



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
December 9, 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=6qIlg1HU6pjc>

Call to Order

Chair Rios called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board 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:

Members Present

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair
Mr. John Bienvenu, Vice Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Ms. Madeleine Aguilar Medrano (until 10:35 p.m.)
Ms. Mary Ellen Degan
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent

Ms. Amanda Mather

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

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 cases 2025-011418-HDRB, 320 Paseo de Peralta, and 2025-011550-HDRB, 539 Garcia St., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, under New Business, have been postponed.

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

3. **Approval of Minutes**

- a. September 23, 2025

No changes were made to the minutes of September 23, 2025.

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

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

- a. 2025-10494-HDRB. 206 Mckenzie St. (July 22, 2025)

Member Cherry moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as submitted. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

5. **Matters from the Public**

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico, expressed concern regarding the bridge near the Supreme Court building. She noted that the applicant requested a large sum of money from the City Council so that the project could be finished before state funding was lost. She asked the Board members what they know about the project and why it is taking so long. Ms. Beninato also stated that the vote taken by the Board on October 28, 2025, regarding Item 2025-011227-HDRB, 925 Canyon Road, was improper and illegal, as the motion passed by a vote of 2-1 when there were five Board members present. She advised that the Chair should have voted in that case to achieve a majority since another member had abstained.

Member Bienvenu raised a point of order and expressed objection to personal comments.

Anthony Guida, speaking via teleconference, noted that Chapter 14 requires that an architect sit on a seven-person Board. He asked which of the members is an architect, whether the decisions made by the current Board have been valid, and when the Board expects to be in compliance.

Heather Lamboy responded that Chapter 14 does not define the type of architect required. Several names have been forwarded to the mayor; however, no appointment

has been made at this time. Mayor-elect Michael Garcia is aware of the need. Member Biedscheid has expressed willingness to step down if another member is appointed. Ms. Aguilar Medrano is sitting in the architect's seat. She is a landscape architect, and this is a type of architect per the definition. Mr. Guida expressed disagreement that a landscape architect is a type of architect.

State auditor Joseph Maestas, speaking via teleconference, referred to an agenda item associated with the development of a new executive office building, which involves his agency.

Chair Rios noted that public comments will be entertained during discussion of that agenda item and invited him to speak at that time.

6. Staff Communications

- a. **2026 Historic Districts Review Board Hearing Calendar (Internal)**
- b. **2026 Historic Districts Review Board Hearing Calendar (External)**

Member Cherry moved to approve the 2026 Historic Districts Review Board internal and external hearing calendars. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (5-0).

7. Old Business

- a. **2025-011122-HDRB, 121 E. Santa Fe Ave.**, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, significant, Brett Trusko, agent for the Trusko Living Trust, owner, requests approval for a 40 sq. ft. addition to a primary façade to a height of 13'-0" where the maximum allowable is 18'-3" and other minor alterations. 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.

Ms. Lamboy presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria have been met and recommended approval of the addition to a primary façade. 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(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards.

Chair Rios asked whether the pergola complies with the requirements as-built and whether it was permitted to touch the fence. Ms. Lamboy responded that it is in compliance and was part of administrative approval. The building criteria were met, and the pergola is permitted to reach the lot line as an unoccupied, open-air structure.

Member Bienvenu asked whether there was an exception request for the mini-split. Ms. Lamboy responded that the proposal was to replace the existing air conditioning unit with

a mini-split, which would entail restoring the window to its historic character; therefore, no exception was required.

Brett Trusko, 121 East Santa Fe Avenue, was sworn in. He noted that the image did not show an air conditioner but a mini-split that was in place when he purchased the house. It is proposed to remain, as the upstairs would have no heating and cooling without it. He noted that the four rear walls were repaired for health and safety reasons before the roof was repaired. The windows added on the side have the same proportions as the original windows.

Chair Rios asked whether the applicant planned to paint the large fence in front of the pergola. Mr. Trusko responded that it has been stained to the same red shade the gate used to be, but he can stain it a darker red. He does not wish to paint the fence because it would cause the wood to retain moisture.

Public Comment:

Anne Pearman, 111 East Santa Fe Avenue, Unit 8, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She noted that she is the immediate neighbor to the west of the subject site. She expressed appreciation to Mr. Trusko for repairing items that were in disrepair.

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She noted that the new windows were not the same size as the old ones, the railing material is unclear, and the shingles are not compatible with the building. She suggested that some of the administrative approvals were made in poor judgement and suggested that the mini-split be placed elsewhere, such as on the north side.

Jordan Young, 652 Galisteo Street, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she expressed appreciation for Mr. Trusko's renovations and for the administrative approval process for repairs, noting that delays can be costly.

Mr. Trusko noted that the original house would have had brick rather than stucco in the back, and the dormers are cedar shakes.

Member Bienvenu noted that some of the projects that were approved administratively might not have been approved by the Board. In light of this fact and the historical confusion regarding what had been allowed, he expressed approval of the project. He asked whether the railings would be wooden and painted white. Mr. Trusko responded that they would be.

Chair Rios recommended that the picket fence in front of the pergola also be painted white. Member Biedscheid noted that the fence was proposed to be stained, not painted. Mr. Trusko clarified that there is no picket fence at this time. The picket fence was included in the original application, but he is considering waiting up to five years to replace it.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011122-HDRB at 121 East Santa Fe Avenue to approve the application with the exceptions criteria have been met, including that the railings be painted white. Member Degnan seconded. A friendly amendment by Chair Rios, that the fence in front of the pergola be painted white. Excepted by Member Bienvenu. Member Biedscheid included that the picket fence be rebuilt and painted white. The motion passed (3-2) with members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Degnan in favor and Members Cherry and Aguilar Medrano against..

