Agenda

Amended Regular Meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board
March 24, 2026 at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue

Procedures for Historic Districts Review Board Meeting

Viewing: Members of the public may stream the meeting live on the City of Santa Fe's YouTube channel at www.youtube.com/@cityofsantafe. The YouTube live stream can be accessed at this address from most smartphones, tablets, or computers.

Join on Zoom: https://santafenm-gov.zoom.us/j/84794433712

By Phone: 301 715 8592

Webinar ID: 847 9443 3712

The agenda and packet for the meeting will be posted at https://santafenm.portal.civicclerk.com/

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
    a. December 9, 2025
    b. January 13, 2026
    c. January 27, 2026
    d. February 10, 2026
5. Approval of Findings/Conclusions
6. Matters from the Public
7. Staff Communications
8. Old Business

a. 2026-011792-HDRB. 924 Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Contributing. John A. Padilla, agent for Carole Peet, Executive Director of El Castillo Life Plan Community, requests reconsideration of the January 27, 2026, status review with primary façade(s) designation. (Heather Lamboy, hllamboy@santafenm.gov)

b. 2026-011831-HDRB. 1489 Upper Canyon Rd. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Non-Contributing. Christopher Purvis, agent for Susan Jancar, owner, requests approval for new construction of a 1,640 sq. ft. structure to a height of 14'-8" where the maximum allowable height is 18'-9" and for a 4'-7" tall by 20'-0" long metal vehicular gate. An exception is requested to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards. (Lani McCulley, ljmcculley@santafenm.gov)

9. New Business

a. 2026-012025-HDRB. 507 & 509 Coronado Rd., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Steve McCormick, agent for Julia Dancy, owner, requests status review and primary façade designation (if applicable) (Amanda Romero, alromero@santafenm.gov)

b. 2026-011825-HDRB. 619 W. Alameda St., 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, and construct 3'-4" high yard walls. An exception is requested to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure. (Lani McCulley, ljmculley@santafenm.gov)

c. 2026-011997-HDRB, 528 and 530 Calle Corvo, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing. Ju Tan, agent for Susan Lamden, owner, requests approval for the proposed remodel including a 150 sq. ft. addition and 200 sq. ft. portal addition to the west elevation. Replacement of all exterior doors and windows. Removal of wrought iron posts and replace with wooden posts and other minor alterations. Two exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited for the wrought iron posts and 14-5.2(D)(5)(b) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced for the wrought iron posts. (Amanda Romero)

d. 2026-011886-HDRB. 521 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District.Contributing. Rajah Bose, agent for Louis Pepper and Ruth Williamson, owners, request approval for a 675 sq. ft. addition to a height of 15'-3" where the maximum allowable height is 16'-4", window, door, and portal replacement. Exceptions are requested to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible, 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c) no new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence, and 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. (Heather Lamboy)

10. Discussion Items

11. Matters from the Board

12. Next Meeting:

a. April 14, 2026

13. Adjourn

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6521, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

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=6qIg1HU6pjc

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 Degnan
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 to14-5.2(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

Regular Meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board
January 13, 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=UJocPktLNJE

Call to Order
Chair Rios called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board to order at approximately 5:40 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 11:15 p.m.)
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent
Ms. Amanda Mather

Others Present
Ms. Heather Lamboy, Planning and Land Use Director
Mr. Frank Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner
Mr. Paul Duran, Senior Planner
Ms. Amanda Romero, Senior Planner
Ms. Maggie Moore, Planning and Land Use Assistant Director
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**

It was noted that cases 2025-011724-HDRB, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue, and 2025-011418-HDRB, 320 Paseo de Peralta, 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**

a. October 14, 2025

Member Bienvenu suggested substantive and clarifying changes to the minutes of October 14, 2025.

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

b. October 28, 2025

No changes were made to the minutes of October 28, 2025.

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

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

a. 2025-10349-HDRB. 821 Acequia Madre (May 13, 2025)
b. 2025-10093-HDRB. 224 and 228 East Palace Avenue (May 13, 2025)
c. 2025-10295-HDRB. 234 Irvine Street (May 27, 2025)
d. 2025-10293-HDRB. 345 Garcia Street (May 27, 2025)
e. 2025-10341-HDRB. 248 Rodriguez Street (demolition) (May 27, 2025)
f. 2025-10343-HDRB. 248 Rodriguez Street (new build) (May 27, 2025)
g. 2025-10348-HDRB. 557 San Antonio Street (May 27, 2025)
h. 2025-10350-HDRB. 907 Don Miguel Place (May 27, 2025)

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

5. **Matters from the Public**

A recess was called at approximately 6:00 p.m. to address technical difficulties affecting Zoom connectivity. The meeting was reconvened at approximately 6:30 p.m.

Anthony Guida, speaking via teleconference, expressed concerns regarding the composition of the Board. He noted that one of the members must be an architect and

expressed disagreement with Ms. Lamboy's statement that a landscape architect is an architect. He noted that five of the seven seats were occupied by members of the Old Santa Fe Association (OSFA), while Chair Rios, who normally does not vote, was the only representative of downtown businesses.

Jordan Young, speaking via teleconference, expressed agreement with Anthony Guida's concerns regarding the lack of a licensed architect and overrepresentation of OSFA on the Board. She suggested that the matter be corrected by recruiting young talent from architectural firms as well as business professionals.

6. **Staff Communications**

a. **Shelby Street Bridge project update:** Ms. McCulley reported that staff approved the bridge design and details on November 21, 2025. The replacement bridge will be six feet wide with a railing height of 42 inches to meet the standards set by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Due to flood requirements, the arch of the bridge will be changed to a camber design. Existing sandstone will be salvaged and reused where possible, and new sandstone matching the existing material will be added. The walkways around the bridge will be reestablished to match the existing walkways, in red brick and oatmeal-colored concrete. The form for the base of the bridge has been ordered, and the construction start date is unknown.

7. **Old Business**

a. **2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street, 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". (Review and design comments).

Chair Rios noted that the 60-day design review period would end on February 6, 2026, and that the subcommittee had discussed suggestions and recommendations that could be submitted in writing to the state. She invited the Board and the public to comment on the recommendations or submit their own and suggested that preservation groups submit written comments to the state.

Member Bienvenu clarified that the items prepared by the subcommittee and staff were not recommendations themselves, but rather discussion points to assist the Board in developing recommendations for the state. At the end of the 60-day design review period, the city will have five days to assess whether its comments and concerns have been adequately addressed by the state; if they have not, the city has the right to require the convening of a joint state–city commission that will resolve the issues of the design.

Mr. Bienvenu read the general discussion points submitted by the ad-hoc committee and staff:

- Discuss whether to recommend that the east and north elevations have additional stepbacks on the upper floors in order to break up the massing and whether additional one-story sections to the building would be appropriate.
- Consider recommending that only one stucco color be used.
- Assess the Board's preference regarding pedimented window frames, and whether any pediments should match those on neighboring state buildings.
- Ascertain whether the proposed heights for the building and tower are accurate and discuss whether the tower may exceed the permitted height. Staff has determined that the permitted height under the ordinance would be 57'-6".
- Consider whether the windows along the façade should be recessed rather than flat.
- Request that the state provide a reason acceptable to the Board for not considering other design alternatives, including the potential use of some of the right-of-way on South Capitol, which the city agreed could be dedicated to the state, as the use of this area could allow the building height to be lowered while providing the square footage the state has deemed necessary to meet its needs.
- Consider recommending that the materials have a sense of substance and permanence, per the ordinance.
- Ascertain that the maximum window and door area does not exceed 40% of a façade, except under a portal, noting that a building mass that is offset by four feet or more is considered a separate façade. Pay specific attention to the northwest façade, which has large windows.
- Consider recommending that a courtyard be created at the northeast corner of the building to break up the mass and provide an opportunity for interpretive signage and street furniture.
- Consider recommending that the patterning be vertical or square rather than horizontal.
- Consider recommending that the portals have roofs especially the lower portals.

Additional discussion points specific to the north elevation:

- Discuss the design rationale for the tower.
- Consider stipulating that the windows under the portal not extend to the ground, as the Board never approves these types of windows. Consider suggesting a window style similar to that of the Roundhouse.
- Whether the small windows on the second story north façade are out of scale in relation to the rest of the façade.
- The windows at the east corner maybe are out of scale.

Additional discussion points specific to the east elevation:

- Query whether additional one-story masses should be incorporated and whether the building should be stepped to make it more pedestrian-friendly.

- Consider creating a courtyard at the northeast corner with gathering space and signage.
- Query whether the mass at the southeast corner is out of scale, whether the fenestration on the façade meets the 40% rule, and whether the windows are excessive for adobe material.

Member Biedscheid expressed willingness to compromise regarding the code, noting that the design is consistent with neighboring buildings and the scale is appropriate to its space. She suggested recommending that the windows be recessed into the façade and that the stucco be one color.

Member Cherry expressed agreement regarding additional stepbacks on the east and north elevations and the single stucco color. He noted that some of the renderings appeared to have a territorial trim that could be considered a pediment, and that the existence of pediments may conflict with the wish for recessed windows. Noted a need to ascertain the height, as the proposed tower height was 28 feet higher than the building, but it did not appear this tall in the rendering. He noted that the third-story windows on the north façade appeared to be offset from the lower windows, which makes the design appear too modern for the historic district.

Chair Rios noted a rendering in which the windows do not have pediments and noted that they should be recessed.

Jennifer Jenkins, 130 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking on behalf of JenkinsGavin and the State of New Mexico, she noted that additional single-story elements are being considered for the perimeter, though this presents a challenge given the square footage required for the functionality of the structure. The state is proposing to add roofs to the lower-level portal on the east façade and wrapping them around to the north façade, which would create the appearance of a single-story mass. The upper-level pergola-style portals would not be covered, as doing so would block the entry of natural light to the building. The city is willing to use a single stucco color, ensure a sense of permanence, and incorporate pediments. All of the windows are recessed. The building height is 50 feet. The stuccoed portion of the tower is 57 feet, and the top of the open-framed element is 78 feet. The tower is functional as well as decorative. Decreasing the height of the building would prove challenging. The state explored the option of using a portion of South Capitol Street, but it was discovered that doing so would decrease much-needed parking and severely disturb traffic patterns, as the building is surrounded by one-way streets. The state is working to ascertain whether the 40% rule has been followed. Jennifer Jenkins expressed willingness to discuss adding a courtyard but noted that it is important to anchor the corner and that pedestrian areas have been provided in the plaza areas. She expressed willingness to alter windows, so they do not reach the ground, modify the third-floor windows on the north façade, and modify the horizontal muntins.

Adding single-story masses on the east elevation would be challenging, but the state is willing to consider it.

Art Tatum, 13131 Sunrise Trail Place, Albuquerque, was sworn in. Speaking on behalf of FBT Architects and the State of New Mexico, he noted that adding roofs to the lower portals should break up the massing on the east and north façades. The pediments were not made triangular because the building is new, but triangular pediments can be considered, possibly for the third-floor windows. The tower complements the territorial revival style; marks the entry; and contains elevators, stairs, and mechanical elements. The state is working to integrate the parking structure into the site design.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the dimensions of the tower and whether open cupolas are common.

Mr. Tatum responded that the tower is 78 feet tall and that open cupolas are common in territorial styles; sometimes, they contain a bell. He was unsure of the width of the tower.

Member Cherry expressed approval of the tower overall and its scale but noted that the beam across makes it appear flat underneath, giving it a Greek appearance, in comparison with the Bataan Memorial Building, which has a lower beam that provides dimension.

Member Bienvenu expressed approval of the tower but expressed agreement with Member Cherry regarding the need for dimension. He suggested that the new renderings include additional detail, such as the door material, and the brick coping. He suggested that detailing be incorporated into the tower. He noted that the state has adequately addressed the issues of the corner courtyard and the South Capitol area. He noted that the southeast corner, which is a prominent façade, has excessive fenestration, making it appear disproportionate even if it is within the 40% rule.

Member Biedscheid expressed agreement with Ms. Jenkins' and Mr. Tatum's comments regarding the discussion points as well as those rejected by the Board. She suggested that the Board heed the architect's comments regarding the design origin and intent, especially considering that the Board lacks a building architect.

Member Bienvenu noted that the offset third-floor windows looked odd.

Mr. Tatum responded that the state had agreed to correct them.

Ms. Romero noted that staff had requested that the story of the bungalows be located under the portal, as a permanent fixture, rather than inside the building. The exact details of the memorial have not been planned yet.

Ms. Jenkins inquired whether there would be another meeting between the state, the subcommittee, and staff to discuss whether the comments had been addressed adequately, and whether the case would need to return to the full Board.

Ms. Romero suggested that the state, the subcommittee, and staff meet before the next Board meeting and then allow the Board to vote. She noted that members of the public should also have the opportunity to provide feedback during the 60-day period.

Public Comment:
Rad Acton, 1206 Canyon Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He suggested that South Capitol Avenue be straightened, which would provide space for a courtyard and for the east elevation to be stepped to match the west elevation. He suggested that the roofed portal memorialize the casitas by reflecting their sod dimension.

John Eddy, 14 Avenida Campo Verde, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He expressed agreement with Members Bienvenu and Cherry regarding the need for detailing. Regarding the tower, he suggested that a view into its ceiling be provided, and that a double-hipped roof be added. He suggested dental work around the top of the roof structure to add character as a territorial building and noted that window lintels in New Mexico should appear to overlap onto the wall to soften the façade. Pediments would shed rain and provide dimension to the windows. He suggested that the roofs of the portals be translucent to allow light to pass through.

Edward Archuleta, P.O. Box 2952, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that most of the concerns discussed by OSFA were addressed aside from the height and the excessive fenestration.

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She expressed approval of the suggestions to add detailing to the tower and suggested making it narrower. She noted that the windows on the southeast corner were too large and delicate for the massing of the building and suggested that detailing and variety be added where possible She suggested that the building be open to visitors for one day per week.

Kathy Rivera, P.O. Box 363, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Regarding the height, she requested that the Board maintain records of whether city or state standards were followed, who took the measurements, and whether exceptions were requested, for future designs and cooperation.

Peter Goodwin, 1402 Cerro Gordo Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He suggested that the fenestration on the south façade be reduced and that the exterior pergola-style portal be set back two or three feet. He suggested that images of other towers be shared with the subcommittee for comparison with the proposed design.

Jordan Young, 652 Galisteo Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she noted that the state's design is attractive and conforming, and that the committee process has significantly slowed the project. She suggested that the Board's process be streamlined, noting that it privileges the voices of people who have sufficient time to attend hearings, as well as money for childcare.

Anthony Guida, 1711 Second Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he expressed agreement with Ms. Young, noting that the massing has been justified and the design is attractive. He suggested that the process for capital projects be reformed, noting that redesign by committee is unlikely to result in a better building and leads to contradicting comments.

Chair Rios thanked all who had commented and were involved in the process, noting that Santa Fe would not be what it was without engaged citizens. She noted that the collaboration between the Board and the state was due to a law that was passed. She suggested that the subcommittee meet again to solidify its recommendations before the next Board meeting, and that individuals write their public comments as bullet points.

Ms. Jenkins suggested that the case appear on the agenda under Old Business at the February 10, 2026, meeting.

Member Bienvenu noted that the Board has not yet provided written recommendations and may not need to if the state returns before the deadline with a revised plan that incorporates what has been discussed, after which the Board can vote on whether there are outstanding issues.

Member Biedscheid noted that the Board is not required to take action aside from deciding whether there are major concerns that require written recommendations for the state, and there appeared to be no major issues remaining. She suggested that any unresolved issues be resolved during the meeting.

Member Bienvenu clarified that the Board does not have final approval but can demand the formation of a committee if there are unresolved issues.

Chair Rios noted that the state may want to discuss how to incorporate public suggestions.

Ms. Jenkins noted that she has been taking copious notes and the meeting was being recorded, so she did not need a written record. She noted that the public comments were similar to those expressed by the Board, such as detailing and the 40% rule.

Chair Rios inquired whether she was willing to review the plans, incorporate the main points discussed, and bring new architectural drawings to the next meeting.

Ms. Jenkins responded that she would need to consult with her team.

Member Cherry suggested that revised renderings be provided rather than full plans.

Member Degnan noted that the state is not obliged to honor the comments made and that the Board would need to see the case again.

Chair Rios noted that the Board has a duty to respond to the application and would need to see the final product.

Ms. Jenkins responded that she could provide it to staff by February 23, 2026.

Mr. Ruybalid suggested that the subcommittee meet again and submit final recommendations to the Board, and that the Board vote on recommendations at the January 27, 2026, meeting.

Member Cherry suggested that the Board compile its recommendations for the state to use in revising the plan.

Ms. Jenkins responded that the comments made during the meeting were clear and that the state has adequate information to adjust the plan and present it at the January 27, 2026, meeting.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that a special session be held.

Ms. Lamboy, speaking via teleconference, noted that the written comments represent the views of the subcommittee, not the full Board.

Member Bienvenu noted that, as the state has responded to the discussion points, it should be possible to resolve the issue quickly at the next meeting.

Board Action:
The Board agreed that the state would provide renderings to staff by January 22, 2026, as the packets are distributed on that day, so that a decision can be taken during the January 27, 2026, meeting.

8. **New Business**
   a. **2025-011700-HDRB, 123 Camino Santiago, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** John Padilla, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation, noting that cases 2025-011700-HDRB and 2025-011701-HDRB would be presented and discussed together. For

both cases, staff recommended that the historic status of the residential structure be upgraded to contributing with the east façade (R1, R2, R3, R4, and R5) designated as the primary façade, including the portal and excluding the non-historical materials, and that the north property line retaining wall be designated as non-contributing per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Non-contributing Status Within Historic Districts.

John Padilla, the applicant, P.O. Box 22986, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that when the case was originally presented, it did not meet the age requirement for contributing status and was deemed to lack character-defining features. The building is now 56 years old and therefore eligible. He noted that the building has not changed since 2018 and that it is a development, not a compound. The retaining wall will be maintained and not revised. On behalf of the owner, he requested that the Board consider the property unchanged and that the 2018 Board decision, designating the building as non-contributing, be allowed to stand.

Larry Lujan, representing 123 and 125 Camino Santiago, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he expressed an intention to keep the property as beautiful as possible.

Member Bienvenu asked whether any structures in the subdivision were contributing.

Ms. McCulley responded that the property in question and one other were deemed non-contributing due to age. The rest are contributing. She noted that the building fits in with the character of the surrounding buildings.

Public Comment:
Ms. West, previously sworn in, expressed appreciation for the property and questioned why the applicant would want to consider it non-contributing.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011700-HDRB at 123 Camino Santiago to approve staff's recommendation that the historic status be upgraded to contributing with the east façade designated as primary, including the portal and excluding the non-historic materials. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

b. **2025-011701-HDRB. 123 Camino Santiago, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** John Padilla, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

The presentation and discussion of this case were included in that of case 2025-011700-HDRB. 123 Camino Santiago, Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011701-HDRB at 123 Camino Santiago to approve staff's recommendation that the historic status be upgraded to contributing with the east façade designated as primary, including the portal and excluding the non-historic materials. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

c. **2025-011537-HDRB. 521 Calle Corvo, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, contributing,** Rajah Bose, agent for Louis Pepper and Ruth Williamson, owners, request status review with primary façade(s) designation if applicable.

Mr. Duran, speaking via teleconference, presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the main residential structure be maintained as contributing, and the south façades (1, 2, 3, and 4), including the portal and excluding the non-historic doors and windows, be designed as primary, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures. Staff recommended that the garage structure be designated as non-contributing due to its age. Staff recommended that the yard wall be designated as non-contributing due to its age.

Chair Rios inquired which facades had non-historic windows and doors.

Mr. Duran responded that the modern garage door would not meet the criteria. The windows and doors on the proposed primary façade are historic, and he would have to conduct additional research regarding the others.

Rajah Bose, 212 Lorenzo Lane, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he noted that the window to the left of the garage complies with neighborhood guidelines, though the materials may no longer be primary and the opening size may have been modified at some point. He requested that the Board exclude the window from the primary designation and that openings be excluded, noting that the westernmost window may be historic material with a secondary window system.

Mr. Duran noted that the garage opening is likely historic, judging from the wooden elements around the door, but the material is not. The picture windows and door likely contain historic materials, but their status is unknown.

Member Cherry asked whether the garage door existed, noting the necessity of determining whether the openings were historic or original. He suggested that if the building were determined to be contributing, excluding non-historic material, the non-historic material could be investigated later and designated.

Member Bienvenu expressed agreement.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011537-HDRB at 521 Calle Corvo to adopt staff's recommendation that the contributing status of the house be maintained, with the south façades (1, 2, 3, and 4), including the portal, be designed as primary, excluding the doors and windows that are demonstrated as non-historic to the satisfaction of the Board; and to adopt staff's recommendation that the garage structure and yard wall be designated as non-contributing due to age. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

d. **2025-011702-HDRB, 665 West San Francisco Street, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** Dominic Bertani, owner, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the structure be maintained as non-contributing due to extensive alterations, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Non-contributing Status Within Historic Districts.

John Murphy, 2833 Plaza Verde, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he identified himself as a representative of the applicant and noted that a form in the meeting package demonstrated that the building had lost its historical character prior to the addition of the gabled roof.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:
Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2025-011702-HDRB at 665 West San Francisco Street to adopt staff's recommendation that the property's status be maintained as non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

e. **2025-011703-HDRB, 424 San Antonio Street, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-statused,** Christopher Purvis, agent for Laura Bird, requests a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for the main residence and accessory structure.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the residential structure be designated as contributing, with the east elevation (R1), including the interior of the portal, the north elevation (R6), and the south elevation (R2), excluding the 1995 addition, as the primary façades, and to designate the

accessory structure as contributing, with the east (G1) as the primary façade, and to designate the yard wall, excluding the picket fence, as contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Non-contributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Chair Rios inquired whether the garage was contributing.

Ms. McCulley responded that it was and that the primary façade would be the east.

Member Bienvenu noted that Page 4 of the staff report states that the property was previously known as the Fenyes residence and the House of the Three Wise Women; however, those names belong to the Acequia Madre house to the west. The two properties may have been developed and rented by the same people.

Christopher Purvis, 518 Old Santa Fe Trail, was sworn in and confirmed that the staff presentation was accurate. He does not believe the aluminum storm windows are historic.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the date of the wall.

Mr. Purvis responded that he was unsure.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011703-HDRB at 424 San Antonio Street to adopt staff's recommendation that the historic status of the residential structure be designated as contributing, with the east elevation (R1), including the interior of the portal, north elevation (R6), and south elevation (R2), excluding the 1995 addition, as the primary façades, and to designate the accessory structure as contributing with the east (G1) as the primary façade, and to designate the yard wall, excluding the picket fence, as contributing. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

f. **2025-011538-HDRB, 800 Gildersleeve Street, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, contributing,** Shane Woods and Gabe Rippel, owners, request approval for a 120 square-foot detached free-standing pergola to the height of 7'-8", where the maximum allowable is 15'-1".

