullnose radius. The Board's comments on that case indicated that a one-inch radius should not be considered a precedent. He noted that, although the proposed casita will be on the same lot, it should be considered as a new case. The Board stipulated a minimum bullnose radius of 2.5 inches for a property on a nearby lot.

Graham Hogan, address inaudible, the applicant, was sworn in. He noted that the project was to add a small casita to Lot 3 that would match the main structure. He shared the site plan and elevations and noted that none of the façades are publicly visible.

Chair Rios inquired whether the lights would be divided.

Mr. Hogan responded that they would not, as the intention was to match the house. While he plans to include a 2.5-inch bullnose on the house on Lot 2, he proposed a one-inch bullnose for the casita to match the house on Lot 3.

Member Bienvenu requested details on the portal post and header.

Mr. Hogan shared images and noted that they are clear, rough-sawn timbers, forming six-by-six-inch wood posts and four-by-12-inch wood beams that would extend to the house. The cover will have a gravel surface to match the house. There is a covered trellis in the courtyard with the same details. There is a header over the windows.

Member Cherry noted that the circumstances of the two cases are different. Regarding the house, there was confusion around the permitted bullnose radius.

Karl Sommer, address inaudible, was sworn in. Speaking on behalf of owner Michael Blum, he noted that the previous Board action contained the word "property," leading the owner to assume it applied to the casita as well as the house, as they are both on the same property. He noted that the owner prefers the house and casita to be harmonious and that the property is not publicly visible.

Member Aguilar Medrano inquired whether staff had calculated the ratio of solid wall space to glass on the west elevation, noting the amount of glass appeared close to 50%.

Ms. Lamboy responded that she is unsure of the calculations, however, the west elevation includes a portal, meaning a larger opening is permitted.

Michael Blum, address inaudible, the owner was sworn in. He expressed intention to incorporate bullnoses with 2.5-inch radii on the neighboring lots but noted that he wanted the casita to match the house on the same lot.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, stated via teleconference that she hoped the Board would require the bullnoses to match the others in the area and that the south elevation should have openings and the north façade would look better with small additional windows.

Member Biedscheid noted that it seemed too late to require a different bullnose, and that a larger bullnose would not change the fact that the house and casita are contemporary.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that the bullnose radius be three inches to match the staff's calculations.

Member Bienvenu noted that he would accept a 2.5-inch bullnose to match the neighboring properties.

Member Cherry noted a need for clarity, adding that, as there is no existing methodology for calculating bullnoses, the current case would not set a precedent.

Member Bienvenu noted that the Board's discussion of the previous case made it clear that the exception was made for the structure, not the property.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011832-HDRB at 645 Garcia Street to approve the project as submitted, with a minimum bullnose radius of one inch as a condition. Member Cherry seconded. The motion failed (2-3) with members Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and members Bienvenu, Aguilar Madrano and Degnan against.

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011832-HDRB at 645 Garcia Street that the application be approved on condition that the corner bullnoses have a minimum radius of 2.5 inches. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with members Bienvenu, Aguilar Madrano and Degnan in favor and members Biedscheid and Cherry against.

- f. **2025-011418-HDRB, 320 Paseo de Peralta, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing**, Charlotte Fox, owner, requests

approval for a mural. Three exceptions are requested to Section 14-5.2(10), signs and murals, Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(b), exterior walls, and Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e), publicly visible façades.

Mr. Moquino presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended denial of the proposed project and found that the exception criteria have not been met for the exceptions requested to Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(b), exceed a single color on exterior wall, and Section 14-5.2(E)(2)(e), exceed a single color on a façade. The application does not comply with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and Section 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Charlotte Fox, the applicant and owner, 822 Camino Zozobra, was sworn in. She noted that the existing mural, called Orchard Sentinel, is on a property that has been in her family for three generations. She apologized for not seeking approval beforehand, noting that, at the time the \$8,000 mural was commissioned, she was unaware that the property fell within the historic district. Her intentions were to cover unsightly utility boxes and power lines and to create a welcoming entrance to the property, which is currently a bed and breakfast. The mural was painted by a local artist and honors Santa Fe's Tewa heritage. She expressed willingness to make changes to the mural to bring it into compliance.