- b. **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 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.

Greg Hoopes, 333 Montezuma Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Chair Rios inquired regarding the internal ceiling height of the garage. Mr. Hoopes responded that it was 10 feet and three inches.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2025-010495-HDRB at 439 Camino del Monte Sol Lot 1-A to approve the application as submitted. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- c. **2025-010873-HDRB, 219 and 219 A Washington Ave**, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Robert Evans, agent for Dennis Price, owner, requests approval for a 1,357 sq. ft. addition including a two-story structure to a height of 22'-0" at 219 Washington Ave and construct a new 1,661 sq. ft. two-story structure at 219 A Washington Ave to a height of 24'-6" where the max allowable is 20'-1". Exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) an addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint and 14-5.2(D)(9) height.

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that all the exception criteria have been met and that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) general design standards for all historic districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside design standards.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the public visibility of the property. Mr. Duran responded that the north portion, part of the western portion, and the parapeted roof are visible from

Washington Avenue. Chair Rios asked whether the new construction was visible from Santacafé. Mr. Duran responded that it was visible to the rear of Santacafé.

Robert Evans, the homeowner's agent, was sworn in. He noted that since the previous hearing for the project, he has reduced the proposed mass and height per the Board's advice.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, expressed appreciation to the architect for making changes per the Board's advice and noted that the second story will be highly visible because the building is small. She inquired regarding the justification for the height, noted that the two styles on the building were inconsistent, and suggested stepping down the first floor by a couple of feet.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2025-010873-HDRB at 219 and 219 A Washington Avenue to approve as submitted, Member Bienvenu added a friendly amendment that all exception criteria have been met. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (4-1).

- d. **2025-011353-HDRB, 401 E. Palace Ave.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing, Andrew Lyons agent for George Abrams, LLC, owner, proposes to remodel exterior of residence and garage. Exceptions are requested to 14-5.2 (D)(5)(b) for removing historic material, replacing brick coping in kind, stucco color and window trim. 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) removal of historic door on a primary façade.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria have not been met and recommended denial of the exception to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) removal of historic door on the (south) primary façade of the main structure. Staff found that the exception criteria have been met and recommended approval of the exception to 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) to remove brick coping and replace it in kind on the main structure and the garage. Staff found that the exception criteria have been met and recommended approval of the exception to 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) to remove historic material, stucco color for main structure and garage. Staff found that the exception criteria have been met and recommended approval of the exception to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) removal of historic door on a primary (south) façade of the garage. 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 Historic District design standards.

Chair Rios requested confirmation that the building has been white for a long time, more than 50 years. Ms. Romero responded that it has been.

Member Aguilar Medrano cited the staff remarks that the wall was removed from the application and asked whether the metal gate had also been removed. Ms. Romero responded that as the gate was the entrance to the courtyard through the wall, it was no longer included in the application. Member Aguilar Medrano asked whether there were any remaining issues noted by the Board in a previous meeting that had not been reconsidered. Ms. Romero responded that the windows would be replaced in kind. The only window of concern was the one on the primary façade, and it will be repaired.

Chair Rios asked whether the applicant wished to replace all of the brick coping or only that which needed replacing. Ms. Romero responded that the applicant requested permission to replace all of the brick, following the existing pattern.

Member Biedscheid requested confirmation that the only exception not proposed to be replaced in kind was the white stucco. Ms. Romero responded that the door was not proposed to be replaced in kind, and staff recommended denial. A matching door was proposed for the garage. The applicant was no longer requesting the pedestrian door and wished to paint the existing garage door white, which the staff approved. The Board had requested white stucco, but the staff determined that the proposed oatmeal was a sufficiently historical color.

Andrew Lyons, P.O. Box 8858, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He clarified that he still proposed replacing the pedestrian door on the garage with a door similar to the house's front door. He was not proposing replacement of the windows but was proposing the removal of two windows on the north side and the replacement of the aluminum storm sashes. He was proposing to remove some rotten trim from one window and a piece of duct tape acting as molding, and to replace the molding, which requires an exception. Mr. Lyons added that he proposed that the doors be LaHabra stucco in oatmeal, which appears to be the closest match to the color under the white paint.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the proposal for the door at the front of the house. Mr. Lyons shared an image of the proposed door, noting that it was a classic design and matched the proposed pedestrian door on the garage.

Member Biedscheid asked why the color of the house was being changed, noting that the white made it distinctive. She cited a previous discussion regarding a painted or synthetic stucco in white and asked whether the applicant would consider a cementitious product or another way to both retain the white color and protect the building. Mr. Lyons responded that LaHabra does not produce an exact match to the current white; the proposed oatmeal is similar to the original color under the white paint.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the process of making the paint stick to the house and asked whether the exception request was to remove historical material and add stucco. Mr. Lyons responded that the existing paint could be sandblasted, or a stucco netting could be applied. Ms. Lamboy added that some of the paint is probably historic, but an

exception might not be required to maintain a cementitious product. Member Cherry suggested either stripping the paint or adding LaHabra glue followed by the color code. Mr. Lyons noted that the house is pentile rather than adobe and has been painted since at least 1968.