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project (with no roof structure) and found that the application complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Historic District Design Standards. Mr. Duran noted, however, that a

site visit revealed projects that had not been approved, and that the pergola had already been built.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the staff's considerations for the proposed pergola materials.

Mr. Duran responded that they were wood and metal.

Chair Rios inquired whether the pergola was proposed for the south elevation.

Mr. Duran responded that it was proposed for the northeast corner of the property.

The applicant was inaudible. He noted that the previous homeowner had applied to the Board for items, including the gates and railings, and they were approved. He has since installed them. The pergola is aluminum.

Member Cherry asked when the items were approved.

Mr. Duran reviewed several cases involving the property but was unable to find approval for the metal gates and wrought-iron elements. The most recent approvals were in 2016.

Member Cherry noted that any approvals from 2016 or earlier would have expired.

Mr. Duran responded that this was correct.

Member Biedscheid asked whether he had prior approval from the Board for the indicated changes.

The applicant responded that he thought he did.

Mr. Duran noted that the current request included only the pergola. The other items were noted by staff during a site visit and would be dealt with later.

Member Bienvenu noted that the pergola appeared to be built from a kit, was not harmonious with the neighborhood, and was placed in a prominent and visible corner.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011538-HDRB at 800 Gildersleeve Street to deny the application on the basis that the proposed pergola, as it exists, and its proposed location are not harmonious with the streetscape and the district standards. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

Chair Rios informed the applicant that he had the option of appealing or submitting an application for a different pergola.

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

Mr. Duran 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 primary façade window replacement. Staff recommended approval of all other elements of the application, as they comply with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Ju Tan, 1219 Cerro Gordo Road, was sworn in. He shared brochures with details of the proposed replacement windows, noting that the owner has received consent statements from neighbors and the Canyon Neighborhood Association for the window replacement. A window assessment deemed all of the windows, aside from two under the portal, as non-repairable and requiring replacement. The proposed replacement replicates the look of steel. Mr. Duran suggested Graham Architectural Products, but the company determined that the project would be too small for them.

Member Biedscheid noted that there was precedent for the Board approving the replacement of historic windows on buildings near the home in question with a product similar to that proposed due to the difficulty of finding steel windows.

Member Aguilar Medrano asked which product from the brochure the applicant preferred to replace the steel window on the primary façade.

Mr. Tan responded that he would prefer the Kolbe VistaLuxe WD LINE accent window.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that the square pattern of the original windows be replicated.

Mr. Tan responded that the existing window on the east façade has a transom. Indicating a drawing of the existing and proposed window, he noted that the proposed window lacks the fixed transom but replicates the four-by-four pattern.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the brand the applicant had investigated for steel windows.

Mr. Tan responded that he had researched eight or nine brands, including Sierra Pacific, Kolbe, Graham Architectural Products, and Hope's Windows. Hope's had steel windows, but they were not an exact match and were very costly.

Member Bienvenu noted that there was only one window on the primary façade, while the other windows were elsewhere, and asked how much it would cost to replace it with a steel window.

Mr. Tan responded that Hope's quoted approximately $14,000 but was unsure whether the project would be feasible. The quote is six months old, and the current cost is likely to be higher. The Kolbe window costs approximately $3,000 to $5,000.

Member Bienvenu noted that steel windows are significant aspects of historic character and should be preserved where possible. The National Park Service has stated that steel windows can be repaired and made energy efficient. Changing the window would likely lead to the building losing its contributing status.

Member Cherry expressed agreement, noting that Hope's replaces steel windows in an energy-efficient manner. While the windows are costly, only one needs to be replaced in kind. He suggested repairing the window rather than replacing it.

Member Biedscheid noted that the window assessment was likely requested by staff, and the assessor was known to be reliable. The window condition was noted as "fair," indicating 30% to 40% deterioration, which is generally a threshold for allowing replacement.

Member Bienvenu noted that the assessment was difficult to interpret but seems to indicate the window would need to be removed and waterproofed; however, removal would cause frame damage.

Tom Wilmoth, owner, 412 Camino Cabra, was sworn in. He noted that cold air infiltrates through the window and is a significant source of thermal loss. When it rains, water penetrates and runs down the wall. He and his wife have pinned hair clips to close the curtains over the window and have applied insulation tape, which works, but it frequently falls off. He asked Mr. Tan to find a replacement window that is as close to the original as possible, keeping his budget in mind. He noted that if the proposed window replacement is denied, and he is required to replace it in kind, he would not be able to do so and would need to continue living in the current manner, with cold air and water entering the home. He invited his neighbors into the home, and they signed letters of support. He also attended a meeting of the Canyon Neighborhood Association, and the Chair provided a letter of support.

Public Comment:
Ms. West, previously sworn in, suggested making an effort to find a more similar replacement window.

Member Bienvenu noted that such information should have been in the application, as it is a factor the Board needs to consider. He requested that future applicants include such information in their applications, noting that the criteria for granting an exception include hardship such as cost. The Board wants people to continue living in the historic district even if they cannot afford the best materials available. The window in question could be replaced in kind, but the extra $10,000 presents an unreasonable request. This may result in a downgrade in status.

Member Cherry expressed agreement regarding the need for such evidence in the application. He inquired whether the homeowner could afford to replace the window in kind and postpone or phase the replacement of the other windows.

Mr. Tan responded that phasing has been considered, but it would significantly increase the cost of the project.

Mr. Wilmoth responded that he would like all the windows to be more energy efficient, as they tend to fog up from breath and heat, such as when washing the dishes in the kitchen.

Mr. Ruybalid noted that the Board has approved findings of fact on a contributing building without a downgrade in status.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011244-HDRB at 412 Camino Cabra to find, under the special circumstances of this case, as proven by the testimony provided, that the exception criteria have been met for the primary façade window replacement, provided that the window is replaced with a product as close to the existing windows as economically feasible, as approved by staff; and to find that all other aspects of the application may be approved as recommended by staff, with a note that the contributing status of the structure may be affected by the replacement of the window but that the Board nonetheless finds that the exception criteria for approving the project are met. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Degnan in favor and members Aguilar Medrano and Cherry against.

Member Aguilar Medrano left the meeting at approximately 11:15 p.m.

h. **2025-011230-HDRB, 527 Agua Fria Street, Units 1, 2, and 3, Westlake-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing,** Osage Design Studio, agent for Neirika, LLC, owner, proposes to construct a 36 square foot addition, replace windows and doors, raise two sections of roofing, re-roof, stucco, and other repairs. Exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i)(ii)(iii) for the replacement of windows on primary facades, and to 14-5.2(D)(3)(a) for raising the roof of a contributing structure.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria have not been met and recommended denial of the exception to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) for replacement of historic windows on primary façades (Items 1a, 1g, 1h, and 1l). Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application (Items 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 1i, 1j, 1k, and 2 through 9), as they comply with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.

Chair Rios requested that the primary façades be identified by elevation.

Ms. McCulley responded that they are the south elevation, larger sections and the entire east elevation.

Richard Woodbury, address inaudible, representing Osage Design Studio, was sworn in. He noted that the status of the project was recently downgraded from significant to contributing, which reflects the evolution of the architecture over time, as people living in homes modify them to make them more comfortable. He would like to replace the wooden windows, improve the lean-to porch to modern comfort, and improve the appearance of the structure.

Steven Vierra, co-owner, 24 Calle San Acacia, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he expressed an intention to restore the home so it could last another 100 years while respecting the neighborhood and its aesthetic. He noted that the home has already undergone so many changes that it no longer represents only one historical era or architectural style. The rotting wood could likely be restored rather than replaced, but this would be a short-term solution and not energy efficient.

Member Cherry asked about the vents on the front door.

Mr. Woodbury noted that the diamond gable vents could be repaired, but that there are currently two front doors. He wishes to change Door 3 to a window and replace Door 2 with a wood-panel door with lights.

Ms. McCulley clarified that Windows F, G, H, I, J, and L were on the primary façade. Staff recommended replacing Door 2 be in kind to maintain its arch. The applicant wishes to make Door 3, which is wooden, into a window, which would be smaller than the door.

Member Cherry noted that Door 3 was non-historic and asked whether the opening was historic.

Ms. McCulley responded that it was not.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the size of the proposed window.

Mr. Woodbury responded that it was three feet wide.

Mr. Ruybalid noted that the motion in progress implied that the exception criteria for raising the roof had been met.

Member Biedscheid responded that they had, as well as for converting Door 3 into a window.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011230-HDRB at 527 Agua Fria Street, Units 1, 2, and 3, to adopt staff's recommendation, which is consistent with the window assessment report, which found that the exception criteria have not been met for the replacement of windows on the primary façades on the south and east and will require the repair of the historic windows on the primary façades, which are windows F, G, H, I, and J; to require the replacement in kind of the gable vents; to adopt staff's recommendation that Door No. 2 be replaced in kind to maintain the arch; and to approve the remaining elements of the application as submitted. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

i. **2025-011724-HDRB, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, significant** Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts Inc., owner, proposes to relocate a door on a primary façade and extend a stair landing. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) to alter a primary facade.

This item was postponed to January 27, 2026.

j. **2025-011725-HDRB, 1302 Cerro Gordo Road, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** Dr. Mavrick Lobe, owner, proposes to construct a 3,698 square foot free-standing residence to a height of 22'-0" where the maximum allowable height is 15'-6". An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(9) for exceeding the allowable height.

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)(9) to exceed the maximum allowable height of the residence. 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 inquired whether the home would be visible from both South Armijo Lane and Cerro Gordo Road, whether there were other two-story homes in the vicinity, whether the applicant was proposing non-divided light windows, and whether there was an additional vehicular door proposed.

Ms. McCulley responded that it would be visible from both roads. There is another two-story home nearby, with a portion of its second story visible on the Cerro Gordo side. There is only one garage door.

Mavrick Lobe, 108 Placita Halcon, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the garage door was metal, but the raised panel was proposed to mimic a wood door. All windows, aside from those under portals, are divided light.

Chair Rios inquired whether the openings indicated on the south elevation were doors, and regarding the interior ceiling heights.

Mr. Lobe responded that they were doors, and the interior ceiling heights were nine feet on each floor.

Member Cherry noted that the windows on the east and west elevation did not appear to be divided light.

Mr. Lobe responded that they are divided light, but the drawings may be inaccurate.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the architectural style of the home.

Mr. Lobe responded that it is an Adobe Pueblo style.

Member Bienvenu noted that although staff recommended that exception criteria had been met, he observed during the site visit that the building height would be imposing on a fairly flat site. He inquired regarding the size of the guesthouse and how the applicant had calculated the size of the proposed home.

Mr. Lobe responded that the guesthouse was 1,498 square feet, and he is unsure regarding the calculations. He noted that the permitted height was 15 feet and six inches, and his proposed home would only be six feet and six inches higher.

Chair Rios noted that the application seemed incomplete and questioned whether the architectural elements were reflected properly.

Member Cherry expressed agreement.

Public Comment:
Rose Armijo, 508 Camino de Guadalupita, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She noted that her home shares a property line with the proposed home, which would block her property's view of the mountains. The other two-story home in the area is set back and does not affect the views of any neighbors. She expressed approval of Mr. Lobe's work on the guesthouse.

Ms. Armijo, first name is inaudible 105 South Armijo Lane, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She expressed agreement with her sister's comments, noting that she lives with her elderly mother, who is an artist and was saddened to learn that her view of the mountains would be blocked by the proposed home. She noted that single-story homes are traditional in the neighborhood.

Ms. West, previously sworn in, suggested that the proposal be modified, noting that the drawings were confusing and the home was too large for the area.

Mr. Peter Goodwin, previously sworn in, noted via teleconference that the proposed home would be out of scale in the neighborhood. He noted that the guesthouse was executed well, but the drawings for the home were confusing. He recommended that the Board deny the second floor.

Member Cherry inquired whether there were one or two lots.

Mr. Lobe responded that there was one lot of approximately 0.75 acres and 30,000 square feet. It was subdivided in the 1960s, and the owner converted it into one property for tax purposes. He expressed respect for his neighbors and noted that he was willing to build a single-story home.

Member Cherry noted that the size of the lot would offer many options.

Mr. Lobe responded that he initially chose two stories because a single-story home would mean that the setbacks would be closer to the fences.

Member Biedscheid inquired whether the case should be postponed so the applicant could return with a redesign or whether the Board should deny the application so he could begin again.

Chair Rios suggested that the case be postponed for a redesign.

Mr. Lobe inquired whether view corridors were preserved in Santa Fe.
Chair Rios responded that they are not.

Member Bienvenu responded that the view corridor would not form part of the Board's decision; the Board's role is to determine whether an applicant has conclusively established all necessary exception criteria.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011725-HDRB at 1302 Cerro Gordo Road move to postpone the case for a redesign, at a time to be determined, noting that the exception criteria have not been met, specifically that the full range of design options has not been considered, and the design is not harmonious with the streetscape and surrounding properties, the hardship regarding lot size has not been demonstrated, there is no known special condition associated with the lot, and the applicant has expressed willingness to lower the height; and to suggest that the applicant explore designs within the allowable height that do not require an exception, whether one story or two. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

k. **2025-011418-HDRB, 320 Paseo de Peralta, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** Charlotte Fox, owner, requests approval for a mural. Three exceptions are requested to 14-5.2(10) signs and murals, 14-5.2(E)(1)(b) exterior walls, and 14-5.2(E)(2)(e) publicly visible facades.

This item was postponed.

9. **Discussion Items**
Mr. Ruybalid provided an update regarding a window replacement proposal at 206 McKenzie Street, which the Board denied on July 22, 2025. The appeal was heard on December 10, 2025, and the governing body voted 9-0 to overrule the Board's vote and grant the window replacement.

10. **Matters from the Board**
There were no matters from the Board.

11. **Next Meeting**
The next meeting date is January 27, 2026.

12. **Adjournment**
Member Bienvenu moved to adjourn. Member Biedscheid seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 a.m. on January 14, 2026.

Minutes prepared by Lori Goshert of Minutes Solutions Inc.

_____ _____

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair Date

Regular Meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board
January 27, 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=Vfp4yaNNv2Q

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. Mary Ellen Degnan
Mr. Scott Cherry

Members Absent
Ms. Madeleine Aguilar Medrano

Others Present
Mr. Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Planner Manager
Mr. Frank Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner
Mr. Paul Duran, Senior Planner
Ms. Amanda Romero, Senior Planner
Ms. Maggie Moore, Planning and Land Use Assistant Director
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 2025-011246-HDRB, 532 Calle Corvo; and 2025-011550-HDRB, 539 Garcia Street; under New Business, have been postponed.

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

3. **Approval of Minutes**

There were no minutes to approve.

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

a. 2025-10488-HDRB, 140 Romero Street (June 10, 2025)

Member Degnan moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as submitted. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote (4-0).

5. **Matters from the Public**

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, requested an update regarding the bridge near the Supreme Court building. She expressed disappointment that staff had apparently approved a large, visible HVAC system at 300 Galisteo Street.

6. **Staff Communications**

a. **Board Vacancy:** Mr. Moquino reported that Amanda Mathers resigned from the Historic Districts Review Board. Anyone interested in the vacant historian seat should email their resume to the Historic Preservation Division at hpdsubmittal@santafenm.gov.

b. **Changes in Code:** Mr. Moquino noted that the cases heard at the current meeting would fall under the old codes. Cases heard at future meetings will fall under the new codes, depending on when the applications were submitted. Cases submitted under the old codes will continue under the old codes.

c. **2026 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Awards:** Ms. Romero noted that the nomination forms for the 2026 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Awards were available in the Board packets and should be submitted by February 27, 2026. The awards will be presented on May 21, 2026, at the San Miguel Chapel, with the reception at El Zaguán.

7. **Old Business**

a. **2025-011586-HDRB, 130 South Capitol Street, Downtown and Eastside Historic District,** JenkinsGavin, Inc., agents for the State of New Mexico General Services Division, request new construction of a 163,230-square-foot office building to a maximum height of 78’ -7 ¾” (at tower) and 50’-8” (at parapet). Maximum allowable height is 57’-6”. (Review and design comments)

Chair Rios noted that anyone who disagrees with a Board ruling may consult with staff and appeal to the City Council, and that public comments would be limited to two minutes.

Jennifer Jenkins, 130 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference on behalf of JenkinsGavin and the state, she invited the architects to present the updated renderings, indicating the changes made in response to Board and public comments.

Arthur Tatum, 13131 Sunrise Trail Place, Albuquerque, was sworn in. He noted that the window size on the east and southeast elevations were reduced, pediments were added to all windows, the portal was roofed to reflect the requested single-story element, one stucco color was proposed, the ground-floor windows no longer extend to the ground, the windows on the third floor on the north façade were enlarged and aligned with the second floor, windows above the entry were enlarged, muntins were made vertical rather than horizontal, and detail was added to the cupola.

Chair Rios inquired how the building, given its size, would relate to the surrounding buildings and to human scale.

Mr. Tatum responded that the surrounding buildings were two or three stories. The architects have broken down the massing with stepping and the portal. Because it is set back from Capitol Street, there is space for pedestrians, including pedestrian courtyards on the south side.

Member Bienvenu noted the challenges inherent in collaborative design and inquired whether the state and the architects were satisfied that the design had been improved, and whether they thought any changes had diminished the design.

Mr. Tatum responded that the required square footage presented a challenge, but the review process resulted in a better building. He noted that the territorial style is flexible, resulting in diversity in the area. The architects liked the windows on the east façade, but changing them was not an issue. They are proud of the proposed building.

Member Degnan inquired regarding the change in size of the third-floor windows on the north façade.

Antonio Vigil, 2144 North Utah Street, Albuquerque, responded that they had been two-by-three feet and were now three-by-five feet.

Public Comment:
Jordan Young, 652 Galisteo Street, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she expressed concern regarding the lack of a building architect on the Board and the overrepresentation of the Old Santa Fe Association (OSFA), noting that this results in development becoming more costly and slower. She suggested that more projects be approved administratively by an architect rather than subject to lengthy meetings with public input, noting that public input privileges the retired, the wealthy, and the lawyered.

Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she noted that the hearings were necessary but that the Board needed a building architect. She expressed disappointment that the Board voted to approve the demolition of the casitas. She noted that the design had improved, but suggested stucco between the first and second floor fenestrations on the main façade rather than white facing.

John Eddy, 14 Avenida Campo Verde, Santa Fe; Beverly Spears, 1897 Conejo Drive, Santa Fe; Frank Katz, 1300 Canyon Road, Santa Fe; Philip Crump, 1897 Conejo Drive, Santa Fe; Randall Bell, 2991 Viaje Pavo Real, Santa Fe; and Rad Acton, 1206 Canyon Road, Santa Fe, were sworn in.

Mr. Eddy expressed appreciation for the aesthetic changes but expressed concern regarding the code violations. He noted that OSFA was a dedicated group of individuals working to protect architectural culture and requested the number of Board positions designated for OSFA members.

Chair Rios responded that there was one designated OSFA position on the Board.

Ms. Spears stated that the state's consultant misled the public and the Board regarding the maximum allowable height. Per the code, the building heights documented on the official map must be used. She noted that the design is noncompliant with city regulations and out of scale.

Mr. Katz noted that the maximum allowable height was 37 feet and that there had been no collaborative sessions with the state. He noted that the building violates design standards and is open to legal challenge. He suggested removing the third floor and extending the footprint into the South Capitol area.

Mr. Crump noted that the building is too large and that the design was not final, as the ordinance mandated consultation.

Mr. Bell noted that collaboration was required and suggested that the project be referred to the City–State Committee.

Mr. Acton noted that OSFA has explored what a compliant building of the necessary square footage should look like and requested that it be explored. He presented the compiled suggestions in writing to the Board.

Chair Rios noted that, by law, city historic preservation groups must be involved in the collaborative process between the state and city, but this did not happen. The comments presented at the meeting should have been heard at the beginning of the process. She noted that city staff have stated that capital outlay projects have separate rules regarding height, but she is unsure why. The ordinance allows 35 feet and staff is indicating that for capital outlay projects have separate rules and height restrictions to allow over 50 feet.

Mr. Ruybalid responded that the project fell under a subsection specific to state capital outlay projects, 14-5.2 M(3)(a)(vi). The maximum allowable height was determined by city staff using calculations based on institutional buildings within the applicable streetscape.

Ms. Jenkins noted that the state has been working with the height calculation in question since 2011. The current architectural team confirmed the calculations with city staff. The state held three well-attended community meetings. The state has not received requests for additional meetings or written comments from community members, including the drawings and comments that OSFA provided to the Board.

Member Degnan requested clarification regarding how the staff verified the height.

Ms. Jenkins cited the memorandum distributed before the January 13, 2026, meeting, which stated that the permitted height is 57 feet and 6 inches.

Member Bienvenu noted that most disagreement arose from poorly written and confusing ordinances and statutes, and that the process should be improved and clarified during the Phase 2 code update. He noted that the process had been followed and that beginning on December 9, 2025, both the Board and the public had a deadline to submit comments. He reviewed the procedure and asked the state whether the design submitted was final and whether the state would agree to submit any substantive changes for Board review.

Ms. Jenkins responded that this was acceptable.

Member Bienvenu noted that the Board had asked staff to verify that the maximum allowable height was correct. Staff did so and verified that the proposed building was under the allowable height, with the exception of the cupola.

Ms. Romero inquired regarding three issues that had been discussed at the subcommittee meeting on January 26, 2026: the depth of the recessed windows, the size of the mullions in the windows, and whether the state would be willing to add windows to an area abutting the windows.

Ted Grumblatt, 7908 Sartan Way, Albuquerque, was sworn in. He responded that the windows were recessed eight inches deep, and the width of the mullions will likely be two inches, which is typical of storefront windows. The state is willing to add windows to the windowless area indicated, in a similar style to the other windows.

Mr. Ruybalid noted that the Board had intended to inquire regarding the details on the tower.

Mr. Tatum responded that the following details had been added: railings, dentals, detailing on the corner columns, and steppings in the cornice.

Chair Rios asked whether the majority of the building was two-story or three-story elements.