Member Cherry noted that he would abstain from the discussion and vote due to a business relationship with an individual affiliated with the property.

Member Biedscheid asked staff whether all murals in the district required exceptions.

Ms. Lamboy responded that there are other murals in the historic district, but the scale of the mural in question led staff to request an exception.

Member Biedscheid noted that she has only seen one proposal for a mural before the Board, and it was denied because it was on a small street. The mural in question is on a much larger street and set further back. She noted that it improves the appearance of an otherwise unadorned building and does not compromise its character. She expressed a desire to encourage interest in public art.

Member Degnan expressed doubt that the applicant could have been raised in Santa Fe without knowing the property was in a historic district and noted that approving the mural could set a precedent.

Member Bienvenu inquired what the ordinance says about murals.

Mr. Ruybalid read Section 14-5.2(D)(10) regarding sign applications and noted that murals are not considered signs and are often referred to the Arts Commission.

He also read portions of the code indicating that in the historic district, more than one color may be used only under Portals. There is little guidance regarding murals.

Ms. Lamboy noted that staff defines murals as a painting or work of art executed on a wall.

Member Bienvenu suggested that more specialized language be added in Phase 2 of the code updates. He noted that, for a mural to be approved, it is important for the Board to know beforehand what it would depict, and that the Board would likely not have approved it, as it significantly alters the building and would set a precedent for similar murals.

Member Degnan asked whether the mural could be considered a sign, as it depicts a fox, and the business owner's family name is Fox.

Mr. Ruybalid responded that it would not. There is a list of criteria regarding what constitutes a sign.

Member Aguilar Medrano noted that the Board is limited to enforcing the code but that she would consider approval because Paseo de Peralta is a large street on the cusp of the historic district and not particularly attractive. She noted that the painting could come to be part of the community, and that notable sites tend to be unusual.

Chair Rios inquired whether the Board decision could be to refer the case to the Arts Commission.

Ms. Lamboy responded that this is correct. In the Downtown and Eastside Historic District Standards, murals are typically painted under Portals.

Member Biedscheid noted that any mural would alter the streetscape, and that is the intention. The mural in question is a decoration with no offensive material. She expressed approval of allowing murals in the historic districts.

Mr. Moquino noted that the Arts Commission normally does not review murals on private property.

Ms. Lamboy responded that the Arts Commission may be involved if the Board requests it.

Member Degnan noted that staff referred the project to the Board because the mural is on a historic building.

Ms. Fox apologized again, noting that she thought a mural would be acceptable on a newer portion of a non-contributing building.

Public Comment:

Katherine Rivera, P.O. Box 363, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She noted that she searched for the word “mural” and found language on Pages 304, 306, and 314 of the new code that implies murals are permitted. The code does not specify an approval process. She noted that Santa Fe is normally supportive of art and recommended approving the mural until an official policy is created.

Mr. Ruybalid noted that Ms. Rivera might have been reading the section regarding the Westside Guadalupe District.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, stated via teleconference that a gallery owner decided not to paint a mural on their property due to liability concerns, as someone may be struck by a vehicle by taking a photo. She suggested that the Board request the removal of most of the mural.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011418-HDRB at 320 Paseo de Peralta to approve the application, noting that the exception criteria have been met as follows: Exception Criterion No. 1, regarding the character of the district, the presence of a mural adds character to a street that is largely without character; Exception Criterion No. 2, regarding hardship, the mural prevents hardship associated with the unattractive exposed utility lines; Criterion No. 3, strengthening the heterogenous character of the city, the mural expands the diversity on a non-contributing building with a nominal impact on the street as a whole. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion failed for a lack of majority (2-2) with members Biedscheid and Aguilar Medrano in favor and members Bienvenu and Degnan against.

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011418-HDRB at 320 Paseo de Peralta to adopt staff’s recommended findings that the exception criteria have not been met and deny the application, as recommended by staff for the reasons discussed. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with Cahir Rios and members Bienvenu and Degnan in favor and members Biedscheid and Aguilar Medrano against.