The homeowner, Tom Abrams, 216 Washington Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He clarified that the paint needs to be removed in order to achieve a satisfactory bond. Because nails cannot be inserted into pentile, a glue mesh will be needed. Stucco is preferred. Member Cherry expressed approval of the process.

Public Comment:

John Eddy, 14 Avenida Campo Verde, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He expressed appreciation for Member Cherry's suggestions regarding the process and noted that the house has been white for as long as he remembered. He questioned whether the doors needed to be changed, noting that no distressing was visible.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, expressed appreciation for the proposal to replace the brick in kind but noted that the proposal regarding the sashes requires discussion and clarification. She requested that the doors be kept or replaced in kind and that the building stucco remain white.

Chair Rios noted that the building has been white for a very long time and asked whether the current green would be retained as the pedimented color.

Christa Romwalter, 106 Placita Halcon, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via zoom, she identified herself as Mr. Abrams' sister and noted that the proposed doors have square glass panes with horizontal panels matching the original doors, as identified through research, as well as those on the west and east sides. The homeowners are doing their best to match the original stucco. Ms. Romero confirmed that the packet contained the noted historical information and notarized letters stating that the doors were replaced in the 1960s, meaning the current doors are not original to the house but historical and in good condition.

Member Biedscheid requested a closer examination of the proposed stucco. Ms. Romero provided the stucco along with a chip from the color under the current paint. Chair Rios noted that its color was greyish. Mr. Abrams responded that it does not look greyish in natural light and that the oatmeal pigment was decreased to make it closer to off-white than to beige. She also asked whether the applicant was willing to paint the house white. Mr. Abrams responded that the proposal was to stucco the building with LaHabra cementitious off-white to match the color beneath the paint.

Member Cherry asked whether the applicant had considered the colonial white sample. Mr. Lyons responded that colonial white is off-white and not the same color as the house. Member Cherry responded that the colors would not look very different if they were not

right next to each other, and it should be possible to achieve a whiter color than the oatmeal with stucco, for example, by removing more of the pigment from the oatmeal and mixing it some of the other color.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011353-HDRB at 401 East Palace Avenue to deny the application with respect to replacing the doors on the primary facades of the main house and the garage, per staff recommendation that exception criteria have not been met; to approve the exception criteria for replacement of the brick coping in kind with respect to color, design, and material, as the exception criteria were met; to approve the re-stucco of the building, noting that the exception criteria can only be met by replacement in kind with respect to color, with the method to be determined by staff, Member Cherry requested a friendly amendment to exclude the consideration of sto; and to approve all other application elements that do not require an exception. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

8. New Business

- a. **2025-011586-HDRB. 130 S. Capitol St. Downtown and Eastside Historic District.**, JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request new construction of a 163,230 sq. ft. office building to a maximum height of 78' -7 ¾" (at tower) and 50'-8" (at parapet). Maximum allowable height is 57'-6".

Ms. Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff did not recommend approval of the proposed application, as it does not meet the applicable streetscape as set forth in Subsections 14-5.2(D)(9)(a)(ii) A, B, C, D, and E. A new structure or proposed alteration or addition shall not cause an adjacent contributing, significant, or landmark structure to lose its status.

Staff presented a model of the proposed project and invited the Board and the public to examine it. It was noted that the presentations and discussions would encompass the current case, which proposes construction of the executive office building, as well as cases 2025-011587-HDRB, 402 Don Gaspar Avenue; 2025-011588-HDRB, 406 Don Gaspar Avenue; 2025-011589-HDRB, 410 Don Gaspar Avenue; and 2025-11590-HDRB, 414 Don Gaspar Avenue, which propose the demolition of the four casitas on the subject properties to create space for the proposed executive office building.

The applicants, Jennifer Jenkins, 130 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe; Antonio Vigil, 2144 North Utah Street, Albuquerque; Art Tatum, 13131 Sunrise Trail Place, Albuquerque; Ted Grumblatt, 7908 Sartan Way, Albuquerque; and Ramon Sarason, 2942 Calle de Ovejas, Santa Fe, were sworn in.

Ms. Jenkins introduced the project team, comprising representatives from New Mexico General Services Department, JenkinsGavin, Inc., and FBT Architects. She noted that a unique set of design standards exist for capital outlay, citing SFCC 14-5.2(M)(2)(b). She shared the background of the project and listed the structures on the site and their status. She listed the state facility needs and requested permission for state auditor Mr. Maestas to speak.

Joseph Maestas, 111 West Lupita Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he noted that his agency was expected to occupy the proposed building. His agency currently occupies a leased building that is far from the capitol, isolating the agency from other governmental bodies. The current office is overcrowded and not conducive to the agency's handling of confidential information, including anonymous fraud, waste, and abuse complaints. He acknowledged the need to balance historic elements and development and noted that the proposed building would be an asset to the community and state and support the local economy.

Mr. Grumblatt presented the design plan in the context of the historic district and the constraints of the business capitol district. Leaving the casitas in place, the proposed design can achieve 128,000 square feet of the 163,000 square feet required for the state program needs. If the casitas are demolished and the space utilized, a total of 165,000 square feet can be achieved. He shared the proposed roofs, walls, windows, colors, height, and other features.

Mr. Vigil shared the site plans and floor plans, and Mr. Tatum shared the renderings, noting the team has worked to make the proposed building smaller per the Board's recommendations.

Mr. Sarason proposed forming an exhibit design committee to create a living installation in the lobby of the proposed executive office building to memorialize the history of the site, including the casitas, the former governor's mansion, the first territorial capitol building, and the history of the Roundhouse design. He suggested an interactive exhibit using virtual reality.