Mr. Tatum responded that there were a lot of two-story elements.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-011586-HDRB at 130 South Capitol Street that findings be entered that this matter came before the Board pursuant to the procedure set forth in Section 14-5.2(M), that the procedures set forth in Subsections (M)(2) and (M)(3) have been followed, that the state has submitted its plan to the review board for review and comment, that a public meeting has been held to receive public input and required notice was given, that the review board has communicated recommendations and comments in writing to the state, and that the state and the review board have consulted to resolve the issues raised and revised plans have been submitted; and that the revised plans, as entered into the record at the meeting held on January 27, 2026, have resolved the issues raised by the Board, and the state has represented that it will not make any substantive design changes to these plans without prior notice to the review board for further review under Section14-5.2(M), without prejudice to all procedural rights they have under that section; therefore, the HDRB does not find it necessary at this time to notify the state that any issues remain unresolved or that issues need to be finally determined as set forth in Section 3-22.6(G), the state statutes, provided that the state should not make any alternations to the design presented on January 27, 2026, without prior review by the Board, and the Board reserves its right to invoke all procedural safeguards set forth in Section14-5.2(M) in the event that substantive changes have been made to the design. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Cherry in favor and Member Degnan against.

8. **New Business**

a. **2026-011790-HDRB, 212 and 212 A East Santa Fe Avenue, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, contributing,** Christopher and Lori Pearson Kramer, owners, request status review with primary façade(s) designation, if applicable, for 212 East Santa Fe Avenue, and status downgrade for 212 A East Santa Fe Avenue.

Mr. Duran, speaking via teleconference, presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the primary residence be maintained as contributing and designated the north, east, and west façades as primary, including all historic doors, windows, and other architectural elements, such as brick coping; that the casita be downgraded to non-contributing; and that the front yard wall be designated as contributing, per Section 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Christopher Pearson Kramer, the applicant, was sworn in and expressed agreement with the staff recommendations.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, expressed agreement with the staff recommendations.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011790-HDRB at 212 and 212 A East Santa Fe Avenue to adopt staff's recommendation to maintain the primary residence as contributing and to designate the north façade and the front portions of the east and west façades as primary as noted on staffs report ; to designate 212 A as non-contributing; and to designate the front yard wall as contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

b. **2026-011767-HDRB, 310 Lomita Street, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, non-contributing,** Michael Darter and Heidi Volpe, owners, request a status review with primary façade designation, if applicable.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the residential structure be upgraded to contributing, with the south façades (R1, R2, and R3), including the patio yard, and the west façades (R8 and R6) designated as the primary façades; that the historic status of the garage structure be upgraded to contributing, with the south façade (G1), excluding the garage door, as the primary façade; that the historic status of the street-facing stone retaining wall be upgraded to contributing; and that the historic status of the rear retaining walls be designated as contributing, per Section 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Non-Contributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the age of the stone retaining wall at the back.

Michael Darter, 310 Lomita Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he expressed agreement with the staff recommendations, aside from those relating to the rear retaining walls and the façade designated as R6. He noted that the retaining walls had changed over time, and that R6 was not visible from the street and should remain non-contributing.

John Murphy, 2833 Plaza Verde, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he noted that the rear retaining walls and the small planter that currently serves as a deck did appear historic to him. The 1995 report regarding the rear retaining walls indicated that they were block, and the capping seems to have been added after that time.

Member Cherry expressed agreement regarding the retaining walls. He asked why the house was being designated as contributing rather than significant, and why the east elevation was not recommended as primary.

Mr. Murphy responded that he was unsure that the historical context or house design would justify designating it significant. He expressed a preference for the south façade, noting that the east façade seemed more utilitarian.

Member Cherry asked whether he recommended that R6 and R7 be designated as primary façades.

Mr. Murphy responded that he did.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted that the home was a beautiful example of buildings in the area and noted that walls that cannot be seen from the street could also be considered contributing and worthy of preservation.

Board Action:
Member Cherry moved in case 2026-011767-HDRB at 310 Lomita Street that the status of the building be contributing, and that the status of the garage also be contributing, with façades R1, R2, R3, R4, R6, R7, and R8 as primary on the house and façade G1 as primary on the garage; that the yard wall on the south side be contributing; and that the retaining walls and patios in the back be non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Cherry and Degnan in favor and member Biedscheid against.

c. **2026-011791-HDRB, 411 Camino Don Miguel, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, contributing,** John A. Padilla, agent for Peter Quintana, owner, requests status downgrade.

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the structure be downgraded to non-contributing, per Section 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

John Padilla, P.O. Box 2986, Santa Fe, and Peter Quintana, the applicants, were sworn in. Mr. Padilla noted that Mr. Quintana acquired the property in late 2024, and it was already in a degraded state. He noted that the property is 0.1686 acres, or 7,341 square

feet. He noted that the Historic Cultural Properties Inventory in the staff report is outdated and that Mr. Quintana owns both properties. He expressed agreement with the staff recommendations.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted that the property is owned by Mr. Quintana's family and asked why the degradation of historic property had been ignored.

Mr. Quintana noted that he is a carpenter and enjoys repairing things. He purchased the property in its current condition.

Member Bienvenu noted contradictions in city records: some show the property as contributing, while others show it as non-contributing.

Member Cherry asked how the property's condition would affect its status.

Member Bienvenu responded that its historical character would affect the status; however, it is unclear whether the property in question would be considered contributing even if its condition were good. A status of contributing also requires a level of ongoing integrity.

Member Cherry stated for the record that there are portions of the building that are imploding and portions of the building that are intact. It would take an engineer to figure out and to do a full assessment with a variety of people to figure out if any parts of the structure would be salvageable. Just want to make sure that they are not doing a disservice by saying, it is imploding. There is a verity of conditions going on of the building by his observation.

Member Degnan inquired how the Board could downgrade the property if its true status is unknown.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011791-HDRB at 411 Camino Don Miguel that findings be entered that the current status of the structure is uncertain because the records are in conflict, and the Board is called upon to designate a status; that based on the staff report and the site visit, the staff findings be adopted that the structure does not help to establish and maintain the character of the historic district, and its integrity no longer remains; therefore, it should be designated as non-contributing. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

d. **2026-011792-HDRB, 924 Paseo de Peralta, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, contributing,** John A. Padilla, agent for Carole Peet, Executive Director of El Castillo Life Plan Community, requests status review with primary façade(s) designation, if applicable.

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the structure be maintained as contributing and to designate all of the north elevation; the east elevation of the historic residence, extending from the one-story section with the chimney northward, including the second story; the west elevation, extending from the original house southward to the south end of the portal; and the south elevation on the original structure, including the second story identified in the Façade Diagram numbers 1 through 8 as primary façades, per Section 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant and Contributing Structures.

Member Bienvenu noted that the property was referred to as the Rapp residence, but it was built by architect Isaac Rapp's widow after his death, and that the property could be designated as significant rather than contributing due to historical association. The alterations are also significant to Santa Fe history, aside from those made in the 1980s.

Mr. Duran noted that Façades 1 through 8 are the original Rapp residence. Staff considered the eastern façades as non-contributing due to the infills and alterations. He was unsure whether the Board could designate some parts as significant and some as contributing.

Member Degnan asked whether there was a precedent for multiple statuses in a dwelling, noting that it could set an odd precedent.

Member Cherry responded that it was atypical. If a structure is designated as significant, all façades are primary; however, some buildings have been designated significant, excluding certain additions. The building could also be designated as significant due to its occupant.

Mr. Padilla, previously sworn in, noted that the El Castillo Retirement Community, which owns the building, is very proud of it. The community refers to the main structure as the Rapp building and intends to move the administrative office there with no significant changes. He cited the 310 Lomita Street case, noting that while that property featured two structures with different designations, the parts of the property in question may have been previously detached.

Mr. Ruybalid cited a case at 710 Canyon Road in which two conjoined buildings had two designations, resulting in different criteria for the front and back portions during the replacement of the shared roof.

Member Cherry noted that the portions depicted in blue and orange met the criteria for contributing status, excluding the non-historic additions, noting that there appeared to be three definitive structures.

Chair Rios expressed agreement, noting that the architects started with one building and added to it.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted that the building was historic due to its character and its connection with Rapp, while the later structures are historic in their own right. She suggested designating the area depicted in green as significant, the area in blue as contributing, and the area in orange as contributing, with the recent additions excluded.
Member Degnan requested clarity regarding the option of designating a single status and inquired whether the Board had included a portion of a lesser status into a designation.

Mr. Ruybalid responded that in the case of 710 Canyon Road, the Board designated the building facing the street as contributing but acknowledged that the attached rear building was non-contributing. All historic portions can be included in a designation.

Member Biedscheid suggested excluding the east façade, which has alterations and infill.

Member Cherry noted that making the east façade primary would protect the mass, shape, and height, while allowing non-historic features to be upgraded.

Board Action:
Member Cherry moved in case 2026-011792-HDRB at 924 Paseo de Peralta that the portion of the building known as the Rapp residence, depicted in green, be designated as significant; that the portion of the building designated as the service wing, depicted in orange, be designated as contributing, with the east façade as primary, excluding the non-historic alterations; and that the portion of the building known as the workshop area, depicted in blue, be designated as contributing, with the east façade as primary. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Cherry and Degnan in favor and member Biedscheid against.

e. **2025-011246-HDRB, 532 Calle Corvo, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, contributing,** John A. Padilla, agent for Susan McShane Salomone, owner, requests approval to construct a 624-square-foot addition to the main house and a 442-square-foot addition to the garage. Three exceptions are requested to Section 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 façade. The addition shall not exceed 50% of the square footage of the existing footprint and shall not exceed 50% of the existing dimension of the primary façade.

This item was postponed.

f. **2026-011770-HDRB, 302 Camino Cerrito, Downtown and 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 Degnan moved in case 2026-011770-HDRB at 302 Camino Cerrito that it be heard at the end of the agenda due to the absence of the applicant. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011770-HDRB at 302 Camino Cerrito that it be postponed to February 10, 2026, due to the absence of the applicant. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

g. **2025-011550-HDRB, 539 Garcia Street, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, contributing,** Geisler Projects, agent for Matt and Penelope Rembe, owners, proposes to construct a 33-square-foot addition to a height of 10'-6", where the maximum allowable is 10'-10". A 309-square-foot portal to a height of 10'-3". 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 re-roof and stucco both buildings. Exceptions are requested to Sections 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) for constructing an addition within 10'-0" of the primary façade, and 14-5.2(E)(2)(b) for a window opening at less than 3'-0" from the corner of a façade.

This item was postponed.

h. **2025-011536-HDRB, 516 Alto Street, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing,** Marc Naktin, agent for Steven Dayton, owner, requests approval to construct a 210-square-foot addition to a height of 14'-1", where the maximum allowable height is 16'-0".

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Sections 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(I) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.

Marc Naktin, 1305 Luján Street, was sworn in. Comments is inaudible.

Chair Rios inquired whether the small addition would change the designation.

Mr. Duran responded that the property would continue to be contributing.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted that she was unable to hear the applicant and asked whether the addition was on a primary façade and whether an exception would be needed. She suggested approval of the project, noting that the addition appeared to be minor.

Chair Rios responded that the addition was not on a primary façade.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011536-HDRB at 516 Alto Street to adopt the staff's recommendation for approval of the project as submitted. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

i. **2026-011769-HDRB, 600 Camino Rancheros, Historic Review Historic District, Non-statused,** Marc Naktin, agent for Melchijah Spragins, Jr., owner, proposes to construct a 1,322-square-foot second-floor addition to a height of 24'-0", where the maximum allowable height is 14'-8". An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(9) for exceeding the maximum allowable height.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria for Section 14-5.2(D)(9) have been met and recommended approval to exceed the maximum allowable height.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the square footage of the existing house and whether there were other dwellings on the property.

Ms. McCulley responded that the house was 4,400 square feet, and there were two accessory dwelling units on the property.

Mr. Naktin clarified that one of the accessory units is a woodshop, and the other is a casita. The proposed second floor would be set back from the façade, and he would try to make it appear seamless.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the proposed ceiling height of the second floor.

Mr. Naktin responded that it would be nine feet, plus an extra eight inches, where there are vigas.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, inquired regarding the hardship criteria and whether the second story would be on the downslope.

Member Bienvenu recommended caution when granting exceptions, as the Board must follow the ordinance, which excludes structures of that height.

Member Cherry noted that staff found that the requirements were met, though there does not appear to be hardship.

Member Bienvenu noted that the criteria have not been met. Criterion 1, which states that the proposal does not damage the character of the district, was not met because a height that is 10 feet higher than the maximum allowed does damage its character.
Criterion 2 regarding hardship was not met because the applicant indicated that no major hardship would result. Criterion 3 was not met because the applicant can continue to live on the property without the extra height. Criterion 4 regarding special conditions of the streetscape was not met because the applicant indicates that the streetscape has the same terrain as the rest of the neighborhood. Criterion 5 regarding special circumstances was not met because the request was specific to the applicant wanting additional space. Criterion 6 regarding the least negative impact was not met because additional height would impact the neighborhood more than finding the desired square footage in another manner.

Member Biedscheid suggested that the Board may be penalizing the applicant for requesting an exception that may have been granted to others in his neighborhood.

Ms. McCulley responded that she is unsure how many of the two-story homes were the result of an exception.

Member Cherry noted that comparing the cases would be complicated for staff. Applicants are responsible for submitting such evidence.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011769-HDRB at 600 Camino Rancheros to have findings entered that the applicant did not conclusively demonstrate the exception criteria to have been met; therefore, the application should be denied. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Cherry and Degnan in favor and member Biedscheid against.

j. **2026-011768-HDRB, 801 Old Santa Fe Trail, Unit A, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, significant,** Santa Fe Permits/Jennifer Salimbene, agent for Stuart Cohen, owner, proposes to replace windows. An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(1)(a) for replacing historic windows on primary façades.

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)(1)(a) for replacing historic windows on primary façades. Otherwise, staff

recommended approval of the other elements of the application, as they comply with Sections 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Member Biedscheid asked when the property was designated as significant.

Ms. McCulley responded that it was designated in the 1990s, probably by the governing body.

The applicant name and address is inaudible, was sworn in. He noted that eight windows are leaking. The owners plan to replace them with windows that look identical.

Member Cherry expressed concern that the character of the building will not be preserved with modern windows. He noted the difficulty of determining which parts of the window are historic, and there are different processes of replacing windows, namely, some that repair sashes and others that discard them.

The applicant noted that for the eight windows in question, the frames are historic, but the sashes are not. It should be possible to keep some of the frames intact, but one is damaged.

Member Cherry noted that the non-historic sashes were made to look identical to the historical ones. The new sashes would not be made in kind, and a factory window inserted into a historic frame would not look historic.

The applicant noted that Windsor Architectural Windows and Doors of Santa Fe has experience with replacing windows in historic buildings. He asked whether factory windows were forbidden.

Member Cherry responded that historic windows are to be replaced in kind, meaning with the same materials and dimensions.

The applicant asked whether the Board recommended a specific window-maker, noting that the requirements were very specific.

Member Cherry noted that there were custom woodworkers in Santa Fe.

Member Biedscheid noted that requiring custom windows seemed unfair to the applicant and the staff. The applicant had hired a qualified window assessor at their own expense, as requested by staff, and had provided a report. The applicant has agreed to restore the windows that are restorable. It is not the Board's job to dictate a high level of detail for a project recommended by staff and accompanied by a complete package.

Member Bienvenu expressed concern about relying solely on a window assessment but acknowledged that staff had recommended the project and that changing the process could be unfair to the applicant. He expressed hope that the upcoming discussion regarding the policy update on windows would clarify matters.

Chair Rios noted that the house was significant but that she was unsure of the cost of replicating the windows.

Member Bienvenu noted that only one window would need to be replaced in kind.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted that only one window required an exception and that replacing a window would change the nature of the opening.

Janet Sanders, co-owner, 801 Old Santa Fe Trail, was sworn in. She expressed disappointment that she and her husband had undergone every step of the lengthy and detailed application process, and it is difficult to defend the comfort and usability of their home when they do not understand the detailed language used by the Board regarding windows. The proposed windows look identical to those being removed. She noted that no one had mentioned that the current windows were uninsulated and single-pane, and they allow cold air into the house, leading to health issues. She asked how the windows proposed by Board members would mitigate that problem.

Chair Rios requested that the applicant replicate the historic windows as closely as possible and asked why the metal gate was changed.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011768-HDRB, 801 Old Santa Fe Trail, Unit A, to adopt the staff's recommendation, finding that all exception criteria have been met, and to approve the project as submitted. Member Cherry seconded. The motion passed (3-2) with Chair Rios, members Bienvenu and Biedscheid in favor and members Cherry and Degnan against.

k. **2025-011724-HDRB, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, significant,** Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Heritage Hotels and Resorts Inc., owner, proposes to relocate a door on a primary façade and extend a stair landing. An exception is requested to Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a) to alter a primary façade.

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) to alter the openings on a primary façade. Staff also recommended approval of the other elements of the application, as they comply with Sections 14-5.2(D)

General Design Standards for All Historic Districts and 14-52(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Richard Martinez, P.O. Box 925, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the city required that five rooms be made accessible, with accessible bathrooms; this has proven challenging because that wing of the hotel was built in 1926, with unusual bathrooms. He intends to maintain the exterior windows and elements as they are as he repairs the interior. The only way to make space for one of the bathrooms is to move the emergency exit door six feet. The door is not historic and will be replaced by an identical metal door.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, suggested that a ramp be added and noted that the hotel requested permission to install a spa in a previous year.

Board Action:
Member Degnan moved in case 2025-011724-HDRB, 210 Don Gaspar Avenue to approve the request, noting that all exception criteria have been met, and relocate the door to allow the Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant restroom facility. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

I. **2026-011794-HDRB, 726 and 728 Galisteo Street, Don Gaspar Area Historic District, significant,** Michael Mizell, agent for Richard Brenner, owner, requests approval for window replacement, re-stucco, and repairs of parapet and brick coping.

Mr. Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that the application complies with Sections 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts and 14-5.2(H) Don Gaspar Area Design Standards.

Michael Mizell, the applicant, P.O. Box 2765, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the openings are historic, but the sashes and windows are not.

Chair Rios inquired whether the applicant intended to change the color of the building.

Mr. Mizell responded that colonial white, an ivory shade, was the original color of the stucco. The building appears darker because it has aged and discolored over the years.

Public Comment:
Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, inquired regarding the current and proposed window materials.

Mr. Mizell responded that the current windows are wooden and double-hung. The proposed windows are the same style, but with insulated glass. The casement windows will be replaced with casements. He did not remember the brand.

Board Action:
Member Degnan moved in case 2026-011794-HDRB, 726 and 728 Galisteo Street to approve the request to replace the wooden windows in kind, and to approve the parapet repair of the sections that require it, as well as the rear gutter and downspout repair, brick coping, and re-stuccoing in colonial white, based on the applicant's evidence of it being the original color. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Degnan in favor and Member Cherry against.

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

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project with the condition that the pergola be relocated to meet the required setback, and found that the application complies with Sections 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for All Historic Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Standards.

Armando Gonzalez, representing Elizabeth Geier, 330 Gormley Lane, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, he explained the miscommunication regarding the permitting process.

Chair Rios requested clarification regarding where the pergola should be moved.

Ms. McCulley responded that the pergola currently sits at the property line and will need to be moved five feet from the fence.

Public Comment:
There was no public comment.

Board Action:
Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-011231-HDRB at 330 Gormley Lane to approve the application with the condition that the pergola be moved within the setbacks required. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (3-1) with members Bienvenu, Biedscheid and Degnan in favor and Member Cherry against.

9. **Discussion Items**

Member Cherry requested clarification from staff regarding when story poles are required and when they are not.

Mr. Moquino responded that they are required in the case of an addition or new construction, even when within the allowable height. He agreed to research the matter and provide further clarification.

10. **Matters from the Board**

There were no matters from the Board.

11. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting date is February 10, 2026.

12. **Adjournment**

Member Bienvenu moved to adjourn. Member Degnan seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Lori Goshert of Minutes Solutions Inc.

_____ _____

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair Date

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 Section14-5.2(D)(2)(d), additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the

addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade, the addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary 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 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

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: **March 24, 2026**

TO: **Historic Districts Review Board**

FROM: **Heather Lamboy, AICP, Planning & Land Use Department Director HLL**

2026-011792-HDRB. 924 Paseo de Peralta. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Contributing. John A. Padilla, agent for Carole Peet, Executive Director of El Castillo Life Plan Community, requests status review with primary façade(s) designation if applicable. Request for reconsideration of the January 27, 2026, decision to classify portions of the building as "significant" and the rest as "contributing."

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

_x_ Historic Inventory Form

___ Zoning Review Sheet

____ Other:

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

___ Proposal Letter

___ Site Plan/Floor Plan

___ Elevations

___ Photographs

____ Other:

At the January 27, 2026, meeting, the HDRB acted on the status of 924 Paseo de Peralta, designating the original 1936 house as significant and the rest of the structure as contributing. Having 2 historic statuses on one building is difficult to administer and can be challenging to interpret. It is accurate that the 1936 structure has defining characteristics and should be preserved. The primary façade designation will protect that building as if those facades were designated as significant. Staff administers applications proposing changes to primary facades in the same manner as facades on significant buildings.

Section 14-4.6(C)(2) states,

"2. Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status

I. Status Designation Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing," as defined in Section 14-9.3, General Definitions. Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of structures located in the historic districts."

Staff requests reconsideration of the HDRB decision to classify a portion of the building as significant and the other as contributing. Based on the Code, status designation may be significant, contributing, **or** non-contributing. There is no provision in the Code that permits portions of one building to have more than one status.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The current El Castillo Retirement Resident Office space and the previous architect, Isaac Hamilton Rapp's original single-family residence at 924 Paseo de Peralta, are listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The original structure was built on a 0.42-acre lot in the late 1920s and comprises 5,906 sq. ft. of roofed area. The residence was constructed in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival architectural style, as evidenced by the flat roof with rounded parapets, recessed doors and windows, and wooden lentil and viga elements throughout the structure. The structure eloquently speaks to its surroundings along the streetscape and has a monumental impact as an aesthetically pleasing element on Paseo de Peralta.

Mr. John Murphey's 2025 Historic Cultural Property Inventory (HCPI) survey report encapsulates the history of this special structure's construction and the owners who once called this residence home. Mr. Murphey's analysis of the structure and its previous additions shows how this historic building speaks to the times and places of the people in the heart of Santa Fe. In general, Mr. Murphey expresses that the structure retains a high level of historic integrity except for the east elevation of the former service wing (2025:16). This determination is observed by previous Historic Districts Review Board (Board) cases in the 1980s and 1990s where changes have impacted the original form of the structure. The changes do not diminish the contributing status of the structure as a whole, it does not give a good representation of the original construction as other elevations demonstrate on the structure. Staff agrees with the historian's evaluation and the recommendations of the primary facades.

Previous cases for 924 Paseo de Peralta include:

Below are previous Legacy HDRB and ADMIN cases for 924 Paseo de Peralta. Currently there are no records available in the Historic Preservation Division files for these cases.

1982-010100025-HDRB, approved.
1983-010100420-HDRB, approved.
1986-010100071-HDRB, approved.
1989-010100007-HDRB, approved.
1989-010100405-HDRB, approved.
HDRBAA-390-ADMIN, approved.
HDRBAA-391-ADMIN, approved.