Chair Rios noted that the applicant had the option to appeal to the City Council or to apply stucco over the mural.

- g. **2026-011824-HDRB, 424 San Antonio Street, Downtown & Eastside, contributing**, Christopher Purvis, agent for Laura Bird, owner, proposes to replace two storm windows, repair all other windows in the main residence, install an additional window in the 1995 addition, construct a 50-square-foot addition, relocate the window of the accessory structure, repair the garage doors and existing fences, construct a 6’-0”-high coyote fence, and construct a 121-square-foot wood ramada to a height of 10’-0”.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation, noting that the application falls under the 2026 code. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-4.6 General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and Section 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Mr. Purvis, comments were in audible.

Member Cherry asked whether the applicant planned to replace the modern window on the north façade near the door, suggesting that it be made to match the others on the building.

Mr. Purvis, comments were in audible.

Member Cherry suggested that the applicant consult old photos of the north façade and asked whether the applicant would be willing to remake the modern window to match the others and to add a window where there is currently a panel.

Mr. Purvis, comments were in audible.

Member Bienvenu expressed agreement regarding the window and thanked the applicant for maintaining the garage doors.

Chair Rios requested confirmation that none of the fencing would be moved forward significantly.

Mr. Purvis, comments were in audible.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, expressed appreciation via teleconference that the garage doors would still read as garage doors and noted that the design was well done.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2026-011824-HDRB at 424 San Antonio Street to approve the application as submitted, with the addition that the non-historic window on the north façade be replaced with one of similar construction to the divided light windows in the historic part of the structure . Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- h. **2026-011770-HDRB. 302 Camino Cerrito, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non-contributing**, Efrain Cuna, agent for Dennis Karbach and Robert Brown, owners, proposes to construct a 286-square-foot freestanding carport to a height of 10'-0", where the maximum allowable is 14'-0".

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2026-011770-HDRB at 302 Camino Cerrito to postpone the case due to the applicant's absence. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

9. Discussion Items

Ms. Lamboy cited a Board decision made during the January 27, 2026, meeting to apply two different statuses to the property at 924 Paseo de Peralta and noted that assigning multiple statuses presents difficulties regarding historic preservation and enforcement of the ordinance. The applicant later approached her and expressed uncertainty regarding how to proceed with the building. She noted that the Board had the option of reconsidering the decision, which would require another hearing.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the nature of the difficulties. He suggested that the building be designated as contributing, with all façades as primary or significant, with non-historic additions.

Ms. Lamboy noted that multiple statuses can be applied to two different buildings, but applying two statuses to one building that has evolved over time presents administrative difficulties. She noted that a contributing status could acknowledge changes made over time. The primary façades of a contributing building are treated the same as those of a significant building. The code states that a single building must be designated as significant, contributing, or non-contributing.

Member Bienvenu noted that the guidance provided during the January 27, 2026, meeting was different.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the timeline of reconsidering decisions.

Mr. Ruybalid clarified that the motion should be to add the matter to the agenda of the next meeting, for discussion regarding whether the decision should be reconsidered. The applicant need not be present.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved regarding the previously reviewed 924 Paseo de Peralta case that the matter be placed on the agenda of the next Board meeting for reconsideration. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

10. Matters from the Board

Member Cherry inquired whether applications for additions require a preliminary zoning review (PZR) and whether it should be in the package. He noted that case 2025-011246-HDRB at 532 Calle Corvo lacked a PZR.

Ms. Lamboy responded that any project involving expansion of a footprint or possible impact to zoning criteria must have a PZR. A PZR for the property in question was obtained but was not in the package. She offered to look for it in the staff files.

Member Biedscheid inquired regarding Mayor Garcia's appointment of an architect to the Board.

Ms. Lamboy responded that Mayor Garcia is conducting an analysis of vacant positions on all city commissions. Staff have forwarded a submission for Joe Simmons but has not heard back.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting date is February 24, 2026.

12. Adjournment

Member Cherry moved to adjourn. Member Degnan seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Lori Goshert of Minutes Solutions Inc.

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date