Member Degnan noted that the casitas had been people's homes and later housed nonprofits. She asked whether the homes are currently empty and whether they could be used for social services or nonprofits.

Ms. Jenkins responded that the four homes are not currently occupied, and the state has carefully considered their possible uses; however, the Santa Fe building official and the official from the New Mexico construction industries division both inspected the homes and determined that the cost of upgrading them to current code would be prohibitive and recommended demolition. The proposed size of the building has been reduced by over 30,000 square feet, and it cannot be further reduced while fulfilling its intended purpose. It is not fiscally responsible to use taxpayer funds to upgrade the casitas.

Member Biedscheid noted that her vote to deny demolition in 2023 was due to stakeholders and the public's lack of opportunity to provide input regarding the process. She inquired regarding the outreach and inclusion efforts. Frank Ruybalid noted that the casitas were presented to the Board in status review form in May of 2023, and a vote was taken to deny their demolition on March 26, 2024. Member Biedscheid clarified that she was inquiring regarding the outreach efforts since the March 26, 2024, vote. Ms. Jenkins responded that the project team met with historic preservation groups and neighborhood associations three times: when preparing the demolition requests, prior to commencing the design phase, and to unveil the design.

Member Aguilar Medrano requested clarification regarding the meeting times, noting that design was far along at the time of the March 26, 2024, vote. Ms. Jenkins responded that at the time of March 26, 2024, vote, only a concept design of the exterior had been created. There were two meetings in 2026: one in late winter or early spring, and one the week of December 1. She added that the current meeting would initiate a 60-day design review period during which the Board could provide feedback. Ms. Lamboy added that the applicants would also be required to submit a development plan to the Planning Commission.

Public Comment:

Sharon Pino, 2955 Berardinelli Street, Santa Fe; Tanya Trujillo, 1598 Cerro Gordo Road, Santa Fe; Peter Barrington, 6932 Angela Drive, Rio Rancho; Rick Martinez, 725 Mesilla Road, Santa Fe; Fletcher Catron, 1062 Encantado Drive, Santa Fe; John Pen La Farge, 647 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe; Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe; Beverly Spears, 1897 Conejo Drive, Santa Fe; Frank Katz, 1300 Canyon Road, Santa Fe; Barbara Felix, 610 Alicia Street, Santa Fe; Tom Spray, 444 Galisteo Street, Santa Fe; Valerie Brooker, 1616 Young Street, Santa Fe; and John Eddy of the Old Santa Fe Association (OSFA) were sworn in.

Ms. Romero reported that Lindsey Bachman, on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of State, submitted a written public comment in favor of the project. It was provided to the Board.

Ms. Pino identified herself as the Deputy Secretary of State and noted that the government offices are out of space, requiring different departments to perform their work in separate buildings. She currently works in the north capitol building, connected to the Roundhouse via a long hallway. The legislature added \$100,000 to the 2025 budget for a move, but there is currently no space to move into. Government staff need to be located near the capitol on a daily basis. She noted that per the renderings, the proposed building appears to fit in with its surroundings.

Ms. Trujillo identified herself as the Deputy State Engineer working in the Concha Ortiz y Pino building, with her agency divided between two buildings. She noted that her agency

supports the demolition of the current building and the casitas to create a modern, functional executive office building.

Mr. Barrington identified himself as the Deputy Director of the Facility Management division of the New Mexico General Services Department. He expressed agreement with the opinions already shared by state employees regarding the need for space to conduct state business. He noted that the proposed executive office building represents a significant economic impact for the city, including up to \$10 million in tax revenue, and requested approval of the project.

Mr. Martinez noted that there are individuals buried on the subject property, as the property once contained a church and burial ground. He noted that these individuals were also citizens of Santa Fe and asked what would happen to the bodies. He asked what would happen to the name of the current capitol building, Concha Ortiz y Pino.

Mr. Catron compared the demolition of the historic Santa Fe buildings to construct the proposed project to the recent demolition of the White House's East Wing to construct a ballroom and noted that attempting to memorialize the casitas would not be adequate. He cited the example of another building that was supposed to be transported intact, noting that the history is now gone.

Mr. La Farge cited the history of the subject area, noting the historic buildings that were torn down to construct the current capitol building and Supreme Court building, despite the protests of the neighborhood associations. He suggested making the proposed building smaller in order to accommodate the original neighborhood.

Ms. West noted the inherent contradiction in that the proposed building will be secure but a public memorial is proposed for the lobby. She noted that she attended all the meetings and that the applicants did not attempt to incorporate the casitas. She expressed agreement with the staff position regarding the proposal and expressed willingness to share ideas on how the casitas could be maintained.

Ms. Spears distributed papers to the Board that included calculations of the allowable height of institutional buildings in the area per city code. She noted that the proposed building, while necessary, is out of scale with downtown Santa Fe buildings.

Mr. Katz expressed disappointment that the application process was not following the procedure established during the construction of the parking garage, in which the city worked with the developer to make the garage smaller and more attractive. He noted that the proposed building was too large and suggested removing the top floor and enlarging the footprint of the building by incorporating the land currently occupied by surrounding roads that the state has already confirmed may be decommissioned. This would also allow the casitas to be maintained or incorporated.

Ms. Felix suggested that the casitas be incorporated and that the area be walkable. Citing the landscaping used for the Roundhouse, she suggested adding spaces that would be enjoyable for employees and the public instead of identical street trees. She expressed agreement with Mr. Katz's suggestion of using the road area.