HDRBAA-551-ADMIN, approved.
HDRBAA-1451-ADMIN, approved.

On March 8, 2018, in Case No. AR-09-2018-1030-ARC, the Archaeological Review Committee (ARC) conditionally approved an inventory and testing report at 924 Paseo de Peralta with the condition that the archaeologist will monitor all ground disturbance on the property or that the archaeologist re-open trenches and excavate to sterile soil and staff can administratively approve the addendum report.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:

The applicant requests status review with primary façade(s) designation if applicable for 924 Paseo de Peralta.




Figure 1: Proposed Façade Diagram for 924 Paseo de Peralta.

Primary Façade:

Non-primary Façade:




Figure 1: Colored current floor plan.

Green: 1936 house
Orange: 1936 service wing
Blue: c.1940s workshop area
Red: c.1980s alterations and infill

Floor plan courtesy of John Padilla, Architect.

Figure 2: Colored illustration floor plan showing the dates of additions. Courtesy of Mr. John A. Padilla and Mr. John Murphey 2025.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-5.2 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

(A) **General Provisions**

(1) General Purpose

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the *city* and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and *development* of the *city* , it is deemed essential by the *governing body* that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve *property* values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and *preservation* of historical areas and *buildings*;

(b) The continued construction of *buildings* in the historic styles; and

(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between *buildings* of historic design and those of more modern design.

(C) **Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts**

(Ord. No. 2004-26)

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

(a) Each *structure* to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical *development*, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other *buildings*, shall not be undertaken;

(b) Changes to *structures* that have acquired historic *significance* in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most *structures* change over time;

(c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a *structure* be preserved; and

(d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic *property* and its environment would be unimpaired.

(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status within Historic Districts

(a) Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing" based upon the definitions of these terms in Article 14-12. Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of *structures* located in the Historic Districts.

(b) Board Authority to Review Status Designation

(i) The Board is authorized to change the status of a *structure* or to designate a status for a *structure* with no status designated.

(ii) A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."

(e) Appeals (Ord. No. 2009-42 § 16)

Decisions made by the historic districts review board may be appealed to the *governing body* as set forth in Section 14-3.17.

(f) Restoration of Status

If a *property owner* makes changes to a *structure* without the proper *city* approvals which result in the lowering of the *structure's* status, staff or the board may require the *property owner* to restore the *structure* such that its former status is restored.

(E) **Downtown and Eastside Design Standards**

The *governing body* recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the *city* from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with *adobe*, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style",

which is a *development* from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

(1) Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with *adobe*, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

(a) With rare exception, *buildings* are of one *story*, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the *buildings* are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight *slope* and surrounded on at least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the *walls* or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the *walls* except to cover an enclosed *portal* or *porch* formed by setting back a portion of the *wall* or to form an exterior *portal*, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns. Two- *story* construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the floor of the second *story*. Façades are flat, varied by inset *portales*, exterior *portales*, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-spouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, often slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding *walls*;

(b) All exterior *walls* of a *building* are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under *portales*, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a *wall* under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color, or have mural decorations;

(c) Solid *wall* space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;

(d) The rule as to flat roofs shall not be construed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof *structures*, but such *structures* other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the *street* on which the *building* fronts;

(e) True old Santa Fe style *buildings* are made of *adobe* with mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the *adobe* effect can be simulated is permissible; provided, that the exterior *walls* are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating *adobe*, laid on smoothly, is required; and

(f) It is characteristic of old Santa Fe style commercial *buildings* to place a *portal* so that it covers the entire sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic *buildings* by *retention* of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of *adobe* construction, prescribed as follows:

(a) No *building* shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed *portales*, *setbacks* or other design elements;

(b) The combined door and window area in any *publicly visible* façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a *portal*. No door or window in a *publicly visible* façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;

(c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof *treatment* described below;

(d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any *publicly visible* façade shall be *adobe* finish, or stucco simulating *adobe* finish. The balance of the *publicly visible* façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for *building permits*;

(e) The *publicly visible* façade of any *building* and of any adjoining *walls* shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under *portales* may be of contrasting or complimentary colors. Windows, doors and *portals* on *publicly visible* portions of the *building* and *walls* shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles; except that *buildings* with *portals* may have larger plate glass areas for windows under *portals* only. Deep window recesses are characteristic; and

(f) Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

DEFINITIONS:

14-12 Contributing Structure:
A structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

14-12 Noncontributing Structure:
A structure, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H District.

14-12 Primary Façade:
One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.




Figure 1: Proposed Façade Diagram for 924 Paseo de Peralta.

Primary Façade:

Non-primary Façade:

CITY OF SANTA FE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST/CLEARANCE PERMIT AND APPROVAL

Case File Number AR-09-2014 Date Application Submitted February 13, 2018

District: Historic Downtown District X ; River & Trails-Regular ____ ; Santa Fe Trail ____ ; Suburban ____

Building Sq. Ft. N/A Development Acreage ____

Project Description: Inventory + Testing at 924 Paseo de Peralta

Site Address/Location: 924 Paseo de Peralta Property Owner: ____

Permit: Grading ____ ; Development X ; Building ____

Applicant Information: Name: John Padilla

Mailing Address: PO Box 72986 Phone No.: ____

Archaeological Consultant: Ron Winters

RECONNAISSANCE REPORT Conditional approval - 7 monitoring w/ More than 1m disturbance (for depth) -or- that the archaeologist re-open trenches + excavate to Sterile Soil + admin approval of addendum report

1. ___ Project Archaeologist's Resume
2. ___ Vicinity Map
3. ___ Project Site Description
4. ___ Development Project Description
5. ___ Outline of Research & Methodology
6. ___ Site Map or Aerial Photograph at a Minimum of 1"=200' for Downtown Dist. & 1"=400' for other Districts
7. ___ Archival Research
   a. ___ Historic Maps & Aerial Photos
   b. ___ ARMS Files & Archaeological Reports
   c. ___ General Land Office (BLM) Surveys or Land Grant Plats
   d. ___ 1917 Hydrological Survey and Santa Fe Acequia System Report (needed if acequia present or nearby)
   e. ___ National and State Register Nominations (needed if in Historic Downtown District or near Historic Structure)
   f. ___ Historic Photos (needed if in Historic Downtown District)
   g. ___ Information from Title Abstract (if available)
8. ___ 2% Testing (Historic Downtown District Only)
9. ___ Description of Prehistoric & Historic Occupation & Land Use
10. ___ Description of Cultural Remains Discovered and Significance
11. ___ NM Site Inventory Forms and Other Documentation
12. ___ Recommended Site Significance
13. ___ Assessment of Development's Impact on Cultural Remains
14. ___ Recommended Treatment for Site
15. ___ Listing of Sources, i.e. historic maps, aerials, reports, etc.

___ ARC APPROVAL: MEETING DATE: ____
Special Conditions: ___ Yes (see attachment) ___ No

TREATMENT PLAN REQUIRED:

Yes: X No: ____

___ TREATMENT PLAN ARC APPROVAL: MEETING DATE: March 8, 2018
Special Conditions: X Yes (see attachment) ___ No

PRELIMINARY TREATMENT REPORT

___ a. Research Design Outline
___ b. Site Map of Excavations
___ c. Other Documentation: Photographs and New Mexico Site Inventory Forms; if applicable
___ d. Description of Cultural Remains Discovered
___ e. Description of Prehistoric and Historic Occupation and Land Use
___ f. Listing of Sources


TREATMENT REPORT ARC APPROVAL: MEETING DATE: ____
Special Conditions: ___ Yes (see attachment) ___ No

FINAL TREATMENT REPORT

____ Date Final Report Due ____ Date Final Report Received

FILE01PLTS-96

Permit Approved: [signature] Date: 08 March 2018
Archaeological Review Committee Chairperson



NOTES

1. ALL CALCULATIONS INDICATE "HEATED" AREA AS PER "BOMA" STANDARDS.
2. THE AREA FOR THE STAIRS IN THE APARTMENT GOING DOWN IS NOT INCLUDED IN APARTMENT AREA.
3. ALL FIXTURES INDICATED ARE BUILT-IN.
4. ALL FLOORS ARE WOOD UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED.
5. ALL CEILING HEIGHTS ARE 8'-6" UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
6. ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE FIELD VERIFIED PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION.

AREA CALCULATIONS:

SUITE 1 AREA	772.96 SQ.FT.
SUITE 2 AREA	331.06 SQ.FT.
SUITE 3 AREA	367.88 SQ.FT.
SUITE 4 AREA	486.58 SQ.FT.
SUITE 5 AREA	736.66 SQ.FT.
SUITE 6 AREA	2,347.35 SQ.FT.
SUITE 6 PORCH AREA	169.22 SQ.FT.
COVERED PATIO AND WALKWAY AREA	1,071.94 SQ.FT.
BASEMENT AREA	739.85 SQ.FT.
SECOND FLOOR APARTMENT AREA	917.61 SQ.FT.
SECOND FLOOR BALCONY AREA	157.20 SQ.FT.
TOTAL AREA	8,098.31 SQ.FT.

PROJECT:
924
PASEO DE PERALTA
SANTA FE

DESCRIPTION:
AS-BUILT
DRAWING

CLIENT:
EL CASTILLO
LIFE PLAN
COMMUNITY

SHEET # 01 OF 01

ORIENTATION

MEASURED BY	J.A./P.M.
DESIGNED BY	N.A.
DRAFTED BY	J.A.
CHECKED BY	P.M.
REVISED:	

SCALE 1/8 = 1' 0"
DATE 03/05/24

REFERENCE # 2402 0

DRAFTING
505-899-1199

EAST ALAMEDA

N89°20'E 41.1'

S75°43'E 174.7'

SAN. SEWER MANHOLE

SAN. SEWER MANHOLE

33.4' S.89 139.9'

N13°09'E 61.5'

S13°09'W

STONE RETAINING WALLS

Santa Fe River

S82°15'E 74.0'

STOCKADE FENCE

124.1' S75°22'E 60.2'

S81°22'E 40.00'

S81°22'E 33.3'

S43°36'E 41.9'

N84°51'E 26.5'

207.0'

253.5' S85°21'E 56.0'

STOCKADE FENCE

WOVEN WIRE FENCE

81.6'

S2°43'W

4.6'

CONCRETE CURB

S2°50'W 53.4'

163.25'

N

SCALE 1"=50'

MEEM

RUTH HEELY

BOYLE LANE

169.1' N1°16'E

N13°26'E

N42°17'W 30.8'

N60°22'W 39.2'

N13°05'W 23.9'

STEM ON FIRE HYDRANT N80°07'W-18.0'

STOCKADE FENCE

N82°41'W

NORTH EDGE OF CURB

(S6.73 N82°41'W-11.32)

EAST DE VARGAS STREET

4.214 ACRES

LOT 2, BLOCK 52A - 1924 OFFICIAL MAP

S7°24'W - 84.62' N89°08'W - 5.85'

N83°07'E 32.05'

85.8 N79°05'W 35.75'

CA'DCW RAIL S58°58'W - 30.85'

MASONRY WALL

STORAGE BUILDING

ELSIE M. BOYLE

S7°24'W - 84.32'

MASONRY WALL

S7°24'W

SAN SEWER MANHOLE

S72°49'E - 32.0

WOVEN WIRE FENCE ON CONCRETE CURB

S3°39'W

191.8'

+ ON CONCRETE CURB

AMENDED 8-26-63

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER AND LAND SURVEYOR AND THAT THIS PLAT WAS PREPARED FROM FIELD NOTES OF A SURVEY MADE BY ME JULY 13 & 14, 1963 AND A PLAT OF SURVEY BY JAMES C. HARVEY DATED JULY 8, 1959 AND THAT THE ENCROACHMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN HEREON ARE THE ONLY ENCROACHMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS EXISTING ON THE GROUND AND THAT SAME ARE LOCATED TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF.

J. F. Scanlon

J.F. SCANLON R.E. & L.S. NO. 1694

AMENDED

PLAT OF SURVEY

FOR

UNITED NUCLEAR - CASTILLO CORP.

SANTA FE, N. MEX

RETURN TO HORNE ENGINEERING 214 CANYON ROAD

EL CASTILLO C1-32

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM 1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

Date of Form: October 9, 2025

For HPD Office use only:
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: Old: 051610626
Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.	924 Paseo de Peralta Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe Parcel # 910005088

5. Property Type:
_x Buildings: 1
__ Structures:
__ Site __ Object

6. Date of Survey:
September 28, 2025

7. Previous Survey Date(s):
_x Yes: July 15, 1993, A.C.
__ No:

8. Name of Project:
HDRB Status Evaluation

9. Lat/Long:
35.6836601,-105.9372215



10. Photo Information: Giulia Caporuscio, photographer. Photo 1: View of east elevation. Camera facing southwest.

11. Brief Description of the Property:

Originally erected in 1936 as the Jean Morrison Rapp residence, the building now extends nearly 184 feet along Paseo de Peralta, its elongated form recording a history of changes and at least one addition. In plan and massing, it suggests a kind of linear organism—anchored by a two-story "head" at the north end, a one-story middle section likely corresponding to the original garage and subsidiary rooms of the house, and a southern "tail" that once housed the workshop area of a mail-order necktie business (Fig. 1). The three principal components reached their present footprint by 1958, as shown on an aerial photograph of that year (Fig. 9). The combined gross building area measures approximately 5,906 square feet, all presently in commercial use. The property is designated Contributing within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Continued on Page 5.

12. Who uses the property? Comme

13. Construction Date:
Date: 1936, with 1940s additions
_x_Known __ Estimated Source: published building permit

14. Setting:
_x_ Suburban __ Rural __ Village __ Urban If Urban: _x_ Commercial __ Industrial __ Residential _x_Public

15. Relationship to Surroundings: _x_ Similar __ Dissimilar
Comments: N/A

HCPI Base Form (FORM 1) *(Continued from other side)*

16. Additional Perspective: **(Photos, drawing, footprint, etc., indicate north arrow when possible)**



Source: Office of the Santa Fe County Assessor
parcel lines are not accurate

17. Surveyor:
(your name, address, telephone number, and any group affiliation)

John W. Murphey
Architectural Historian
Architectural History Services
w/ Giulia Caporuscio

For: Current owner:

18. Owner (if known) and other knowledgeable people:

Current owner: El Castillo Retirement Residences

N/A

19. Is Property Endangered? **_x_ Unknown __ No __ Yes How?**

20. Significance to Current Community: **_x_ Unknown __ None __ Low __ Moderate __ High**
Describe: Unknown

21. Other Significance or Information of Interest: (such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.)
See Historical Overview.

22. National or State Register:

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? __ Unknown _x_ No __Yes
If yes: __ State __ National
If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? _x_ No __Yes
Why? See Evaluation of Historical Status

23. National or State Historic District: City of Santa Fe

Is this property in a historic district? __ Unknown __ No _x_ Yes
If yes: __ Significant _x_ Contributing __ Non-contributing __ No Status
Per City of Santa Fe official designation map

If 'yes', what is the name of the district? __ State __ National _x_ City of Santa Fe:
Downtown and Eastside Historic District

24. Supplemental Forms:

__ None _x_ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) __ Continuation Sheets, # pages: _____

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2***
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626
Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.	924 Paseo de Peralta Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS:

6. Visible Construction Material:

_x_Adobe __ Brick __ Composition __ Concrete: Block

__ Concrete: Cast Stone __Concrete: Poured __ Earth Plaster __ Masonry: Simulated

__ Metal: Corrugated __ Metal: Structural Siding __ Metal: V-Crimp __ Stone: Random Ashlar

Stone: __ Random Coursed __Stone: River Rock __Stone: Rusticated __ Stone: Tabular

_x_Stucco: __ Tile: Clay __ Vinyl Siding __ Wood: Board and Batten

Wood: __ Horizontal Siding __ Wood: Jacal __ Wood: Log __ Wood: Shingle

__ Wood: Tongue and Groove __ Other:

7. Number of Stories: __ N/A
Number: _x_1 __11/2 _x_ 2
__ 21/2 Other:_____

8. Foundation: __ N/A
_x_ Not visible __ None
_x_ At Grade _x_Raised:
Materials: _x_ Concrete: __Stone
Other:
Notes

9. Roof: __ N/A

Shape: _x_Flat __Gabled
__ Hipped __ Pyramidal
__Shed Other:
Pitch: __ None __ Low
__ Medium __ Steep
Features: __ Eave:
_x_ Parapets
Materials: __Asphalt
__ Earth
__ Composition shingle __ Metal: Pressed
__ Composition Roll __Metal: Corrugated
__ Metal: Standing Seam __Metal: Standing Seam
__ Tile: Terra Cotta __ Wood: Shingle
Other: Gravel , modified bitumen

10. Window Types

Operation	Material	Glazing	Number
Hung Sash	Wood	1/1	14
Hung Sash	Wood	2/2	3
Hung Sash	Wood	3/1	1
Hung Sash	Wood	4/4	12
Hung Sash	Wood	6/6	30
Hopper – Cellar	Steel	3	1
Hopper	Wood	6	2
Fixed	Wood	1	4

Note: Based on visibility and access during survey

11. Door Types

Type	Style	Material	Number
Single-Leaf	Panel	Wood	1
Single-Leaf	Glass & Panel	Wood	2
Single-Leaf	½ -light	Wood	4
Single-Leaf	10-light	Wood	6
Single-Leaf	10-light w/sidelights	Wood	1
Double	French w/sidelights	Wood	1

12. Chimneys _x_ 3: two corner and one centered wall chimney

13. Porches _x_ N/A
Type: __ Entry _x_Partial-Width __ Full-Width __ Wrap

14. Other Significant Features N/A

15. Modifications: x __ No known modifications

#1 Date: c.1940s; addition of workshop area; different design than original house and circumstantial link to Webb Young, Trader.
#2 Date: Unknown; removal of character-defining vigas and canopies; drawings and visual evidence.
#3 Date: c.1980s-90s; infill of garage and east portal; 1958 aerial, 1993 HBI, and visual evidence.
#4 Date: c.1980s-90s; replacement of various doors and windows; visual evidence.

16. Primary Architectural Style __ Not Applicable

__ Art Deco/Streamline Moderne	__ Gothic Revival	__ Mission Revival	__ Pueblo	_x_Spanish-Pueblo Revival
__ Bungalow/Craftsman	__ International	__ Neo-Classical	__ Queen Anne	__ Territorial
__ Colonial Revival	__ Italianate	__ Northern NM	__ Ranch	__ Territorial Revival
__ Folk Victorian	__ Mediterranean	__ Prairie	__ Spanish-Colonial	__ Tudor Revival

Notes: __ Other: Vernacular

17. Documents Available and Their Locations

Historic Preservation Division
Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe
200 Lincoln Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 955-6605
https://www.santafenm.gov/land-use/historic-preservation


Archaeological Records Management Section
Laboratory of Anthropology
708 Camino Lejo
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 476-1320
https://nmhistoricpreservation.org/arms.html

S I T E:

18. Attached or Associated Properties

Are associated properties eligible for listing:

19.Site Plan: Portion of 2018 survey plat. Courtesy of Dawson Surveys, Inc.



For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Architectural Description Continued

Original Residence

The original 1936 residence is distinguished by its two-story massing and stylized public entry along Paseo de Peralta. Historian Carl D. Sheppard, interpreting Jean Morrison Rapp's obituary, viewed the house as a posthumous—or perhaps recycled—design of her late husband, architect Isaac Hamilton Rapp.[1] While small details such as battered wall corners and the once-generous use of exposed vigas (now removed) could be read as references to Rapp's Pueblo Revival vocabulary, much of the building departs from his established idiom. Absent are the characteristic swooping parapets, mission-like towers, deeply recessed openings, and stepped wall profiles. The composition is comparatively blunt in its articulation. By contrast, the F. Leonard and Rosina Smith House more clearly demonstrate Rapp's residential design vocabulary (Fig. 2).

East

The east elevation forms the public face of the building and exhibits its highest level of architectural composition (Fig. 2). Closest to the street, a one-story symmetrical façade centers on a large, sculpted wall chimney flanked by grouped six-over-six wood-sash windows (Photos 3 & 4). Though restrained in detail, the façade introduces the principal motifs of the original residence: flat, unarticulated wall planes; generally symmetrical fenestration fitted with multi-light wood sash beneath simple wood lintels; and a parapet that turns upward in a modest swoop—or "batwing"—at the corner.

Moving north, the façade steps back to form a more formal entrance. This section is defined by a thick, heavily battered opening (Photos 5 & 6), its shape recalling the 1920s revivalist interpretations of Pueblo architecture seen in the work of Katherine Stinson-Otero and others, and most notably in the doorways of the New Mexico Museum of Art. The entry, now partially obscured by potted plants, contains a pair of ten-light French doors of a type repeated elsewhere on the house. Above the entrance rises the two-

[1] Sheppard, Carl D., *Isaac Hamilton Rapp, Architect: Creator of the Santa Fe Style* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 98-100.

story section, which includes several wood-sash windows and an opening to the deck over the ground-level entry.

North

The north façade faces a parking court and the Santa Fe River. Its composition is simple, with an entry set off-center in the facade, fitted with a wood panel door approached by four concrete steps (Photos 7 & 8). The corners show a slight batter near grade, recalling Rapp's early use of this motif, starting in 1908 with Colorado Supply Company Building (demolished). Beyond that allusion, the facade is unembellished: a flat, uninterrupted wall plane with two six-over-six wood-sash windows—one beside the entry and one above it—each capped with plain wood block heads. The result is a markedly austere elevation, stripped of the expressive elements of Rapp's work.

West

Similar to the east side, the west elevation encompasses both stories of the original residence. It now faces directly onto the three-story block of the El Castillo Life Plan Community, a 1960s apartment complex that substantially altered the setting and erased much of the home's original garden.

The two-story portion features a centered entry reached by an open concrete stair (Photo 9). The doorway contains a single-light door with framed sidelights and an operable transom above—a formal treatment uncommon in Rapp's work and more suggestive of Territorial Revival influence. Over the entry projects a small, wood-beam and stucco canopy that provides a decorative accent.

The first story fenestration is symmetrical, consisting primarily of two-over-two wood-sash windows, while the upper story displays an irregular arrangement, including one opening that appears to have been reduced in size. At the south end of the façade, three short vigas extend from the wall—one protruding through a wood lintel, resembling an animal horn in its odd placement.

The remainder of the west façade is one story in height, standing opposite the chimney section on Paseo de Peralta (Photo 10). Here, the elevation is defined by a deep, shaded

portal that frames a formal entry opening onto a raised concrete patio and, beyond, a view toward the El Castillo complex.

Extending roughly twenty feet, the portal is supported by two square posts with *zapata*-type corbels. Both the spanning beam and the corbels show signs of hand-tooling, their irregular profiles suggesting individual craftsmanship (Photo 11). The entry consists of paired glass doors flanked by ten-pane sidelights and topped with an operable transom (Photo 12).