Mr. Spray noted that he spoke to the Board in 2012 regarding the proposed project as a representative of OSFA. At that time, OSFA commissioned a massing study which found that the footprint of the proposed building could fit comfortably on the site without the demolition of any existing structures. This was shared with the Board, and the state abandoned the project. He noted that the state is now requesting additional space but has rejected the city's offer to close Capitol Road. He recommended that the Board deny the proposal.

Ms. Brooker expressed agreement with earlier comments regarding the need to reduce the size of the building, suggesting that state employees rely on electronic communication. She noted that the impact of 500 additional vehicles in the area would be significant.

John Eddy representative of OSFA noted that OSFA supports the Board initiating an independent height analysis and continuing to preserve the city's pedestrian-friendly and harmonious streetscapes. He expressed support for the staff's recommendation to deny the demolition of the four historic homes, noting that a denial would result in the project being remanded to the joint city-state stakeholder committee for continued design modification. He noted that the proposed building is too large, does not protect the historic homes, and blocks the view of the mountains.

Marc Bertram, 906 Trail Cross Court, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he identified himself as an experienced developer in the real estate field and expressed a preference for the more modest building design originally proposed by the state, which maintained the historic building. He noted that while he is in favor of development, local rules must be followed in this case as in any other. He noted that the project, at \$1,000 per square foot, is a poor use of taxpayer funds and suggested that the state maintain its current properties.

Jordan Young, 652 Galisteo Street, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she noted that the state executive office building would bring more people and business downtown and stated that the wish for historic preservation was blocking reasonable development. She noted that the casitas cannot be restored and that the proposed building fits in with the surrounding buildings more than the casitas do.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, stated via teleconference that creating a museum is not the same as preserving history. She noted that the state has failed to maintain the casitas and suggested that they be upgraded and used as program centers or entryways. She noted that the scale of the proposed building would overwhelm the capitol area and

that the proposed parking does not allow sufficient space for visitors to the building to park. She expressed agreement with other commenters regarding the mass of the building and lack of compliance and noted that the Board had already denied demolition of the casitas in 2024.

Anthony Guida, 1711 Second Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he identified himself as a former Board member and the president of Friends of Architecture Santa Fe. He expressed support for the construction of the proposed executive office building and the demolition of the casitas, noting that it would bring people downtown and allow citizens ready access to elected officials. He noted that the Board has already approved the demolition of the Concha Ortiz y Pino building, which is contributing, unlike the casitas.

Member Bienvenu acknowledged that a different standard exists for capital outlay, whereby the state must proceed in a manner that is harmonious and generally compatible with city ordinances, while the city must consider how the standards will impact the costs and functionality of a proposed project. Whether the project will bring people downtown is not within the purview of the Board, but project costs, functionality, and harmony with design standards are. Santa Fe has worked to maintain its position as the state capital, and the capitol area is no longer a residential area. Previous projects required demolition, and the casitas are now out of place. He cited three criteria for demolition: a structure's historical importance, whether it forms an integral part of a unique street section, and its state of repair and structural stability, and noted that according to all three of these, the time had come to forfeit the casitas and establish a more beneficial structure.

Member Degnan noted that demolition of the casitas was denied before and questioned the necessity of a new vote. Mr. Ruybalid noted that precedent and law present insufficient clarity regarding whether res judicata applies to land use boards; therefore, it is up to the Board's discretion to uphold the previous denial or determine that new evidence and changing conditions justify revisiting the case.

Member Cherry noted that the subject site comprises three acres of buildable space, and only two if the casitas are retained; however, there is a 12-acre site east of the capitol that is currently occupied by the Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA) building and large parking lots. He noted that archaeological analysis of the subject property found no evidence of burials. Ms. Jenkins responded that the PERA property was considered for the project; however, there are significant burials under the parking lot, making ground disturbance inappropriate.

Member Degnan suggested that the proposed project be relocated to the PERA building parking lot, noting that burials were removed to construct the convention center.

Member Biedscheid suggested that the Board revisit its previous denial of the demolition of the casitas based on the submittal of the final design and additional discussions. She

noted that the subject area currently functions as the capitol area, and the casitas have not been homes for many years. She expressed support for the proposed design.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that the Board's previous decision be upheld, noting that the design seems to be unchanged, and public participation is divided.

Chair Rios noted that the Board denied demolition of the four casitas, and the state has not honored that process. She acknowledged that demolishing the casitas is the easier solution, and incorporating them is more challenging, but noted that when people visit places where history is preserved, it is appreciated. Santa Fe's old buildings tell a story, and houses in worse condition than the casitas have been restored. She noted that many people do not understand the concept of historic preservation.

Chair Rios polled the Board regarding whether the 2024 demolition denial vote should be revisited or maintained. Members Degnan and Aguillar Medrano voted to maintain the decision, while Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid, and Cherry voted to revisit it.

Mr. Ruybalid noted that any design recommendations must be made in writing and sent to the state within the 60-day review period. He advised the Board to delegate the recommendations to the state executive office building subcommittee rather than listing the recommendations in a motion.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street, to delegate the written recommendations regarding the design to the existing state executive office building subcommittee whereby the subcommittee shall draft recommendations to the state that will be presented for final approval by the Board at the January 13, 2026, meeting. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- b. **2025-011587-HDRB. 402 Don Gaspar Ave.** Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Contributing (office and garage buildings). JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request demolition of the office building (previously a duplex) and garage. Exceptions requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a), Loss of Historic Status, Sections 14-5.2(M)(3)(b) and 14-5.2(M)(4) Status and Demolition of Historic Structures with State Capitol Outlay Projects.

Staff did not recommend approval of the proposed demolition of the historically contributing building. Staff found that the demolition approval criteria have not been met as set forth in Section 14-5.2(M), which references the criteria stated in Section 3.14(G), demolition of historic and landmark structures.

The presentation and discussion of this case were included in that of case 2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011587-HDRB at 402 Don Gaspar Avenue to enter as findings that circumstances have changed since the previous decision, that a more extensive design has been presented, and that exception criteria for demolition have been met, and to accordingly approve the demolition of the property subject to final review and approval of the final design of case 2025-011586-HDRB, Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and Members Aguilar Medrano and Degnan against.

- c. **2025-011588-HDRB. 406 Don Gaspar Ave.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Contributing (office and garage buildings). JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request demolition of the office building (previously a residence) and garage. Exceptions requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a), Loss of Historic Status, Sections 14-5.2(M)(3)(b) and 14-5.2(M)(4) Status and Demolition of Historic Structures with State Capitol Outlay Projects.

Staff did not recommend approval of the proposed demolition of the historically contributing building. Staff found that the demolition approval criteria have not been met as set forth in Section 14-5.2(M), which references the criteria stated in Section 3.14(G), demolition of historic and landmark structures.

The presentation and discussion of this case were included in that of case 2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011588-HDRB at 406 Don Gaspar Avenue that the analogous findings be entered regarding the change in circumstances, that the exception criteria have been met, and that the demolition of the property be approved subject to approval of the final design of case 2025-011586-HDRB. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-2). with Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and Members Aguilar Medrano and Degnan against.

- d. **2025-011589-HDRB. 410 Don Gaspar Ave.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Contributing (office and garage buildings). JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request demolition of the office building (previously a residence) and garage. Exceptions requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a), Loss of Historic Status, Sections 14-5.2(M)(3)(b) and 14-5.2(M)(4) Status and Demolition of Historic Structures with State Capitol Outlay Projects.

Staff did not recommend approval of the proposed demolition of the historically contributing building. Staff found that the demolition approval criteria have not been met as set forth in Section 14-5.2(M), which references the criteria stated in Section 3.14(G), demolition of historic and landmark structures.

The presentation and discussion of this case were included in that of case 2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011589-HDRB at 410 Don Gaspar Avenue that the analogous findings be entered regarding changed circumstances, that the exception criteria have been met, and that the demolition of the property be approved subject to approval of the final design of case 2025-011586-HDRB, Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and Members Aguilar Medrano and Degnan against.

- e. **2025-11590-HDRB. 414 Don Gaspar Ave.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request demolition of the office building (previously a residence). Exceptions requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a), Loss of Historic Status, Sections 14-5.2(M)(3)(b) and 14-5.2(M)(4) Status and Demolition of Historic Structures with State Capitol Outlay Projects.

Staff did not recommend approval of the proposed demolition of the historically contributing building. Staff found that the demolition approval criteria have not been met as set forth in Section 14-5.2(M), which references the criteria stated in Section 3.14(G), demolition of historic and landmark structures.

The presentation and discussion of this case were included in that of case 2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-11590-HDRB at 414 Don Gaspar Ave that the analogous findings be entered regarding exception criteria and changed circumstances and that demolition of the property be approved subject to approval of the final design of case 2025-011586-HDRB. The motion passed (3-2) with Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and Members Aguilar Medrano and Degnan against.

Member Aguilar Medrano moved to address Matters Before the Board before the remaining cases. Member Degnan seconded. No vote was taken; however, Matters Before the Board was addressed before the remaining cases, after which Member Aguilar Medrano excused herself from the meeting.

- f. **2025-011459-HDRB, 912 Don Gaspar Ave**, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, significant, Positive Energy Solar, agent for Moe Zamora, owner, proposes to install publicly visible solar. Exceptions are requested to section 14-5.2(D)(3)(b) for publicly visible rooftop appurtenances and 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) for placing features on a primary facade.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria to Section 14-5.2(D)(3)(b) have not been met and recommended denial for publicly visible rooftop appurtenances, and the exception criteria to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) have not been met and recommended denial for placing features on a primary façade. Staff recommended denial of the entire application, as it does not comply with 14-5.2(D) general design standards for all historic districts, and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District design standards.

Chair Rios requested confirmation that a total of 18 panels, nine on each of two elevations, was proposed. Ms. McCulley responded that 19 panels were requested.

Elizabeth DeAguero, 1235 Siler Road, was sworn in. She noted that she was representing Positive Energy Solar on behalf of their client, Moses Zamora. Multiple design alternatives were considered, but the current design was found to be most suitable and meet the Historic District's characteristics while remaining unobtrusive. The panels will blend in with the dark grey roof.

Member Cherry asked how high off the roof the panels would be and whether the conduits would be painted to match the house. Ms. DeAguero responded that the panels, which are two inches thick, will be nearly flush with the roof with one inch between the roof and panels. The conduits will be painted to match the roof shingles where they run along the roof and to match the wall where they run along the wall. The conduit along the wall will not be publicly visible.

Member Degnan requested confirmation that the 19 panels were two inches thick and inquired regarding their square footage. Ms. DeAguero responded that there were 18 panels.

Public Comment:

Ms. West, previously sworn in, stated that she is generally in favor of solar panels, but codes for them have not yet been developed. She asked whether technology is available to allow solar panels to further match the roof while remaining functional.