The portal, possibly modified through later commercial renovations, feels visually compressed rather than domestic. From a distance, it appears wedged between the two-story main volume and the adjoining wing that originally held the service functions of the residence.

Service Wing

The midsection facing Paseo de Peralta appears to have originally contained a garage and a small portal, both now enclosed with walls and glazing. The presumed garage bay contains one of six small gallery spaces along the building's east façade (Photo 13). It features a ten-light wood door and three six-over-six wood-sash windows. The openings lack the wood block heads characteristic of the original residence. Immediately to the north is another gallery space created through the infill of the former portal, an alteration completed after the 1993 HBI survey (Photo 14).

On the opposite side of the garage, along the west elevation, is set of stairs leading to a subterranean area that was advertised in the 1940s as an apartment (Photo 15). The fenestration at both levels is a mix of hung-sash wood windows.

Workshop Area

Arranged on a slightly offset axis, the south wing is a roughly sixty-five-foot-long, one-story rectangular volume, likely constructed in the 1940s when the property served as the production and mail-order center for a wool necktie company.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

East

The east elevation, facing Paseo de Peralta, contains three small “storefronts” now used as galleries, built into what was originally a production area and later converted to apartments. Each unit has a single-leaf entry door—either glazed or wood—flanked by grouped six-over-six wood-sash windows (Photos 16-18). Unlike the windows of the main house, these lack wood heads. While the openings generally conform to a 1940s plan, some appear to be later replacements dating from the 1980s commercial conversion.

South

The south end is plain, broken only by a single offset sash window (Photo 19).

West

The west elevation represents the functional side of the south, or service, wing. It is pierced by several double-hung wood-sash windows in varied light configurations (Photos 20-23). None of the openings have projecting sills or wood heads, leaving the wall surface unadorned. The parapet is cut by two shallow V-shaped notches accommodating exposed wood trough canales for roof drainage.

Interior

The building was not accessible at the time of survey, but views through the windows indicate a heavily modified interior reflecting its successive changes in function.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Historical Overview

A River Parcel

According to the 1912 King's Official Map of Santa Fe, the parcel that now holds 924 Paseo de Peralta was owned by architect Isaac Hamilton Rapp (1854–1933) (Fig. 3). It is unclear when he acquired the land, but Rapp—hailed as the "Creator of the Santa Fe Style"—had been spending time in the city in the early 1900s.

His early commissions included oversight of construction at the Territorial Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb in 1901. With his partners William M. Rapp and A. C. Hendrickson, Rapp went on to design several major Santa Fe landmarks: the Elks Club and Theater (1911), Gross, Kelly & Co. Warehouse (1914), Sunmount Sanatorium (1914, 1920), and the Museum of Fine Arts (1916–17).

These projects brought him to Santa Fe regularly, where he and his wife, Jean Morrison Rapp, rented a residence on Palace Avenue. Despite owning the riverfront lot, they never built a home there.

Rapp died 1933, leaving the Santa Fe River lot and a ranch near Las Vegas, New Mexico, to his wife.[2] A 1935 aerial shows the Santa Fe land covered with trees.

A House of Her Own

For the first few years, Jean Morrison Rapp (Fig. 4) continued to live in Trinidad, Colorado, where her husband had maintained his office and where they had shared a home. After his death, she traveled widely but returned to Santa Fe to attend the annual Fiesta festivities. In early 1936 she announced that she would be moving to Santa Fe permanently.

Jean Morrison (1864–1937) was born in Ohio to Napoleon B. and Levinia Morrison. Her great-grandfather, James Smith of New Hampshire, had served in the American

[2] Deed Without Warranty, Jean M. Rapp, executrix of Isaac Hamilton Rapp, deceased, to Jean Morrison Rapp, recorded March 11, 1935, Book Y, Page 343, Instrument # 48411, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Revolution.[3] She studied at the University of Illinois and, in 1886, married architect Isaac Hamilton Rapp.

During her earlier years in Santa Fe, Jean Rapp was deeply engaged in civic and reform causes. She affiliated with the New Mexico woman's suffrage movement, declaring herself a suffragette as early as 1912 in correspondence with Ruth Alexander, society editor of the Santa Fe New Mexican.[4] She served as historian of the local Daughters of the American Revolution chapter, participated actively in the Woman's Board of Trade, and pursued an interest in Native cultures, assisting at times with archaeological and anthropological studies. She later chaired the Indian Conservation department of the New Mexico State Federation of Women's Clubs.

By the time she resettled in Santa Fe in her seventies, however, her activities centered more on entertaining than on reform.

In July 1936, Jean Morrison Rapp received a permit to construct a 13-room residence on the Castillo property, which the *Santa Fe New Mexican* predicted would be "one of the finest residences to be built here."[5] According to her obituary, friends recalled that the design for the house came from her husband's architectural firm, while Jean herself "had every point of the house planned just as she had dreamed of doing for many years."[6]

The $20,000 house was completed by the end of 1936 and quickly became a center of social activity, with Jean hosting teas and gatherings for friends and family. She cultivated a large garden at the rear of the property, a setting that reflected her love of beauty and hospitality. In her later years she also turned to painting and deepened her involvement in the arts, serving as president of the Art Museum Women's Board, which established a musical department at the museum.

---

[3] Susan Riviére Hetzel, *Lineage Book: National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, Volume XV* (Washington, D.C.: The Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, 1902, 310.

[4] FN: Elysia Tsosie, "Biographical Sketch of Jean Morrison Rapp," *Alexander Street*, https://documents.alexanderstreet.com/d/1009932358.https://documents.alexanderstreet.com/d/10099 32358

[5] "Building Permits for June Total $79,576," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 2, 1936, 4.

[6] "Mrs. Rapp Dies Suddenly at Here Saturday," *The Santa Fe New Mexican, Capital Examiner*, June 1, 1941, 14.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

On May 31, 1941, Jean Morrison Rapp died of a heart attack in her Castillo Street home, while looking out one of its windows onto the garden she had nurtured.[7]

After Jean Morrison Rapp's death, the property passed through her estate to her daughter, Helen R. Bunge of Chicago. Helen and her husband, George C. Bunge, held the house only briefly before selling it in 1944 to James W. Young, also of Chicago (Fig. 5).[8] Young was the creative director for the advertising firm J. Walter Thompson and a former senior official in the Department of Commerce under Franklin D. Roosevelt. He acquired the property supporting his son, Webb Young, a painter, then marketing Western wear in Santa Fe with his father's backing.

An Executive's Son and Tiemaker

Born in 1913 in Covington, Kentucky, and raised in Chicago, Webb Young first came to Santa Fe as a boy in the 1920s, spending summers at Jemez Canyon. He briefly studied drawing with local painter Gerald Cassidy. After a short stint in Chicago as a commercial illustrator and student at the Art Institute, he returned permanently to Santa Fe.[9]

In 1934, Webb Young opened a trading post called "Webb Young, Trader" in a storefront on Don Gaspar Avenue, in a space now occupied by the Meteorite, Mineral and Fossil Gallery. His shop stood near that of Preston McCrossen, an earlier textile merchant and artist who, in 1930, had helped the Spanish Colonial Arts Society establish the first retail outlet devoted to goods made by Hispanic weavers and other craftspeople.[10] That outlet, the Spanish Arts Shop in Sena Plaza, had been founded with the idealistic goal of helping Hispano artisans market and sell their work.[11] McCrossen later transformed this cooperative venture into his own more commercially driven business, McCrossen's Handwoven Textiles—a model that Young clearly sought to emulate.

[7] Ibid., 1.
[8] Warranty Deed, George C. and Helen R. Bunge to James W. Young, recorded December 27, 1944, Book 27, Page 117, Instrument # 75824, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[9] "Webb Young" [obituary], *The New Mexican*, February 20, 2005, B-2
[10] "Spanish Colonial Arts Have Permanent Center," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 16, 1930, 6.
[11] Daria Labinsky and Stan Hieronymus, *Frank Applegate of Santa Fe: Artist and Preservationist* (Albuquerque: LPD Press, 2001), 228-231.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Business records indicate Webb's father, James W. Young, was a "special partner" in the enterprise. From his tourist trading post, Webb sold sundry Western goods, including belts, bridles, saddle blankets, jewelry, pottery, and wool hand-woven neckties.

The company soon moved to Canyon Road, where Webb lived with his wife, Margaret Lane Webb. There, Young entered the tie-making business, employing Hispanic artisans to weave wool neckties on traditional looms. Visitors could watch the craftsmen at work, then purchase the finished ties in an adjoining showroom. By the late 1930s, he had expanded the enterprise into a mail-order operation.

His father analyzed advertising markets and encouraged him to invest in full-page color ads; one insert in *Life* reportedly generated orders for 26,000 ties.[12] Through advertisements in *Sunset*, *Esquire*, *The New Yorker*, *Newsweek*, and *Time*, Young promoted a catalog of wool neckties "Hand Woven by the Mountain People of New Mexico" (Fig. 6).

At the Castillo Street property, which Webb took over in late 1944, he likely constructed the one-story south arm of the building, variously referred to as the workshop or plant, where weavers produced the handwoven ties (Fig. 7). The building also included a "Spanish Crafts Shop," probably occupying the space between the house and the workshop.

The company was dissolved in 1947 and reincorporated as Webb Young Trader, Inc., this time without his father as a corporate officer.[13] That same year, James W. Young deeded the Castillo Street property to his son—perhaps signaling the end of the father-and-son advertising experiment.

The Castillo Street operation did not last long, as Webb soon relocated the business to Camino del Monte Sol. The mail-order enterprise declined amid postwar shifts in fashion and was closed in 1951, with the corporation formally dissolved in 1953.[14] Webb

[12] James W. Young Builds a Business by Copy Testing," *Advertising Age*, April 8, 1940, 11, no. 15: 24; David Ogilvy, *Ogilvy on Advertising* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1983), 147. The former article indicates the project was clearly the father's business. This led to establishing a production plant on Cerrillos Road.
[13] "Legal Advertisement," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, March 1929, 1947, 5.
[14] "Legal Advertisement," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, December 15, 1953, 3.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

continued to paint and draw, establishing himself as an emerging Western landscape artist and operating a one-person gallery on Canyon Road.[15]

An Architect's Side Project

Architect John Gaw Meem acquired the property in April 1948 for $45,500, purchasing it with his own funds.[16] At the time it consisted of two tracts: the residence and the former Webb Young, Trader plant and shipping facility.

Within a month, Meem secured a permit for a $8,000 project to convert both the house and the mail-order production building into apartments.[17] That same year he brought on his third and final partner, William Buckley. Twenty-four years his junior, Buckley was an Illinois architect who had arrived in Santa Fe earlier in 1948 to work for Meem's chief competitor, Willard C. Kruger and Associates.[18]

Buckley prepared a floor plan for a set of drawings titled "Additions & Alterations to a Building for John Gaw Meem" (Fig. 8). Meem himself produced a partial elevation, showing only modest exterior changes—lowering a lintel, adding a new door on the east elevation, and replacing several windows on the west. No new massing or fenestration patterns were introduced. Most of the work was confined to the interior, where former bedrooms and workrooms were reconfigured as apartments.

The Castillo Apartments

The remodeled complex, informally known as the Castillo Apartments, appears to have opened the following year with seven units, a number that had increased to eleven by the time of the 1950 census.[19] Its tenants reflected a cross-section of Santa Fe's mid-

[15] Webb Young" [obituary], *The New Mexican*, February 20, 2005, B-2
[16] Statutory Warranty Deed, Webb Young Trader, Inc. to John Gaw Meem, recorded April 29, 1948, Book 34, Page 491, Instrument # 89057, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[17] "Former Weaving Plante Revamped for Apartments," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 20, 1948, 2.
[18] John W. Murphey and Alan "Mac" Watson, *John Gaw Meem Office* (National Register of Historic Places Nomination), Santa Fe: New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, 2018, 45.
[19] U.S. Census Bureau, National Archives at Washington, DC; Washington, D.C.; Seventeenth Census of the United States, 1950; Year: 1950; Census Place: Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Roll: 3578; Page: 2; Enumeration District: 26-20.

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

century professional class: a druggist, two secretaries, two sales agents, an electrical engineer, and Supreme Court judge Eugene D. Lujan, the only Hispanic renter. Several households included young children, while a notable proportion of the occupants were single women. Among them was Cecile Janin Wimer, a 58-year-old widow employed as a drafter with the State Highway Department.[20] The record is unclear as to who owned or managed the apartments.

The Castillo Apartments fit into the wider pattern of postwar conversions and small-scale infill that addressed Santa Fe's acute housing shortage in the late 1940s.

Later Commercial Use

The property remained in apartment use through the mid-1960s, as confirmed by city directories and newspaper accounts (hospital admissions, police reports, and the like). A significant change came in the summer of 1964 with the completion of the El Castillo Apartments, then Santa Fe's largest apartment complex. Financed by the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, the development consisted of three three-story courtyard buildings containing 119 units and three heated pools. Rising directly behind the old Rapp residence, it became a looming backdrop that dwarfed the once-graceful home.

Soon after, Castillo Street was converted into Paseo de Peralta, the new downtown bypass known as "the Loop." The road project affected many adjoining properties and brought zoning changes that opened the way for new uses. The old Rapp residence was first taken over by Marc W. McAuliffe & Associates, a real estate concern. Within a short time the tenant mix expanded to include a hypnotherapist, a diet center, and a law office. The property was renumbered as 924 Paseo de Peralta.

With Santa Fe's rediscovery in the 1980s, the building shifted toward a wholly tourist-oriented program of tenants. These included Discover Santa Fe, a tour guide company, the Mudd-Carr Gallery, and the Nambé Mills showroom. The smaller apartments and the former Webb Young, Trader plant were converted into gallery suites.

[20] Ibid.; Hudspeth Directory Company, *Hudspeth Directory Company*, *Santa Fe City Directory, 1949* (El Paso: Hudspeth Directory Company, 1949), 119, and 483.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Commercial renovations included the replacement of windows and doors, the addition of signage, and likely interior reconfigurations for retail floor space, upgraded utilities, and new finishes suited to public use. At least two spaces (the garage and a nearby portal) were converted to commercial storefronts.

Together these alterations brought the building to its present appearance.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Evaluation of Historical Status

The building at 924 Paseo de Peralta has a layered history, reflecting several threads of Santa Fe's cultural and architectural development. Over time it acquired associations—some quite brief—with a number of noteworthy individuals and events. However, these do not include attribution of the original house as a posthumous work of architect Isaac Hamilton Rapp. More plausibly, his widow, Jean Morrison Rapp, played a leading role in the design, assisted by an unidentified architect or builder.

Later phases of the building's evolution are less well documented, though it appears likely that Webb Young, Trader, was responsible for constructing the workshop addition to the south. Subsequent commercial renovations have diminished the domestic character that originally led the *Santa Fe New Mexican* to describe the property, soon after completion, as a "beautiful new home."

While the building no longer conveys those early residential associations, it remains a well-built structure retaining a high degree of historic integrity—except along the east elevation of the former service wing.

Taking these factors into account, it is recommended that the property retain its Contributing status, and that the following elevations be considered primary façades:

1. East elevation of the historic residence, extending from the one-story section with chimney northward to the north end of the two-story section.
2. North elevation.
3. West elevation, extending from the original house southward to the south end of the portal.

This recommendation excludes later, non-original design elements, materials, windows, and doors.

© John W. Murphey / Architectural History Services. All rights reserved. This Historic Cultural Property Inventory form is the intellectual property of the author and is provided for regulatory review purposes only. No reproduction, distribution, or other use is permitted without the author's written consent, except as required by the City of Santa Fe Historic Preservation Division and related governmental review bodies.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Illustrations




Figure 1: Colored current floor plan.

Green: 1936 house
Orange: 1936 service wing
Blue: c.1940s workshop area
Red: c.1980s alterations and infill

Floor plan courtesy of John Padilla, Architect.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 2: Leonard and Rosina Smith House, undated.
John W. Murphey, *334 Garcia Street, Santa Fe: The F. Leonard and Rosina Smith House—Robert O. and Rosina B. Brown Residence, A Brief History* (Santa Fe: Architectural History Services, July 23, 2018).

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Figure 3: N. L. King, "Official Map of the City of Santa Fe," 1912. Lot then owned by Isaac Hamilton Rapp.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 4: Jean Morrison Rapp, 1921. Eva Scott Fényes, photographer. ID # 1410.04.186. Courtesy of the Acequia Madre House Archive.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Figure 5: James W. Young, undated.
Courtesy of The One Club for Creativity, New York.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



HAND WOVEN

BY THE MOUNTAIN PEOPLE OF NEW MEXICO

A unique gift for friends, business associates, customers. No law yet against choosing for yourself, too. Direct from weavers, $1 each; 6 for $5; postpaid.*

For over 200 years the Spanish people who settled New Mexico have been raising sheep and weaving wool. Their looms and their skill have been handed down from father to son. And the colorful landscape in which these mountain people live and work has made natural artists of them.

A few years ago I began to take the lovely fabrics these people weave and have them made up into such stunning ties as are shown here. I advertised in a small way, and high grade people all over the country began to send to me for them. This color page is "shooting the works" for me. I'm just gambling that you will like these newest patterns when you see them.

Fascinating texture

These ties are 100% virgin wool. That is what gives them their soft, rich colors and fascinating texture. And that is what gives the man who wears them that informal, tweedy look which so many men now seem to want.

These ties are not only hand woven. They are also *hand cut*, to generous length, and so as to tie in either a loose or tight knot; *hand sewn* so that they always hang straight; and *hand pressed* so that the fabric stays "live."

And how they wear! They slip easily in stiff or soft collars and don't fray where the collar rubs. They can be cleaned again and again. And I defy you to twist or rumple them so that wrinkles won't come out overnight. One customer I have says that saves his valet pressing!

Special Christmas Gift Services

These ties make such an appreciated Christmas gift that some of my business men customers buy them by the hundreds, for friends, customers, salesmen, etc. My special quantity price of 6 ties for $5 makes this a pretty easy thing to do. If you want me to mail such gift ties direct from here I will gladly do it. I will enclose your card, or sign your name to an attractive one I have. I will put a jolly Christmas seal on the package and mark "Not to be opened, etc." No extra charge for this service.

But perhaps you doubt your ability to pick ties to please your friends. I can take care of that with my Gift Certificate. Just tell me the number of ties you would like Old George to have; send me his name and address; and the proper amount of money. I will mail him the cheery Gift Certificate, with your name on it; and with it a handsome booklet showing 42 ties in color, and telling the interesting story of these mountain weavers. Then Old George can not only select his own, but learn the story behind the gift. But—because of extra handling and postage—you must send me 10¢ extra for each such certificate, if to go by regular mail; 15¢ if to go by air mail.

Why not make up your list now—please your friends—and save yourself further shopping?

How to order

All ties are $1 each; 6 ties for $5; postpaid. (But because of rising wool costs these prices are not guaranteed after Jan. 1, 1942.)

For Special Air Mail Service on packages of ties ADD the following amounts for extra postage: 1 tie 12¢; 2 ties 24¢; 3 ties 30¢; 4 ties 36¢; 5 ties 40¢; and 5¢ more for each tie over 6. Shipment guaranteed same day order received.

For each Gift Certificate ADD 10¢ if to go by regular mail; 15¢ if to go by air mail.

Make payment by personal check or bank draft.

Order by numbers shown opposite each tie here. Give me one or two second choices if you can, in case I run out of some pattern you want.

I cannot fill orders for any foreign countries except Canada and Mexico—and, of course, U.S. Possessions and Territories. Kindly typewrite or print all names and addresses. I am not much of a handwriting expert.

I must be frank

I must tell you that these weavers, in true Spanish style, start celebrating *La Navidad* pretty early in the month. So please send your order quickly if you want to be sure of Christmas delivery on the patterns you select. I try to fill every order on the day it is received, and usually do; but you know what the postal people are up against at this season. Every order on a MONEY BACK basis. Read my Unqualified Guarantee shown above.

UNQUALIFIED GUARANTEE

If any tie I send you does not please you, for any reason whatsoever, return it within ten days for exchange, or get your money back without quibble. Could I say fairer than that?

WEBB YOUNG, *Trader*

Patio 1200, Santa Fe, New Mexico

*So says Bruce Beckmann, General Sales Manager of Pid Bros., Brooklyn, N. Y., and former official of the U. S. Department of Commerce, who writes me: "Your ties are absolutely unique—in beauty, in style, and in wearing quality. I have worn practically nothing else for two years, and don't see how you sell such ties at such a low price."

Figure 6: 1941 magazine advertisement for Webb Young, Trader.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Figure 7: April 1947 advertisement for Webb Young, Trader, showing the Castilo Street location. Courtesy of *The Santa Fe New Mexican*.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Figure 8: Drawings from Meem Job File No. 560, May 1948.
Courtesy John Gaw Meem Collection, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 9: November 10, 1958, aerial photograph.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Survey Photographs

(All images taken by Giulia Caporuscio on September 28, 2025, unless otherwise noted)



Photo 2: December 2023 Google Street View image. The vehicle's elevated cameras provide a full sweep of the building's east façade.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Original House



Photo 3: East elevation, one-story section. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 4: East elevation, one-story section. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 5: East elevation. Entry. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 6: East elevation. Entry. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 7: East and north elevations. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 8: North elevation. Camera facing south.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 9: West elevation. Camera facing up.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 10: West elevation. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 11: West elevation. Camera facing up.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 12: West elevation. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Service Wing



Photo 13: East elevation. Infilled garage. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 14: East elevation. Infilled portal. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 15: West elevation. Basement apartment below. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Workshop Area



Photo 16: East elevation, north section. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 17: East elevation, middle section. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 18: East elevation, south section. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 19: South elevation. Camera facing north.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 20: West elevation, north section. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 21: West elevation, middle section. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 22: West elevation, south section. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Jean Morrison Rapp Residence/ Castillo Apartments/ Webb Young, Trader/ Nambé, et al.**	**2. Location:** **924 Paseo de Peralta** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District -Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: 051610626** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 23 West elevation oblique. Camera facing northeast.

March 17, 2026

Historic Districts Review Board
Planning & Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe

RE: Historic Status Review Request
924 Paseo De Peralta

Chair Rios and Members of the Historic Districts Review Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the building's historic status at 924 Paseo de Peralta. The property is currently listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

On January 27, 2026, the Board heard the status case for the property and assigned two designations to the building: contributing and significant. As discussed during the February 10, 2026, meeting, assigning dual statuses to a single building has created administrative challenges for staff and practical difficulties for the property owner in maintaining, rehabilitating, and modifying the structure.