Member Bienvenu acknowledged staff concerns regarding an issue that required addressing and noted that the proposed placement of the solar panels would minimize their visibility.

Member Degnan noted that while solar panels are unsightly, they are appreciated, and the district does not yet have a clear policy regarding their use. Ms. Lamboy noted that denial was not recommended by the legislature and apologized for the confusion. She noted that the applicant has taken steps to conceal the proposed solar panels, and they should be acceptable as long as the historic status of the building can be maintained.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011459-HDRB at 912 Don Gaspar Avenue to approve the application as submitted, noting that the exception criteria have been met, the use of solar energy is encouraged in the Historic District, the requirement regarding pitched roofs is to integrate the collector into the pitch, and the Board has previously approved solar collectors in the Historic District. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- g. **2025-011418-HDRB, 320 Paseo de Peralta**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Noncontributing, Charlotte Fox, owner, requests approval for a mural. Four exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(10) signs & murals, 14-5.2(E)(1)(b) exterior walls, 14-5.2(E)(2)(e) publicly visible facades, and 14-8.10(H) special sign regulations in the H Districts.

This item was postponed.

- h. **2025-011328-HDRB, 433 Calle La Paz**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing, Martinez Architecture Studio PC, agent for The John C. Gregory Revocable Trust and the Pamela S Austin Revocable Trust, owners, proposes to replace windows and doors, vigas, install wood railings, exterior stairs with hand rails, and construct a 210sq. ft. portal to a height of 10'-6" on the main residence, install 5'-0" high fencing, and construct at 148 sq. ft. portal to a height of 11'-5", replace windows and doors, and install an overhang on the casita, and refinish the garage door. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) for replacing historic windows.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria have been met and recommended approval of the exception to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) to replace historic windows on a primary façade. 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 Historic District design standards.

Richard Martinez, P.O. Box 925, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that his neighbors had wished to express support for the project but were unable to do so due to the late hour. The house is traditional, with an open space in the center currently comprising small paths and mulch. He would like to improve the courtyard by building a portal on the casita facing it and installing a stairway. He plans to replace the windows and refinish the door

to match the historical requirements and add a five-foot coyote fence to replace the existing wire fence.

Public Comment:

Ms. West, previously sworn in, expressed support for the project.

Member Cherry expressed disagreement with the window assessor's conclusions regarding windows J and H, noting that if the lack of flashing was an issue, then the windows would have begun leaking after installation. He noted that the windows appear to be repairable.

Member Bienvenu expressed an intention to further discuss the windows at a later date.

Chair Rios, on being asked to vote due to a tie, acknowledged that Member Cherry's assessment regarding the windows was likely correct; however, another professional recommended replacing in kind. She noted that the Board needed to implement a process that was consistent for all applicants and recommended replacing the windows in kind.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2025-011328-HDRB at 433 Calle La Paz to approve the application, with the exception of replacement of windows J and H. Member Degnan seconded. The motion failed (2-3) with Members Cherry and Degnan in favor and Chair Rios and Members Bienvenu and Biedscheid against.

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011328-HDRB at 433 Calle La Paz to approve the application as submitted, noting that the exception criteria have been met. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with Members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Degnan in favor and Member Cherry against.

- i. **2025-011419-HDRB, 1020 Camino San Acacio**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Non-contributing, Henry Avila, agent for Phillip Freese, owner, requests approval for new construction of a 740 sq. ft. detached garage to a height of 14 by six feet where the maximum allowable is 15 by 10 feet.

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) general design standards for all historic districts, and 14-5.2 (E) Downtown and Eastside design standards.

Member Biedscheid noted that the dimensions of the garage seem abnormally tall and long and asked whether the floor plan includes space that is not garage space. Mr. Duran responded that the maximum dimensions per code are 15 by 10 feet, and the proposed dimensions are 14 by 6 feet. There are access doors in the rear, indicating that workshops may be planned.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the internal ceiling height.

Henry Avila, County Road 109, House No. 8, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He responded that the ceiling height in the center portion of the garage is eight feet, and the other sections are 12 feet. The owner wishes to install a car lift so that a smaller vehicle can park above a larger vehicle, as there is not much parking available along the street.

Member Biedscheid noted that having a garage parallel to the street, especially at the proposed height and length, would be unusual in that area and asked whether it could be constructed elsewhere on the property. Member Bienvenu noted that the garage door not facing the street would mitigate the issue. He acknowledged that the garage would dominate the streetscape and that the Board has authority regarding building proportions.

Chair Rios asked whether the applicant or owner had considered placing the garage elsewhere. Mr. Avila responded that there is no other place on the property to place the garage and noted that the garage appears higher than it is because the land slopes up from the road.

Member Cherry asked whether the ground could be lowered to street height. Mr. Avila responded that this could compromise the foundation of the house. Member Degnan requested clarification. Member Cherry responded that the suggested action would require knowledge of the foundation, which can only be found by digging. Mr. Avila noted that an investigation was conducted, and the foundation is only 24 inches lower and constructed of rocks with concrete filling. Member Cherry acknowledged that this was a rubble trench foundation style common in the 1990s, and lowering the ground would be feasible but costly. He noted that while the scale of the proposed garage is odd, it presents a sense of stepping up to the existing home.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2025-011419-HDRB at 1020 Camino San Acacio to approve the application as submitted. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-2) members Chair Rios, Cherry and Degnan in favor and Members Bienvenu and Biedscheid against.

- j. **2025-011325-HDRB, 119 Camino Santiago**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, John Padilla, agent for Dominic Serna, owner, proposes to replace windows and doors, construct a five-foot yard wall with gate and a six-foot coyote fence, infill two doors, construct an enclosure, reconstruct the portal, roof, & stucco, Exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) for replacing historic windows and doors, 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) for altering the portal of a primary facade, installing a fence and gate on a primary facade, & 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) for the enclosure under the portal.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) have been met and recommended approval of the exception for replacing historic windows and doors. Staff found that the exception criteria to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) have not been met and recommended denial of the exception for altering the portal of a primary façade by installing a fence and gate on a primary façade. Staff found that the exception to Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) has been met and recommended approval of the exception for the enclosure under the carport. Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application that do not require exceptions, as they comply with 14-5.2(D) general design standards for all historic districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District design standards.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the height of the proposed gate for which the staff recommends denial. Ms. McCulley responded that it is three feet and six inches high. It forms part of a fence closing off the carport.

Member Biedscheid asked whether the fence in question would connect to the yard wall fence. Ms. McCulley responded that it would be inside the portal, and the yard wall fence terminates before the portal.

John Padilla, P.O. Box 22986, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the owner intends to live in the building, and the proposed modifications would make the home functional for his growing family. He clarified that the fence would not enclose the carport and would stand free of the primary façade and prevent the homeowner's small children and dogs from wandering into the street. The home was built in the 1960s and does not have much storage space; therefore, the owner wishes to install storage under the carport so that more of the home can be converted into livable area. This would not change the appearance of the carport.

Member Degnan inquired regarding the staff's recommended denial of the gate and fence. Ms. McCulley responded that this was mainly due to the way the exception criteria were approached.

Chair Rios noted that there are many unique homes in the area, some of them unattractive; however, individuals are purchasing them and improving their appearance. She expressed approval of the proposed gate and fence, noting that they are low and will not be attached to the house.

Member Biedscheid asked whether the small gate would be in line with the yard wall or freestanding on the portal. Mr. Padilla responded that the yard wall stops short of the viga column, and the landscaping would be trimmed back. The new fence would fall short of the portal wall and stand free.

Member Biedscheid noted that the property was designed as communal space, and closing the front yard with a wall would change its nature. Mr. Padilla responded that the

development was once a church retirement community, but the area has changed and will continue to change. The area is controlled by an association with strict regulations.

Member Cherry acknowledged Member Biedscheid's concerns regarding the fencing of communities and asked how far the side wall was from the street. Mr. Padilla indicated the wall on the site plan, noting that the wall cannot reach the existing sewer easement, so there is significant space between the wall and the curb.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the height of the proposed yard wall. Mr. Padilla responded that the wall is four feet, six inches high, and the gate is five feet.

Public Comment:

Dominic Serna, 119 Camino Santiago, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he identified himself as the owner of the subject property and noted that his intentions were to render the home livable for his family and to create an attractive courtyard entrance, not to wall off the property at the perimeter.

Member Bienvenu expressed support for the yard wall, noting that it would make the home more livable and possibly more attractive. While approving the wall might create a precedent for the neighborhood, the wall is low and set back from the street.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011325-HDRB at 119 Camino Santiago to find that the exception criteria have been met for the reasons set forth by the applicant, and to approve the application as submitted. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed (4-0).

- k. **2025-011549-HDRB, 527 Agua Fria St. Units 1, 2, & 3**, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Significant, Osage Design Studio, agent for Neirika, LLC, owner, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic structure be maintained for its association with events or persons that are important on a local level and the historic integrity of the building, with all facades as primary, per 14-5.2(C) designation of significant, contributing, or noncontributing status within historic districts.

Zoom session went offline at 12:00AM

Delores Vigil, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. Commented on project.

Public Comment:

Unknown of any public comment. No recording.

Board Action:

Unknown of who made the motion and seconded, no recording. The Historic Districts Review Board moved in case 2025-011549-HDRB at 527 Agua Fria St. Units 1, 2, & 3 to designate the residence as contributing with the south facades R1 and R3 and the east Facades R2, R4, R5 and R6 as primary, including the portal on the southeast corner, the alcove over the front south facing exterior, including all windows and doors, and excluding any non-historic materials. The motion passed. No recording of the vote.

- I. **2025-011550-HDRB, 539 Garcia St.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing, Geisler Projects, agent for Matt and Penelope Rembe, owners, proposes to construct a 33 sq. ft. addition to a height of 10'-6" where the maximum allowable is 10'-10", a 309 sq. ft. portal to a height of 10'-3", and replace windows and doors on the residence, convert the garage to a casita by altering the garage door to a window, and installing a new window, and reroof, stucco, and paint both buildings. Exceptions are requested to section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) for constructing an addition within 10' of the primary façade, and 14- 5.2(E)(2)(b) for a window opening at less than 3' from the corner of a façade. **This item was postponed.**

9. Discussion Items

Unknown of any discussion items, no recording

10. Matters from the Board

Member Aguilar Medrano noted that, while she sits in the architect position on the Board, she does not position herself as an architect. She is a landscape architect and was originally appointed to fill the construction industry seat. The city has discretion in how the requirements for Board composition are interpreted. Member Bienvenu added that, aside from submitting applications, Board members have no control over the Board composition. The mayor and governing body make those decisions.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting date is January 13, 2026.

12. Adjournment

Unknown of who made the motion and who seconded. No recording The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Lori Goshert of Minutes Solutions Inc.

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date