The challenges associated with dual designations include:

- Reduced clarity in communication with staff regarding permissible work on the building
- The potential for conflicting guidance due to overlapping contributing and significant criteria
- Increased likelihood of requiring exceptions, even for routine maintenance

Collectively, these issues create unnecessary obstacles to effective preservation planning for the property.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask that the building retain its contributing status, in line with Mr. Duran's recommendations in the January 27, 2026, staff report. As defined, a contributing building is over 50 years old and maintains the character of the historic district. By identifying primary façades and key architectural features, the structure's integrity can be preserved with greater clarity about which materials and design elements must be maintained.

Additionally, Isaac Rapp's legacy will be honored by renaming the building the Rapp Building on the El Castillo campus. The property owners are committed to preserving the integrity of their architectural design as part of that recognition.

I appreciate your consideration.

Thank you for considering our request. Please let me know if you need any additional information.
Sincerely,

John A. Padilla, AIA
Architect

P.O. Box 22986
Santa Fe, NM 87502
505.660.1682
japadillaarchitect@gmail.com
padillaarchitect.com

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: **March 24, 2026**

TO: **Historic Districts Review Board**

VIA: **Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director** HLL
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director *MRM*
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager, *GM*

FROM: **Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division** LgM

2026-011831-HDRB. 1489 Upper Canyon Rd. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Non-Contributing. Christopher Purvis, agent for Susan Jancar, owner, requests approval for new construction of a 1,640 sq. ft. structure to a height of 14'-8" where the maximum allowable height is 18'-9" and for a 4'-7" tall by 20'-0" long metal vehicular gate. An exception is requested to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ **District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.**

__x__ **Historic Inventory Form**

__x__ **Zoning Review Sheet**

__x__ **Other**: Previous Case Documents

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ **Proposal Letter**

__x__ **Site Plan/Floor Plan**

__x__ **Elevations**

__x__ **Photographs**

____ **Other:**

HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD ACTION – MARCH 10, 2026:

At the Historic District Review Board (the Board) hearing on March 10, 2026, the Board considered Case 2026-011831-HDRB. The Board approved the applicant's request to construct a new 1,640 sq. ft. residential structure directly west of the existing main residential structure. The Board postponed its decision on the applicant's request to approve a metal gate (with exception) and yard wall. The Board requested a redesign of the gate and additional information from staff regarding the record of previous approvals at the property. The Board requested that the yard wall not be attached to the garage unless the applicant came forward with a revised HCPI and a request for a status review with applicable primary façade designations. The Board requested that the metal gate be redesigned and suggested that the metal gate, as constructed, would not fit the streetscape of Upper Canyon Road. The applicant is returning to the Board on March 24, 2026, for a hearing with alternative designs for the gate and is proposing a pedestrian gate constructed of coyote fence latillas adjacent to the garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

In addition to the existing vehicular gate design, the Applicant has proposed three (3) alternative gate designs for the Board's consideration (see Figures 2-5). The existing vehicular gate design requires an exception to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards. Staff finds that the exception criteria to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards have not been met and recommends denial of the existing metal gate. Staff recommends approval of design option two (see Figure 3) as the fences in the area are all latilla or split rail fences, and this option would blend with the other streetscape gates. In the staff's recommendation, design option two (2) would not require an exception to the design standards of the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Additionally, staff recommends approval of the height of the yard wall and gate as constructed. The Applicant has proposed installing a coyote fence with a pedestrian gate adjacent to the garage. The new pedestrian gate would replace a portion of the stuccoed yard wall that currently connects to the garage. The new pedestrian gate would be separated from the garage by 4 inches, and the staff finds that the design complies with 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Sample motions:

Two motions may be required in this case.

a. In case 2026-011831-HDRB, 1489 Upper Canyon Road, approve/deny the exception to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards to construct a metal vehicular gate, finding that the exception criteria have/have not been met.
b. In case 2026-011831-HDRB, 1489 Upper Canyon Road, approve/deny the yard wall.

Should the Board deny the exception request, the applicant shall return with an alternative proposal for review before proceeding to a building permit.

The property lies within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. See Chapter 14, SFCC, Article 14-4.2. There may be archaeological concerns associated with this project, and archaeological clearance may be required.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The single-family residence located at 1489 Canyon Road is designated as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The Spanish-Pueblo Revival structure was built pre-1944 and comprises approximately 750 sq. ft. of roofed area. The property also houses a garage on the southeast corner. The garage is not statused.

The property was approved for a coyote fence lattilla gate, and yard wall under case 2021-003510-ADMIN. The fence permit 2022-21983-WALR was issued in 2022 with a revised letter and drawings for the administrative approval, which approved a stuccoed yard wall where the coyote fence was previously planned between the gate and the garage. The gate was to remain a coyote fence gate. However, this approval limited the height of the yard wall to 4'-0". The height limit for the administrative approval is at the maximum height allowed to be approved administratively, as any yard wall over 4'0" must come to the HDRB for review.

The metal gate was installed at approximately 4'7" high and 20' wide with a rust colored patina. The yard wall is constructed starting at a height of 4'-7" (equal to the height of the gate) and steps up in height to 5'6" where it connects to the garage. The maximum allowable height for the yard wall and gate in this property's street facing fences is 5'7".

PREVIOUS CASE SUMMARIES:

ARC:
No archaeological clearance has been issued for the property.

HDRB:
There are no Historic Districts Review Board cases on file for the property.

ADMINISTRATIVE:

The property was approved for a re-roof of the residence under case 2026-011905-ADMIN.

The property was approved for a coyote fence, latilla gate, and yard wall under case 2021-003510-ADMIN. The fence permit 2022-21983-WALR was issued in 2022 with a revised letter and drawings for the administrative approval, which approved a stuccoed yard wall where the coyote fence was previously planned between the gate and the garage. However, this approval limited the height of the yard wall to 4'-0". The yard wall is constructed to a height of 4'-7" (equal to the height of the gate) and steps up in height to 5'6" where it connects to the garage. The maximum allowable height for the yard wall and gate in this property's street facing fence is 5'7".




Figure 1: Approved site plan 2021-003510-ADMIN

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:

The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

1) Installation of an existing 4'-7" tall by 20'-00" long metal vehicular gate where the maximum allowable height is 5'-7" (67"). An exception is requested to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards for the use of material not in keeping with the streetscape. This area was approved for a coyote fence latilla gate under case 2021-003510-ADMIN to a maximum height of 4'-0", whereas the gate that was installed is metal and 4'-7" in height.
2) Raise the height of the previously approved yard wall from 4'-0" to the height of 4'-7", stepping up to 5'-6" as constructed. The maximum allowable height for the yard wall and gates along the street of this property is 5'7".
3) Install a pedestrian gate of latillas in the yard wall nearest the garage.




Figure 2. Existing Metal Gate.

The applicant has provided three design options for the Historic Districts Review Board:

1) Remove steel panels and install wooden balusters




Figure 3: Option one elevation with the wooden balusters.

2) Remove all steel panels and install vertical stained wood boards in the openings




Figure 4: Option two elevation with the wood boards in the openings

3) Remove steel panels and install a 2x2 hardware cloth in the openings




Figure 5: Option three with hardware cloth mesh inserts



Figure 6. Overview of 1489 Canyon Road.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards: The applicant requests an exception to install an existing 4'-07" tall by 20'-00" long metal vehicular gate.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: The use of rusted steel for the gate material does not damage the character of the district because the patina on the steel and the pattern of the frame softens the effect of the steel, so that it blends with the color of the other elements to be found in the streetscape

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is not met. The solid massed metal gate adversely impacts the Upper Canyon Road streetscape; however, staff would consider conditionally approving the metal gate if the applicant were amenable to installing a less obtrusive and massive gate with some fenestration to soften the appearance.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: This gate is required to stop the parking of people using the Dorothy Stewart trail within the courtyard, which creates a liability and unsafe environment for the owners and the public.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is not met. Staff understands the liability aspects to people wondering about the property, and a more fenestrated gate would provide the security measure needed while not adversely impacting the streetscape.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: This lot has a narrow area to use, and so allowing the owners to have a gate there allows them to retain the safety of their yard, and making it in steel will be more durable than other gate materials, which is part of the heterogeneous character of Santa Fe in the 21st century.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is not met. The applicant has not provided a full range of options that the Board can decisively consider, given the location, material, and streetscape.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-4.6 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

A. General Provisions

1. Purpose

To promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of Santa Fe and to ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City, the Governing Body deems it essential to preserve the qualities relating to the history and culture of Santa Fe, maintain a harmonious outward appearance to preserve property values, and attract residents and tourists alike. The specific purposes of this section are to preserve qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, such as the following:

I. Continue the existence and preservation of historic areas and buildings;

II. Continued construction of buildings in Santa Fe's historic styles; and

III. General harmony as to architectural style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

2. Conflicting Standards

I. Zoning District Regulations

All designated landmarks and all properties located in historic districts shall be subject to the regulations of the base zoning district in which they are located, except for height as regulated in Section 14-4.6E, *General Design Standards for*

All Historic Districts. When the requirements of the base zoning district conflict with the requirements of this Section 14-4.6, *Historic Districts,* the more restrictive standard shall apply.

II. Multiple Overlay Regulations

When a designated landmark or property located in a historic district is also located within another overlay, and there is a conflict between the requirements of the historic district and the other applicable overlay district, the more restrictive standard shall apply.

5. Boundaries

a. The boundaries for the historic districts are as shown on the Official Zoning Map and incorporated in this Code by reference.

b. If the boundary line of a historic district bisects or crosses a property without encompassing the entire lot, the applicable requirements of the historic district shall be as determined by the Planning and Land Use Director.

6. Design of Buildings

Full responsibility for the design and development of structures is upon the applicant. The case file of any prior application related to a property is available for review by the applicant upon request.

7. Nonconforming Buildings and Structures

Any building or structure in the historic district that does not meet the standards for architectural style outlined in this section shall be considered nonconforming, and subject to the provisions of Section 14-1.13(), *Legal Nonconforming Structures,* unless given special approval by the HDRB for architectural or historic interest, or unless individually entered in the state register of cultural properties or in the national register of historic places or designated as significant on either register.

B. Minimum Maintenance Requirements

All historic landmarks and all buildings and structures in the historic districts shall be preserved against decay and deterioration and maintained free of structural defects. The owner or other person having legal custody and control of the building or structure shall repair such building or structure if any of the following defects are found:

1. Parts attached to a building or structure in a manner that they may fall and injure people or property;
2. Deteriorated or inadequate foundation;
3. Defective or deteriorated flooring or floor supports or flooring for floor supports of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
4. Walls or parts of walls, partitions, gates, fences, or other vertical supports that split, lean, list, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration or that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
5. Ceilings or parts of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports, or other horizontal components that sag, split, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration, or that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
6. Fireplaces or chimneys that list, bulge, or settle due to defective material or deterioration, or that are of insufficient size or strength to carry imposed loads safely;
7. Deteriorated, crumbling, or loose plaster or stucco;
8. Deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, foundations, or floors, including broken windows or doors;
9. Lack of weather protection or defective weather protection for exterior wallcovering, including lack of paint, or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering; or
10. Any fault or default in the building or structure that renders it structurally unsafe or not properly watertight.

C. Buildings with Significant or Contributing Historic Status

1. Purpose

Historic designation is intended to address the following:

I. Recognizing each structure as a physical record of its time, place, and use.

II. Preventing changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings;

III. Preserving and retaining changes to structures that have acquired historic importance in their own right, recognizing that most structures change over time;

IV. Preserving distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure; and

V. Avoiding making new additions and related or adjacent new construction in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

2. Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status

I. Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing," as defined in Section 14-9.3, *General Definitions.* Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of structures located in the historic districts.

II. HDRB Authority to Review Status Designation

a. The HDRB may change the status of a structure or designate a status for a structure that has no status designated.

b. A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through a survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."

c. When the HDRB designates a structure as contributing, it shall also specify which facades of the structure are primary.

V. Restoration of Status

If a property owner makes changes to a structure without the proper City approvals, which result in the lowering of the structure's status, staff or the Board may require the property owner to restore the structure such that its former status is restored.

3. Review by Historic Districts Review Board Required

I. Except where this chapter provides for review by staff, the HDRB shall review all applications for new construction, alteration, or demolition in the historic districts and of landmark structures throughout the city, based on the standards set forth in this section.

II. The historic board shall judge any proposed alteration or new structure for harmony with adjacent buildings, preservation of historical and characteristic qualities, and conformity to the standards for architectural style set forth in this section.

Ill. The HDRB may approve, deny, approve with conditions, or, with the consent of the applicant, postpone an application.

a. For applications approved with conditions, no permit shall be issued until the HDRB conditions have been met.

b. An application that is postponed shall be heard at a date agreed upon by the HDRB and the applicant.

IV. No permit shall be issued until the time for appeal to the Governing Body has expired.

4. Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All development located within the historic districts and subject to this section shall comply with all applicable general development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6E), *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts,* as well as any applicable

specific development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6G), *Additional District-Specific Design Standards.*

D. Exceptions

The HDRB may grant an exception to the regulations set forth in this section, provided that such exception does not exceed the underlying zoning, except when the board of adjustment grants a variance. Staff shall determine whether an exception to general design and preservation standards described in Section 14-4.6E is required and shall recommend that the HDRB approve, approve with conditions, or deny the exception.

1. Height

   If an applicant requests approval of a height in the historic district that exceeds the underlying zoning district requirement, the applicant shall first receive an exception to this section. If the HDRB approves a requested height exception, the applicant shall proceed to the Board of Adjustment or other applicable city body for consideration of the proposed variance, as described in Section 14-2.1H.1.

2. Design Standards

   The HDRB may review and grant or deny requests for exceptions to all provisions of Section 14-4.6E, *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts* (except provisions regarding Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks). 14-4.6G) for construction or alterations within the historic districts, and Section 14-7.61) for signs in historic districts. Exceptions are project-specific and do not apply to the subject property in perpetuity.

   I. Procedure

      When requesting exceptions, the applicant shall use the procedures for public notice and hearing in Section 0), unless the applicant also requests a variance to the underlying zoning. In such a case, the applicant for the historic ordinance exception shall not be required to publish a separate legal ad in the local newspaper. Publication of the agenda is still required.

   II. Approval Criteria

      To approve an exception, the HDRB shall make findings of fact that the applicant conclusively demonstrated that the requested exceptions comply with all the criteria listed as follows:

      a. Do not damage the character of the district;
      b. Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare; and
      c. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

3. Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks

The HDRB is responsible for reviewing and granting or denying requests for exceptions from regulations in Section 14-4.6F. The HDRB may grant exceptions and impose conditions thereon to Section 14-4.6F) for the height of structures within the historic districts as specified in Section 14-4.6F.1).

Exceptions are project-specific and do not apply to the subject property in perpetuity.

I. Procedure

When requesting exceptions, the applicant shall use the procedures for public notice and hearing in Section 0), unless the applicant also requests a variance to the underlying zoning. In such a case, the applicant for the historic ordinance exception shall not be required to publish a separate legal ad in the local newspaper. Publication of the agenda is still required.

II. Approval Criteria

To approve an exception, the HDRB shall make findings of fact that the applicant conclusively demonstrated that the requested exceptions comply with all the criteria listed as follows:

a. Do not damage the character of the streetscape;
b. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;
c. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts;
d. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;
e. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and
f. Provide the least negative impact with respect to the Purpose of this section as set forth in Section 14-4.6A.1.

E. General Design Standards for All Historic Districts

These standards shall apply to all additions or alterations to existing structures in the Historic Districts. Contributing, significant, and landmark structures may be subject to specific additional restrictions and district-specific standards in Section 14-4.6G).

I. General

I. The historic status of a property with a historic status designation of significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status is prohibited.

II. If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application may be denied.

III. For the regulations of this subsection, all facades of a significant structure are primary facades.

2. Building Additions

I. Design

a. Building additions that meet the standards of Section 14-4.6G.2), *Downtown and Eastside Historic District,* shall continue to meet those standards, in addition to the standards set forth in this section.

b. Building additions shall have similar materials, architectural treatments and styles, features, and details as the existing structure, but shall be distinguishable from and not attempt to duplicate the existing structure.

II. Size and Location

a. Building additions are not permitted on primary facades.

b. All building additions shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the primary facade.

c. Building additions shall not exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the building's historic footprint and shall not exceed 50 percent of the historic length in linear feet of the primary facade.

d. To the extent architecturally practicable, new building additions shall be attached to any existing non-primary facade of a structure rather than attaching them to the primary facade of a structure.

III. Height

a. The maximum height of building additions to significant and landmark structures shall be at least six inches lower than the parapet or equivalent roof feature of the existing adjacent connecting facade.

b. Building additions to contributing structures shall be no more than one additional story higher than the existing structure. To the extent architecturally practicable, two-story additions shall be set to the rear or the side rear of the structure. When an additional story is to be placed upon an existing contributing structure, that footprint may be no greater than fifty percent of the footprint of the existing structure, subject to the provisions of Subsection A(1) above. For the purposes of this paragraph, an additional story shall not exceed twelve (12) feet from the existing rooftop to the highest point of that story.

IV. Remodeling to Increase Height

a. For remodeling of an existing significant or landmark structure, no increase in height of the structure is permitted.

b. For remodeling an existing contributing structure, a height increase may be permitted through approval of an exception, as described in Section 14-4.6D.

V. Rooftop Equipment

Rooftop equipment, including but not limited to solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment, may only be installed on contributing and

noncontributing structures and shall not be publicly visible, nor shall a parapet be raised to conceal such equipment.

3. Porches and Portals

   Existing porches or portals on significant and landmark structures, and on primary facades of contributing structures, shall not be permanently enclosed.

4. Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

   I. For all facades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary facades of contributing structures:
      a. Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double-pane glass may be used. No window opening shall be widened or narrowed.
      b. Window depth and other characteristics of window and door fenestration shall be preserved.
      c. No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.
      d. No historic opening shall be closed.

   II. For all facades of contributing, significant, and landmark structures:
      a. Architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows shall be repaired rather than replaced.
      b. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities.
      c. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical, or pictorial evidence.

5. Roofs

   The existing historic roof styles and materials shall be maintained or replaced in kind if necessary. The addition of dormers or other roof features should only be considered when they are an existing historic feature of the structure.

6. Surface Cleaning

   The surface cleaning of structures shall employ the gentlest means possible. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials are not permitted.

7. Archaeological Resources

   Discovery of archaeological resources made during the development of a historic property shall be referred to the Archaeological Review Committee. See Section 14-2.1G.1.V.c, *Unexpected Discoveries.*

8. Signs

Sign applications and required submittals shall be reviewed by the Planning and Land Use Department. Approval or denial shall be indicated by the department on the application for the construction permit and on each of the required submittals.

9. Murals

If an application impacts a mural funded through the art in public places program or is otherwise within the scope of the arts commission's enabling responsibilities,

The HDRB may refer the application to the City Arts Commission. If a proposed mural does not meet the criteria in the historic ordinance, an exception is required.

10. Pedestrian-Oriented Areas

I. The HDRB shall recommend to the Governing Body appropriate streets or portions of streets within the historic district to be set aside for pedestrian-oriented areas.

II. The Governing Body may set aside the areas recommended, provided that three-fourths of the property owners adjoining the street or portion of street affected have given consent thereto.

III. Such pedestrian-oriented areas shall be closed to vehicular traffic, and any improvements made by the City in the public right-of-way within the area shall be for pedestrian purposes.

IV. No pedestrian-oriented area shall be set aside unless there is adequate space available conveniently related to the area for vehicle parking. The HDRB's recommendation to the Governing Body shall include a statement of the available parking spaces.

2. **Downtown and Eastside Historic District**

The governing body recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the city from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with adobe, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a development from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

I. Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with adobe, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

a. With rare exception, buildings are of one story, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the buildings are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight slope and surrounded on at

least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the walls or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the walls except to cover an enclosed portal or porch formed by setting back a portion of the wall or to form an exterior portal, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns.

Two-story construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the

floor of the second story. Facades are flat, varied by inset portales, exterior portales, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-sprouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved, and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, open slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding walls.

b. All exterior walls of a building are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under portales, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a wall under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color or have mural decorations.
c. Solid wall space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;
d. The rules as to flat roofs shall not be constructed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof structures, but such structures other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the street on which the building fronts;
e. True old Santa Fe style buildings are made of adobe with a mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the adobe effect can be simulated is permissible, provided that the exterior walls are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating adobe, laid on smoothly, is required; and
f. It is characteristic of Old Santa Fe style commercial buildings to place a portal so that it covers the entire

sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

II. Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

a. No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks, or other design elements;
b. The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;
c. No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;
d. No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;
e. The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish, and of relatively smooth texture. Facade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complementary colors. Windows, doors, and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles, except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic, and
f. Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

NEW MEXICO HISTORIC BUILDING INVENTORY FORM

H1198

building threatened? yes	surveyed date by mb	county Santa Fe	ID no. 051600485
field map Santa Fe, New Mexico	number 1	UTM reference zone 12 13 easting	northing

location description: 1489 Canyon


city/town: Santa Fe

land grant/reservation: ~~land grant/reservation~~


building name:

legal description: tnsp 17 N range 10 E sec 26 SE ¼ SW ¼

film roll by no. 22	negative nos. 9	loc. of neg. HPB



plan shape



date of construction: Pre 1944 estimate ____ actual

source: Directory

use
present: residential
other: ____
historic: residential
other: ____

condition
___ excellent X good
___ fair ___ deteriorating

degree of remodeling
X minor ___ moderate ___ major
describe:

style	foundation material
Pueblo Revival	Not vis
	wall material/surface: Stucco

architectural features

Windows - 2 & 3 lite steel casement, no lintels exp
Portal - shed roof, lumber posts, corbels, T beam, timpoise
Door - 4 lite/panel
3 masonry chimneys
Canales - metal over vigas
Garage - pueblo style, metal clad overhead door

surroundings: Residential

relationship to surroundings
X similar ___ not similar

district potential
X yes ___ no

significance
___ eligible X of interest ___ none

if eligible, why?

comments
wall
hedge
wire fence
wood fence
landscape
street trees
stone curb
0 setback
acequia

Streetscape

associated buildings? X yes

what type?
Garage

if inventoried, list ID nos.

see back? ___ yes

1489 Upper Canyon Rd

CITY OF SANTA FE

HISTORIC PRELIMINARY ZONING REVIEW
PLUD-20

PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to a public hearing in front of the Historic District Review Board (HDRB) all applicants must obtain Historic Districts Preliminary Zoning Review (HPZR) from the Current Planning Division. The HPZR does not grant zoning approval. Following design approval from the HDRB, final zoning review will be performed at the time of building permit.

Applicants must submit complete and accurate information for review. Incomplete submittals will not be processed. All HPZR requests must be submitted to Current Planning via zoningcounter@santafenm.gov

PROJECT INFORMATION

Date 10/23/2025	Property Owner of Record Susan Jancar						
Applicant/Agent Contact Christopher Purvis							
Site Address 1489 Upper Canyon Road, Santa Fe NM 87505							
Suite or Space #	Subdivision Name Harvey Plat						
Lot #	Block #			Total Roof Area (square feet) 2760			
Lot Coverage % 8.8	Lot Size (square feet) 31406						
Proposed Construction Description	Build New Residence, convert existing residence to Guest House						
The following documents are required for review as applicable:	/ Legal Lot of Record / Building Plans / Existing site plan w/ setbacks / Proposed site plan w/ setbacks / Existing & Proposed Elevations Development Plan						
Zoning District R-2	Overlay Districts Escarpment Flood Plain Other						
Proposed Setbacks	Front EX / 20'8""	Rear EX/49'6"	Left Side EX/39'6"	Right Side EX/39'3"			
Required Setbacks	Front 7FT	Rear 15FT	Left Side 5 FT	Right Side 5FT			
Proposed Height 14'8"	Max Height hdrb	Parking Required 3	Provided 3	Bike Parking	Provided		

Historic Planning Case Manager Paul Duran

If you selected "other," please write in the name of your case manager.

ADDITIONAL SUBMITALS (IF APPLICABLE)

Y N Affidavit Restricting Use of an Accessory Structure Containing a Bathroom or Kitchen		
Y N Setback Affidavit and Agreement		
Y N Site Visibility Triangle	Y N Escarpment Slope Analysis	Y N Flood Plain Grading Plan


This hereby certifies that the information provided for preliminary zoning review is accurate and will not be modified without consulting the Land Use Department staff prior to HDRB hearing.

CHRISTOPHER PURVIS Owner / Applicant Agent

To Be Completed by Land Use Department Staff

PRELIMINARY REVIEW STATUS

X Preliminarily Reviewed	Reviewed w/ conditions	Denied
Comments/Conditions	Final development must comply with standards set forth in Ch. 14 of City of Santa Fe Land Development Code.	
Preliminary Zoning Review completed by Rachel Mansion	Date 11/06/2025	
Preliminary Zoning Review # 2025-011500-PAR		


1544 CERRO GORDO RD
1592 B CERRO GORDO RD
1519 CANYON RD 8
1521 CANYON RD B2
1573 CANY R
1519 CANYON RD 9
1519 CANYON RD 5
1571 CANYON RD
1557 CANYON RD
1519 CANYON RD 3
1519 CANYON RD 2
1557 CANYON RD A
1588 CERRO GORDO RD
1522 A CERRO GORDO RD
1572 CERRO GORDO RD
1469 CANYON RD
1519 CANYON RD A
1545 CANYON RD
1518 CERRO GORDO RD
1532 CERRO GORDO RD
1510 CERRO GORDO RD
1520 CERRO GORDO RD
1534 CERRO GORDO RD
1475 CANYON RD
1519 CANYON RD
CANYON RD
1518 1/2 CERRO GORDO RD
1494 CERRO GORDO RD
1477 CANYON RD
1525 CANYON RD
1523 CANYON RD
1517 1/2 CANYON RD
ESPERANZA LN
1494 CERRO GORDO RD A
1498 CERRO GORDO RD
1467 CANYON RD
1524 CANYON RD
1465 CANYON RD
1481 CANYON RD
1500 CANYON RD
1510 CANYON RD
1500 CERRO GORDO RD
1472 Canyo Rd.
1461 CANYON RD
1435 CANYON RD
1468 CANYON RD
1433 CANYON RD
1436 CANYON RD
1432 CANYON RD
36x2
51.51
36x84
45 79 69 54
47x2
51x2
99x2
8291
107
121
COUNT - 20
TOTAL - 1347
MAX - 67"

A. CHRISTOPHER PURVIS ARCHITECTS

Historic Districts Review Board
City of Santa Fe, City Hall
Santa Fe NM 87501 Wednesday, March 11, 2026

RE: 1489 Upper Canyon Road
Enclosed
A-4 Gate drawing 3-11–2026
Gate photographs
Status Photograph

To Gary Moquino and
Members of the Historic Districts Review Board

For Clarification purposesThe house is listed as contributing in the downtown and east side please see attached city designation.

The 4’2” rusted steel gate (mounted 5” off the ground) that is currently installed on the property did not receive HDRB approval when it was installed. We thanks the board for entertaining options for a solution to this problem.

We propose three different ways to approach this ,all of which involve removing three and a half feet of wall adjacent to old garage and installing a coyote gate in that location. Also all of the options could be painted or left as rusted .

1) remove steel panels and install wooden balusters
2) remove all steel panels and install vertical stained wood boards in the openings
3) remove steel panels and install a 2x2 hardware cloth in the openings

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards: The applicant requests an exception for the use of a 55” high 20 foot wide steel gate

(i) Do not damage the character of the district
Applicant Response: The use of rusted steel for the gate material does not damage the character of the district because the patina on the steel and the pattern of the frame softens the effect of the steel so that it blends with the color of the other elements to be found in the streetscape. We propose several ways to achieve this effect

(ii) Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare
Applicant Response: This gate is required to stop the parking of people using the dorothy stewart trail within the courtyard which creates an liability and unsafe environment for the owners and the public.
There are several forms this gate could take we submit them to see which would solve the problem best

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts
Applicant Response: This lot has a narrow area to use and so allowing the owners to have a gate there allows them to retain the safety of their yard and making it in steel will be more durable than other gate materials which is part of the heterogeneous character of santa fe in the 21st century.The options provided give several solutions to this

Please call if you have any questions on the project 982-5461


Sincerely,




Christopher Purvis.
518 Old Santa Fe Trail St1 PMB 373 Santa Fe N. M.
87501 Tel 505-982-5461 E Mail Architect@ACP-ART.com




WALL AND GATE SOUTH SIDE 1489 CANYON ROAD



1 SOUTH ELEVATION
Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"



4 SOUTH ELEVATION
Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"



3 SOUTH ELEVATION
Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"

A. CHRISTOPHER PURVIS
ARCHITECTS
518 Old Santa fe trail St1 PMB 373
Santa Fe New Mexico 87505 Tel 505 982 5461
E Mail Architect@ACP-ART.com

Jancar Home
1489 Upper canyon Road
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

3/10/26

A-4

City of Santa Fe

Land Use Department | Historic Preservation Division

Administrative Approval

THIS IS NOT A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

DO NOT BEGIN WORK WITHOUT A PERMIT. SUBMIT THIS FORM WITH YOUR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATION AND RETAIN A COPY AT THE JOB

Date: April 16, 2021

To: Building Permit Division

From: Daniel Schwab

Be advised that per §14-5.2 SFCC 1987 the work described below at the referenced address does NOT require Historic Districts Review Board approval and is hereby staff-approved as described below. Please allow the applicant to submit for a construction permit(s) for this work if required.

Project Address: 1489 CANYON RD, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Case Number: 2021-003510--ADMIN

Contact Name: Bradley Becker

Phone Number: 303-956-4923 **Email:** brady@DramApothecary.com

Approved Scope of Work: *Wall and coyote fence per site plan. Stucco color to match house. Maximum height: 4 feet 0 inches within 20 feet of street.*

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED:

PERMIT or PERMIT REVISION

ROUTE TO HISTORIC DIVISION

INTERIM HISTORIC INSPECTION

FINAL HISTORIC INSPECTION


April 12, 2021

To whom it may concern,

This proposal letter is for administrative approval for a coyote fence across a partial section of front of the property at 1489 Canyon Road. Fence will setback 3-5ft from the property line and begin in the north east corner of the property. The first fence section will run 25ft to the garage wall, the second section will continue from the other side of the garage wall and continue another 25ft. A coyote fence gate will run to another 25ft section. Coyote fence will comply with section 14-5.2(9)(F)(c)(ii) and the Wall and Fence Guidelines. See scale drawing below.

Materials will be typical Santa Fe coyote fence materials — spruce-fir latillas that are tied to a steel welded framework typical for historic districts and matching the surrounding neighbors and will conform with Historic District Ordinance.

Brady Becker - 719-426-8881 - Brady@DramApothecary.com



Revised Submittal


Dear Mr Moquino,

Below are the revisions to permit 2022-21983-WALR.
Historic Admin Approval 2021-003510--ADMIN

The Historic Districts comments for revision were as follows: "Not approved for coyote vehicle gate or stuccoed wall. Need approval from Historic Division."

The following revisions have been made to this project based on the comments.
1) The vehicle gate has been removed from the project.
2) The wall material is Stucco/Adobe.

Brady Becker - 719-426-8881
Brady@goodlunch.com



strument No. _____
)UNTY OF SANTA FE)
'ATE OF NEW MEXICO)ss

To whom it may concern,

This proposal letter is for administrative approval for a coyote fence and wall across a partial section of front of the property at 1489 Canyon Road. They will setback 3-5ft from the property line and begin in the north east corner of the property. The first fence section will run 25ft to the garage wall, the second section will be a 4ft wall from the corner of the garage to the driveway opening. A coyote fence gate, then another 25ft 4ft section of Coyote fence. Coyote fence will comply with section 14-5.2(9)(F)(c)(ii) and the Wall and Fence Guidelines.

See scale drawing below. Materials will be typical Santa Fe coyote fence materials — spruce-fir latillas that are tied to a steel welded framework typical for historic districts and matching the surrounding neighbors and will conform with Historic District Ordinance. The stucco wall color will match the house and will comply with historic standards.

The current stucco on the house needs repair. We would like to use the new swatch color for both the house and the wall.


Brady Becker - 719-426-8881 - Brady@DramApothecary.com



Existing Swatch




New Swatch






COYOTE FENCE DETAIL



WALL DETAIL



City of Santa Fe

Land Use Department | Historic Preservation Division

Administrative Approval

THIS IS NOT A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

DO NOT BEGIN WORK WITHOUT A PERMIT. SUBMIT THIS FORM WITH YOUR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATION AND RETAIN A COPY AT THE JOB

Date:

To: Building Permit Division

From:

Mariah Kavanaugh, Planner Technician

Be advised that per §14-5.2 SFCC 1987 the work described below at the referenced address does NOT require Historic Districts Review Board approval and is hereby staff-approved as described below. Please allow the applicant to submit for a construction permit(s) for this work if required.

Project Address: 1489 CANYON RD, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Case Number: 2026-011905--ADMIN

Contact Name: PATRICK GARCIA

Phone Number: 505-699-9604 **Email:** sangredecristoroofcompany@gmail.com

Approved Scope of Work: *Re-roof structure as submitted, (900 sq. ft.).*

Conditions of Approval: *Roofing materials must not be publicly visible.*

There shall be no publicly visible rooftop appurtenances, no roofing material shall be on the top of the parapets and shall be flashed on interior of parapets.

Not approved to replace canales or skylights.

There shall be no changes to existing mechanical, line sets, or other rooftop appurtenances at this time.

No other work approved at this time.

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED: **PERMIT or PERMIT REVISION**

FINAL HISTORIC INSPECTION


1489 Canyon Rd
Foam Installation
Legend
1489 Canyon Rd
1489 Canyon Rd
Google Earth
Image Landsat / Copernicus
N
20 ft



Sangre De Cristo Roof Company
1570 Center Court Unit B
Santa Fe, NM 87507 US
(505) 699-9604
sangredecristoroofcompany@gmail.com

Estimate

ADDRESS
Susan Jancar
1489 Canyon Rd
Santa Fe, NM 87501

SHIP TO
Susan Jancar
1489 Canyon Rd
Santa Fe, NM 87501

ESTIMATE 2245
DATE 06/13/2025

ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION	QTY	RATE
Roof Tear Off	Tear-Off: Mod Bit - The roof crews will remove and tear off all the roof(s) to the roof deck and will dispose of all debris generated. - Crews will prepare the roof for the re-roof procedure. *Approx sq ft -900	1	3,000.00
Foam Roof	Preparation of Roof: - Clean-up and disposal of any surface area debris. Post Prep Work: - Spray 2" over portals and 5" over heated spaces of Gaco Roof Foam 2733 SPF to existing roof surface to ensure 1/4" slope per foot taper and R-14 portals and garage or R-35 average insulative value over heated spaces. - Then will coat with Gaco A4700 Acrylic Coating on all vertical surfaces and canales. - After coating with Gaco A4700 crew will apply 7/16" Santa Fe Brown crushed course gravel on all horizonal roof surface areas. - Clean up as needed.	1	16,300.00
City of Santa Fe Permit	City of Santa Fe Permit: Will have the inspector out to inspect the foam before we spray the roof. Another inspection of the roof will take place when the roof has been completed, to ensure that the roof was installed per code and regulation. *Cost is to be determined by the City of Santa Fe.	1	
Warranty Terms	Roof will have a 10 year warranty once roof is completed.	1	0.00

Thank you for your business. We take ACH payments.
Please mail checks to:
1570 Center Ct, Unit B
Santa Fe, NM 87507
EXCLUSIONS: No electrical, plumbing, gas, HVAC lines, interior repairs, mold remediation, swamp cooler repair, or structural framing repairs are included in this estimate.

The estimate does not include any deck replacement: Deck replacement cost $4.50 per square foot.

NOTE: There is a potential for dust and debris to fall on interior areas during the project. The team will make every effort to prevent debris or dust from getting into the interior areas, and will take precautions as appropriate, however, the Company is not responsible for dust or debris that may happen to collect on interior surfaces, nor is the company responsible for interior site clean-up.

Material pricing may increase due to manufacture increase. To ensure pricing

SUBTOTAL	19,300.00
TAX	1,580.19
TOTAL	**$20,880.19**

stays as quoted a material deposit of 30% is required.
*LATE FEE will be applied after due date.

Accepted By

Accepted Date 01/16/2026

Gaco™

Product Data Sheet (PDS): **GacoRoofFoam™ F2733**
Revised: 11/2023

GACOROOFFOAM™ F2733
SPRAY-APPLIED POLYURETHANE FOAM

A. PRODUCT DESCRIPTION:

GacoRoofFoam F2733 is an HFC blown (zero-ozone depleting) liquid spray system that cures to a medium-density rigid polyurethane insulation for roofing applications. GacoRoofFoam 2733 does not contain CFCs, HCFCs or other gases harmful to the ozone layer.

B. APPROVALS:

GacoRoofFoam 2733 meets ASTM E108 Class A rating for external fire exposure and exceeds the requirements of ASTM C1029 (Type III). This product is part of multiple system approval by UL and FM 4470 – Class 1. GacoRoofFoam F2733 has a severe hail rating when combined with GacoFlex S2100.

FM APPROVED

C. PACKAGED PRODUCT DATA*:

PROPERTY	*STANDARD / METHOD*	*OBSERVED VALUE / DESCRIPTION*
CHEMICAL CLASSIFICATION	N/A	"A" Component: Contains polymeric isocyanate "B" Component: Contains polyol, catalysts and blowing agents
VISCOSITY	ASTM D2196 @ 77 °F (25 °C)	"A" Component: 200 ± 50 cps "B" Component: 1150 ± 50 cps
SPECIFIC GRAVITY	ASTM D1638 @ 77 °F (25 °C)	"A" Component: 1.23 S.G. "B" Component: 1.17 S.G.
DENSITY	When measured @ 77 °F (25 °C)	"A" Component: 10.34 lb/gal (1.24 kg/L) "B" Component: 9.8 lb/gal (1.20 kg/L)
MIXING RATIO	N/A	"A" & "B" Component: 1:1 (by volume)
STORAGE STABILITY	When stored between 50 – 70 °F (10 – 21 °C)	"A" Component: 6 months "B" Component: 6 months

D. APPLIED PRODUCT DATA*:

PROPERTY	*STANDARD / METHOD*	*OBSERVED VALUE / DESCRIPTION*
NOMINAL DENSITY (SPRAYED-IN-PLACE)	ASTM D1622 @ 77 °F (25 °C)	2.7 – 3.4 lb/ft³ (43.2 – 54.5 kg/L³)
R-VALUE (AGED)	ASTM C518	R-6.5 h·ft²·°F/Btu @ 1 in (25 mm) R-25 h·ft²·°F/Btu @ 3.5 in (89 mm)
COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH: (PARALLEL TO RISE)	ASTM D1621 @ 77 °F (25 °C)	53.7 psi (370 kPa)

TENSILE STRENGTH	ASTM D1623 @ 77 °F (25 °C)	60.2 psi (415 kPa)
SHEER	ASTM C273	44.1 psi (304 kPa)
WATER VAPOR TRANSMISSION	ASTM E96 Desiccant Method @ 77 °F (25 °C)	0.98 perm-in
DIMENSIONAL STABILITY (28 DAYS)	ASTM D2126 @ 158 °F (70 °C), 97 % RH	Width: 0.01 % (linear change) Length: 0.00 % (linear change) Depth: 0.00 % (linear change)
WATER ABSORPTION	ASTM D2842	0.5 % (Passed)
CLOSED CELL CONTENT	ASTM D2856C @ 77 °F (25 °C)	98.2 %
SPREAD OF FLAME	ASTM E84 / UL723	35 (Flame Spread Index)
RECOMMENDED SERVICE TEMPERATURE RANGE	N/A	-40 – 200 °F (-40 – 93°C)
AUTO-IGNITION TEMP	N/A	> 200 °F (> 93 °C)

E. PRODUCT INSTALLATION:

STEP	*INSTRUCTIONS*
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS & APPLICATION	To ensure optimum performance, a minimum pass thickness of 0.75 in (19 mm) is recommended with the maximum not to exceed 1.5 in (38 mm) per pass. It is recommended that the resin side pre-heater be set 10 – 15 °F (-12 – -9 °C) warmer than the Isocyanate side to equalize component viscosities. Maximum spray equipment temperature setting is 130 °F (54 °C). NOTE: This system can be sprayed on clean dry substrates down to 45 °F (7°C). GacoRoofFoam 2733 must not be applied if the temperature during application is less than 5 degrees above the dew point. NOTE: All hot work, i.e. welding, torches and open flame work must be completed prior to installation of the polyurethane foam insulation. Smoking in the same area while the spray polyurethane foam insulation is being applied shall be strictly prohibited.

* *For specific Safety and Health information please refer to the appropriate Safety Data Sheet that is associated with this product.*

Gaco™

Product Data Sheet (PDS):

GacoFlex™ A47 Series
Acrylic Roof Coating
Revised: 09/2022

GACOFLEX A47 SERIES
ACRYLIC ROOF COATING

A. DESCRIPTION:

GacoFlex A47 Series water-borne acrylic roof coating forms a durable liquid-applied elastomeric membrane with high tensile strength, water resistance, reflectivity, and weatherability properties.

B. RECOMMENDED USE:

GacoFlex A47 is intended as a roof maintenance coating over sprayed polyurethane foam, aged asphalt roofs, metal roofs, and aged single-ply roofing membranes. Use is restricted to circumstances where the membrane surface is in sound condition but requires a renewal of the surface due to the normal effects of use and aging.

C. LIMITATIONS:

Not intended for low-slope applications (< 2:12) or over surfaces prone to ponding water. Consider GacoFlex silicone roof coatings when long term resistance to ponding water is required. Not suitable for use over gravel-surfaced built-up roofs or asphalt shingles.

D. APPROVALS:

Pending approvals.

E. PACKAGED PRODUCT DATA:

PROPERTY	*DESCRIPTION*	
COLOR	A4700 White	
	Custom colors available	
ADHESION	Excellent adhesion to polyurethane foam, such as GacoFlex GacoRoofFoam™, aged asphalt roofs, metal roofs, aged single-ply membranes, and existing coatings. Some metal roofs may require a suitable GacoFlex primer. An anti-corrosive metal primer may be used on ferrous metal roofs to help prevent corrosion from spreading. Metal panels must be structurally sound to serve as a suitable substrate for a roof coating. GacoFlex Gaco Prime LVOC Primer may be required over existing coatings. Do not apply GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating over existing silicone coatings.	
THEORETICAL COVERAGE	818 ft² / gal / mil (76 m² / 3.78 L / 0.02 mm)	
SOLIDS	Weight: 66.5 % Volume: 51.0 %	ASTM D1644 ASTM D2697
STORAGE STABILITY	24 months when stored between 50 °F – 110 °F (10 °C – 43 °C). Do not allow product to freeze. Some separation may occur after extended storage. Mix thoroughly before use.	
TOXICITY	Not for use in contact with edible substances or potable water.	
V.O.C.	< 50 g / L	EPA Method 24
FLASH POINT	> 200 °F (> 93 °C)	ASTM D1310
VISCOSITY	100 - 125 KU	ASTM D2697
DENSITY	11.7 lbs / gal (5.3 kg / 3.8 L)	

F. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES:

PROPERTY	*ASTM TEST*	*REQUIREMENT*	*RESULT*
TENSILE STRENGTH – INITIAL	D2370	>= 200 psi (1.4 MPa)	229 psi (1.6 MPa)
ELONGATION AT BREAK – INITIAL	D2370	>= 100 %	220 %
TENSILE STRENGTH – 1000 HOURS	D2370	>= 200 psi (1.4 MPa)	411 psi (2.8 MPa)
ELONGATION AT BREAK – 1000 HOURS	D2370	>= 100 %	252 %
TEAR RESISTANCE (DIE C)	D624	60 min.	68.5 lb / in (31 kg / 25 mm)
LOW TEMPERATURE FLEX	D522	½" Mandrel, -15 °F (-26 °C)	Pass
LOW TEMPERATURE FLEX – 1,000 HOURS	D522	½" Mandrel, -15 °F (-26 °C)	Pass
WATER VAPOR PERMEABILITY – 20 MILS DFT (INCH POUNDS)	E96	50 Perms. max	7.0 Perms
WET ADHESION			
FOAM	C794 / D903	2.0 lb (0.9 kg) min.	Pass
GALVANIZED STEEL		2.0 lb (0.9 kg) min.	Pass
PLYWOOD		2.0 lb (0.9 kg) min.	Pass
SBS CAP SHEET		2.0 lb (0.9 kg) min.	Pass
APP		2.0 lb (0.9 kg) min.	Pass
WATER SWELLING	D461	20% max	5%
SOLAR PERFORMANCE		**Initial**	**After Soiling**
SOLAR REFLECTANCE – A4700 WHITE	C1549	0.86	0.72
THERMAL EMITTANCE – A4700 WHITE	C1371	0.91	0.89
SOLAR REFLECTIVITY INDEX – A4700 WHITE	E1980	109	88

G. APPLICATION

STEP	INSTRUCTIONS
THINNING	Thinning is not recommended under normal conditions.
MIXING	Mix until homogeneous with a mechanical mixer before application to ensure uniform color and consistency.
SURFACE PREPARATION	Repair all leaks, cracks, and other deficiencies and seal flashings in the existing substrate using like materials as recommended by the original membrane manufacturer before applying GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating. Newly repaired areas may require a suitable GacoFlex primer. Contact Technical Services for primer recommendations. When necessary, use GacoWash at 1-part concentrate to 9-parts water to clean roof before application. Rinse well and allow substrate to dry thoroughly. **NOTE:** DO NOT WASH ASPHALT SUBSTRATES
APPLICATION	Do not apply GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating to wet surfaces. Make sure roof surface is completely dry, clean, and free of dirt, grease, biological soiling, loose granules, and paint residue before coating. Apply GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating only when air, material, and surface temperatures are between 50 °F – 110 °F (10 °C – 43 °C). Apply product in the morning to allow for maximum dry time during daylight hours. If roof temperature exceeds 100 ºF (38 °C), a light mist of water may be used to increase working time. Apply at a minimum rate of 1.25 gal / 100 ft² (4.7 l / 9.3 m²) to achieve required minimum 10 mil Dry Film Thickness (DFT). Additional coats may be required to achieve required minimum Dry Film Thickness (DFT) based on appropriate substrate type and surface characteristics. GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coatings may be applied with a 3/8 in (10 mm) nap roller, brush, or airless sprayer. FOR USE OF AIRLESS SPRAYERS: General recommendation of 2,000 – 3,000 psi (13.8 MPa – 20.7 MPa) at the gun tip, 1.0 –3.0 gal / min (3.8 L – 11.4 L / min) flow rate, and tip sizes ranging from 0.025 – 0.040 in (0.64 – 1 mm). Larger spray units will allow for longer hoses on larger jobs. Contact Technical Services if further assistance is required in determining the optimal equipment for project-specific requirements. **NOTE:** DO NOT EXCEED 1.5 GAL / 100 FT² (5.6 L / 9.3 M²) PER COAT
DRY TIME	Approximate dry time is 4-6 hours at 75 ºF (24 °C) and 50% RH per coat of GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating. Low temperatures or high humidity conditions will extend cure times. Do not apply GacoFlex A47 Series Roof Coating when precipitation or heavy dew is expected within 4 hours (6–8 hours in high humidity conditions).
CLEAN UP	Clean up tools and equipment with soap and water immediately after application. Follow spray equipment manufacturer's guidelines on clean up and maintenance of spray equipment.

** For specific Health and Safety information, please refer to Safety Data Sheet (SDS)*

CITY OF SANTA FE

PRELIMINARY APPLICATION REQUEST
HPD-01

APPLICATION RESOURCES AND REVIEW PROCESS

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION RESOURCES

MISSION : The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) of the City of Santa Fe is dedicated to assisting community members who reside in one of the city's five historic districts with modifications to their properties. The HPD staff oversees the enforcement of the city's historic and archaeological review districts.

OFFICE : Santa Fe City Hall 200 Lincoln Avenue Santa Fe, NM 87501

WEBSITE : https://santafenm.gov/land-use/historic-preservation

CURRENT AND UPCOMING PUBLIC MEETINGS : https://santafenm.portal.civicclerk.com/

INTERACTIVE GIS MAPS : https://santafenm.gov/information-technology-telecommunications/gis

SANTA FE CITY CODE (SFCC) : https://library.municode.com/nm/santa_fe/codes/code_of_ordinances

APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND FEES : All applications shall be submitted electronically as PDF files to hpdsubmittal@santafenm.gov. Incomplete applications, including those missing required submittals will be returned without processing. Application fees will be assessed and invoiced upon acceptance of the application. Historic District Fees and a link to pay invoices are available online.

GENERAL QUESTIONS : For general inquiries and questions please email historicpreservation@santafenm.gov

REQUEST A MEETING : To request an in-person, over the phone or online meeting with HPD staff please click here.

CONSTITUENT SERVICES : To report a complaint or code violation please submit a Solve a Problem request.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION REVIEW PROCESS

PRE-APPLICATION PHASE

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) reviews administrative requests and assists applicants in presenting cases to the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) and the Archaeological Review Committee (ARC). Property owners are required to complete a Historic District Pre-Application Request (PAR) for any proposed modifications to properties within the five historic districts. Once a complete PAR is received, the applicant will be issued an invoice and assigned a HPD Case Planner who will assist the applicant or their agent throughout the review and approval process. Minor alterations may be approved administratively. However depending on the historic status designation of the property-whether it is non-contributing, contributing, significant or a landmark-and the scope of the proposed modifications, a public hearing before the HDRB and/or ARC may be required.

PRELIMINARY ZONING REVIEW

For all applications requiring a hearing before the HDRB a Preliminary Zoning Review (PZR) is required. Please allow 5-10 business days to process a complete application. All PZR requests must be submitted to Current Planning via zoningcounter@santafenm.gov

PUBLIC HEARING (AS REQUIRED)

Once an application is complete, the case planner will schedule a public hearing before the HDRB and/or ARC. The HDRB meets on alternating Tuesdays at 5:30 PM at City Hall. The ARC meets on the last Thursday of the month at 4:30 PM at City Hall. The notification requirements for public hearings are set forth in SFCC §14-3.1(H).

POST APPROVAL PHASE

Following action of the HDRB/ARC, staff will prepare the findings of fact and conclusions of law (FOFCOL), which documents the official findings, any conditions of approval and an expiration date for the approval. The case planner will create a board action letter outlining the HDRB's decision. If approved, the applicant can then proceed to building permitting.

HPD PAR SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

Please submit a complete, signed PAR along with each of the following submittals as separate PDF files saved with unique and descriptive file names to hpdsubmittal@santafenm.gov. Incomplete applications will not be accepted for review.

- ☐ PROPOSAL LETTER

  Detailed description of the proposed project, including location, square footages (roofed, unroofed and flat surfaces), heights and other dimensions, materials, colors and finishes, window and door styles, yardwalls and gates. Include a brief architectural history of all structures, i.e. current status, date of construction and any prior alterations.

- ☐ EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLANS (SCALE 1"=20')

  Digital site plan showing the relationship of the project to the street and adjacent properties at 1"=20' or larger. Include a graphic scale and north arrow. Include set back dimensions.

- ☐ AERIAL SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

  Current and historic photos showing property and streets.

Please contact your assigned case planner or historicpreservation@santafenm.gov with any questions.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION PRE-APPLICATION REQUEST

PROPERTY OWNER(S) INFORMATION

Name (First, Last): Susan Jancar

Address: 1489 Canyon Road
Street Address — Suite/Unit #

Santa Fe — NM — 87501
City — State — ZIP Code

Phone: (970) 946-0157

E-mail Address: jancardds@gmail.com

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION (IF DIFFERENT FROM OWNER)

Name (First, Last): Sangre De Cristo Roof Company

Address: 1570 Center Court — Unit B
Street Address — Suite/Unit #

Santa Fe — NM — 87507
City — State — ZIP Code

Phone: (505) 699-9604

E-mail Address: sangredecristoroofcompany@gmail.com

APPLICATION DETAILS

Estimated Construction Cost:	16,300
Existing Square Feet:	900
Proposed Square Feet:	900

Proposed Work: foam Roof Installation

AFFIDAVIT AUTHORIZING AGENT/APPLICANT (SIGNATURE REQUIRED)

I am/We are the owner(s) and record title holder(s) of the property located at:
Susan Jancar

I/we authorize Sangre De Cristo Roof Company to act as my/our agent to execute this application.

Signed: [signature] Date: 1-29-2026

Signed: Susan Jancar Date: 1/29/26

Revised July 2025

SUBMIT APPLICATION

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. _____ District No. _____ ☐ NRHP ☐ SRCP Criteria: ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D

1 Name of Property *(Historic and/or current name for property)*

2 Location *(Address or description of location)*

509 CORONADO ROAD

3 Local Reference Number

4 County

Santa Fe

5 Property Type

☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Site ☐ Object

6 Date of Survey

5 / 14 / 02

7 Previous Survey Date(s)

___ / ___ / ___

☒ No previous survey

8 Name of Project


NA

9 UTM

Zone ___

Easting ___

Northing ___



10 Photo Information

Negative Location: HPD View of: SOUTH

Roll #: 1 R1 1 CD #1 37

Frame #: 1, 9-11, 13,15,16 CD #1 22-29, 37

11 Brief Description of the Property *(What is it?)*

HIGH STUCCOED WALL W/ WOOD PERSON GATE. MAIN HOUSE PLUS GUEST HOUSE DOWN DRIVEWAY
LARGE GRAVELLED AREA & MANY EVERGREENS

12 Who Uses the Property? *(Current and historic users and uses made of property. Indicate cultural affiliation of users.)*

13 Construction Date

Date: 1950s ☐ Known ☒ Estimated Source:

14 Setting

☒ Suburban ☐ Rural ☐ Village ☒ Urban If Urban: ☐ Commercial ☐ Industrial ☒ Residential ☐ Public

15 Relationship to Surroundings ☒ Similar ☐ Dissimilar


Comments: HIGH WALL AT FRONT INCOMPATIBLE WITH OPEN CHARACTER OF THIS AREA.

Continued on other side

HCPI Base Form (FORM 1) *(Continued from the other side)*

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

16 Additional Perspective *(Photo, drawing, footprint, etc.; Indicate north arrow when possible.)*



17 Surveyor

(Your name, address, telephone number, and any group affiliation.)

Catherine Colby
906 Don Miguel Pl.
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Photographer:
Mary G. Ragins

18 Owner (if known) and Other Knowledgeable People

(Provide contact information for persons known or believed to have information about property.)

Notes: *(If photo, include photo information, as in #10.)* MAIN HOUSE SOUTH
R1 9 CD#1 29

19 Is Property Endangered? ☐ Unknown ☒ No ☐ Yes How?

20 Significance to Current Community ☐ Unknown ☐ None ☒ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High

Describe:

21 Other Significance or Information of Interest *(Such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.)*

22 National or State Register *(See instructions for eligibility criteria.)*

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? ☐ Unknown ☒ No ☐ Yes

If yes: ☐ State ☐ National

If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? ☒ No ☐ Yes

Why?

23 National or State Historic District

Is this property in a historic district? ☐ Unknown ☐ No ☒ Yes

If yes: ☒ Contributing ☐ Non-Contributing ☐ Unknown

If 'yes,' what is name of district? DOWNTOWN EASTSIDE ☐ State ☐ National

24 Supplemental Forms ☐ None ☒ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) ☒ Continuation Sheets, # pages: PHOTOS SITEPLAN

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs >>>>>**Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing Form 2** <<<<<<

For HPD Office use only: HCPI ____ No. ____ District ____ 3 Local Reference Number

1 Name of Property *(Historic and/or current name for property)*

2 Location *(Address or description of location)*

509 Coronado Road

4 County: SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey: 5/02

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

6 Visible Construction Material

- ☐ Adobe
- ☐ Brick
- ☐ Composition
- ☐ Concrete: Block
- ☐ Concrete: Cast Stone
- ☐ Concrete: Poured
- ☐ Earth Plaster
- ☐ Masonry: Simulated
- ☐ Metal: Corrugated
- ☐ Metal: Structural Siding
- ☐ Metal: V-Crimp
- ☐ Stone: Random Ashlar
- ☐ Stone: Random Coursed
- ☐ Stone: River Rock
- ☐ Stone: Rusticated
- ☐ Stone: Tabular
- ☒ Stucco
- ☐ Tile: Structural Clay
- ☐ Vinyl Siding
- ☐ Wood: Board & Batton
- ☐ Wood: Horizontal Siding
- ☐ Wood: Jacal
- ☐ Wood: Log
- ☐ Wood: Shingle
- ☐ Wood: Tongue & Groove
- ☐ Other: ____

Notes:

7 Number of Stories ☐ Not Applicable

Number: ☒ 1 ☐ 1 1/2 ☐ 2 ☐ 2 1/2 Other: ____

8 Foundation ☐ Not Applicable

☒ Not Visible ☐ None ☐ At Grade ☐ Above Grade ☐ Raised

Materials: ☐ Concrete ☐ Stone Other: ____

Notes:

9 Roof ☐ Not Applicable

Shape: ☒ Flat ☐ Gabled ☐ Hipped ☐ Pyramidal ☐ Shed ☐ Other: ____

Pitch: ☐ None ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ Steep

Features: ☐ Eave ☒ Parapet

Materials: ☒ Asphalt ☐ Composition: Shingle ☐ Composition: Roll ☐ Earth ☐ Metal: Corrugated ☐ Metal: Pressed ☐ Metal: Standing Seam ☐ Metal: V-Crimp ☐ Tile: Terra Cotta ☐ Wood: Shingle ☐ Other: ____

10 Windows *(Describe operation, materials, and glazing patterns of those windows on main or street facing elevation and other notable windows.)*

☐ Not Applicable

Operation	Material	Glazing	Number
SLIDING	METAL	3	3

Notes:

11 Doors *(Describe type, style, and material of those doors on main or street facing elevation and other notable doors.)*

☐ Not Applicable

Type	Style	Material	Number
	CUSTOM	WOOD PANEL	1

Notes:

12 Chimneys *(Describe whether interior or exterior and material)*

13 Porches ☐ Not Applicable

Type: ☒ Entry ☒ Partial-Width ☐ Full-Width ☐ Wrap

14 Other Significant Features *(Unique or outstanding features; Describe)*

15 Modifications *(For each modification, indicate the source of the modification date stated. If it is your own, write "surveyor." If prior survey, give date of survey.)*

☐ No known modifications

1. ____ Date: ____ ☐ Known ☐ Estimated Source: ____

2. ____ Date: ____ ☐ Known ☐ Estimated Source: ____

Continued on other side

HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) ***(Continued from the other side)***

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

16 Primary Architectural Style

☐ Not Applicable

☐ Art Deco/Streamline Moderne	☐ Gothic Revival	☐ Mission Revival	☐ Pueblo	☒ Simplified Spanish-Pueblo Revival
☐ Bungalow/Craftsman	☐ International	☐ Neo-Classical	☐ Queen Anne	☐ Territorial
☐ Colonial Revival	☐ Italianate	☐ Northern New Mexico	☐ Ranch	☐ Territorial Revival
☐ Folk Victorian	☐ Mediterranean	☐ Prairie	☐ Spanish-Colonial	☐ Tudor Revival

Notes:

☐ Other: _____

17 Documents Available and Their Locations *(Plans, histories, oral histories, maps, aerial photos, bibliographical references, etc.)*

SITE

18 Attached or Associated Properties *(List & describe. Indicate whether surveys exist for these and provide survey numbers, if known.)*

Are associated properties eligible for listing?

19 Site Plan

SEE CONTINUATION SHEET

Please Include:

- Footprint of building
- Porches and balconies
- Major landscape features
- North arrow
- Associated properties
- Walls, fences, gates
- Nearby roads
- Driveways

Notes:

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. | District No. | 3 Local Reference Number


1 Name of Property *(Historic and/or current name for property)*


2 Location *(Address or description of location)*

509 CORONADO RD

4 County: SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey: 4/14/02





Continued on other side

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. _____ District No. _____ 3 Local Reference Number

1 Name of Property *(Historic and/or current name for property)*

2 Location *(Address or description of location)*

509 CORONADO

4 County


SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey


5/14/02



R1 9 SOUTH CD#1 29




R1 10 SOUTH CD#1 28




R1 11 EAST CD#1 27



R1 13 ..... NORTH CD#1 25




N 16 WEST CD#1 22



N 15 WEST CD#1 23


R1 1 CD#1 37



MAIN HOUSE



R1 12 SOUTH & WEST CD#1 26



R1 14 NORTH CD#1 24

GUEST HOUSE

Continued on other side


RIN1 South Elevation

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only. HCPI No. District No. 3 Local Reference Number

1 Name of Property (Historic and/or current name for property)


2 Location (Address or description of location)

509 CORONADO

FRONT

4 County SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey



R1 N10 SOUTH ELEVATION



R1, N9 SOUTH ELEVATION

nued on other side

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. | District No. | 3 Local Reference Number


1 Name of Property *(Historic and/or current name for property)*

2 Location *(Address or description of location)*


509 CORONADO

4 County: SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey



R1 N11 EAST ELEVATION



R1 N13 NORTH ELEVATION

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. | District No. | 3 Local Reference Number

1 Name of Property (Historic and/or current name for property)


2 Location (Address or description of location)

509 CORONADO


FRONT

4 County SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey



RI N16 WEST ELEVATION



RI N15 WEST ELEVATION

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No. District No. 3 Local Reference Number


1 Name of Property (Historic and/or current name for property)

2 Location (Address or description of location)


509 CORONADO
REAR

4 County SANTA FE

5 Date of Survey



R1 N12 SOUTH / WEST ELEVATION



R1 N14 NORTH ELEVATION

nued on other side

McCormick Architects LLC
1611 Paseo de Peralta
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505.699.6199

December 11th, 2025

Historic Review Board
City of Santa Fe
200 Lincoln
Santa Fe, NM 87501

RE: Status Review for 507 Coronado (currently non-contributing)

Dear Historic Review Board:

We are applying for status review for the house at the above address. No permits have been issued for some time and the existing form is more than 20 years old.

Therefore, we are providing a new HCPI with recommendations.

Thank you for your consideration,



12.11.25

Steve McCormick date


913
501
509
507
513
E CORONADO RD

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM 1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

Date of Form: December 11, 2025

For HPD Office use only:
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: N/A
Ted and Josephine Lopez Property	507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe Parcel # 910009184 & 910009187

5. Property Type:
_x Buildings: 2
_x_ Structures: 2
__ Site __ Object

6. Date of Survey:
November 26, 2025, JWM

7. Previous Survey Date(s):
_x_Yes: May 14, 2002, Catherine Colby
__ No:

8. Name of Project:
HDRB Status Evaluation

9. Lat/Long: 35.6747853,-105.9386578



10. Photo Information: John W. Murphey, photographer. Photo 1: South (front) elevation, facing northeast.

11. Brief Description of the Property:

The former Ted and Josephine Lopez property is located near the intersection of East Coronado Road and Old Pecos Trail. The property comprises two separately addressed parcels, containing the primary residence at 507 East Coronado Road (910009184) and a smaller passive-solar casita used as a guesthouse at 509 East Coronado Road (910009187). The main house, constructed in the late 1950s, exhibits a modest Pueblo Revival style typical of suburban residences of its period. The casita was built after 1978 and reflects the character of late 1980s to early 1990s passive-solar design. Both buildings are classified as noncontributing resources within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. ***Continued on Page 5.***

12. Who uses the property? Residence and guesthouse

13. Construction Date:
Date: c. 1957
_ _Known _x_ Estimated Source: city directories, deeds, aerial photo

14. Setting:
__ Suburban __ Rural __ Village __ Urban If Urban: __ Commercial __ Industrial _x_ Residential __Public

15. Relationship to Surroundings: _x_ Similar __ Dissimilar
Comments: N/A

HCPI Base Form (FORM 1) *(Continued from other side)*

16. Additional Perspective: **(Photos, drawing, footprint, etc., indicate north arrow when possible)**



Source: Office of the Santa Fe County Assessor
parcel lines may not be accurate

17. Surveyor:
(your name, address, telephone number, and any group affiliation)

John W. Murphey
Architectural Historian
Architectural History Services

For: Current owner, via Steve McCormick Architects LLC

18. Owner (if known) and other knowledgeable people:

Current owner: Julia Dancy Revocable Living Trust, both parcels

19. Is Property Endangered? **_x_ Unknown __ No __ Yes How?**

20. Significance to Current Community: **_x_ Unknown __ None __ Low __ Moderate __ High**
Describe: Unknown

21. Other Significance or Information of Interest: (such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.)
See Historical Overview.

22. National or State Register:

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? __ Unknown _x_ No __Yes
If yes: __ State __ National
If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? _x_ No __Yes
Why? See Evaluation of Historical Status

23. National or State Historic District: City of Santa Fe

Is this property in a historic district? __ Unknown __ No _x_ Yes
If yes: __ Significant __ Contributing _x_ Non-contributing" Primary House and Casita _x_ No Status: Privacy Wall and Pergola
Per City of Santa Fe official designation map

If 'yes', what is the name of the district? __ State __ National _x_ City of Santa Fe:
Downtown and Eastside Historic District

24. Supplemental Forms:

__ None _x_ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) __ Continuation Sheets, # pages: _____

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2***
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: N/A
Ted and Josephine Lopez Property	507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: November 30, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS:

6. Visible Construction Material:

_x_Adobe __ Brick __ Composition __ Concrete: Block

__ Concrete: Cast Stone __Concrete: Poured __ Earth Plaster __ Masonry: Simulated

__ Metal: Corrugated __ Metal: Structural Siding __ Metal: V-Crimp __ Stone: Random Ashlar

Stone: __ Random Coursed __Stone: River Rock __Stone: Rusticated __ Stone: Tabular

_x_Stucco: __ Tile: Clay __ Vinyl Siding __ Wood: Board and Batten

Wood: __ Horizontal Siding __ Wood: Jacal __ Wood: Log __ Wood: Shingle

__ Wood: Tongue and Groove __ Other:

7. Number of Stories: __ N/A
Number: _x_1 __11/2 __ 2
__ 21/2 Other: partial basement

8. Foundation: __ N/A
_x_ Not visible __ None
__ At Grade __Raised:
Materials: _x_ Concrete: __Stone
Other:
Notes

9. Roof: __ N/A

Shape: _x_Flat __Gabled
__ Hipped __ Pyramidal
__ Shed Other:
Pitch: __ None __ Low
__ Medium __ Steep
Features: __ Eave:
_x_ Parapets
Materials: __Asphalt
__ Earth
__ Composition shingle __ Metal: Pressed
__ Composition Roll __ Metal: Corrugated
__ Metal: Standing Seam __ Metal: V- Crimp
__ Tile: Terra Cotta __ Wood: Shingle
Other: Torch-down BRAI

10. Window Types Primary House

Operation	Material	Glazing	Number
Combination	Vinyl-Metal	1S-1F-1S	6
Combination	Vinyl-Metal	1F-1-1S	1
Sliding	Vinyl-Metal	1-1	1

Note: Based on visibility and access during survey

11. Door Types Primary House

Type	Style	Material	Number
Single-Leaf	Panel	Wood	1
Single-Leaf	9-light/panel	Metal	1
Double-Leaf	Full-Light	Wood	1
Sliding	Patio	Vinyl	2

12. Chimneys _x_ two, exterior, east and north

13. Porches _x_ N/A
Type: __ Entry _x_Partial-Width __ Full-Width __ Wrap

14. Other Significant Features N/A

15. Modifications: x __ No known modifications

Primary House

#1 Date: 1973-1978; addition of first iteration of east elevation portal; aerial photographs.
#2 Date: 1983; introduction of carport and likely second iteration of east elevation portal; aerial photographs and HDRB case data.
#3 Date: Post-1978, alteration of north elevation openings and introduction of chimney; 1978 aerial photograph.
#4 Date; Unknown, recent; wholesale replacement of windows and doors; visual and material evidence.

16. Primary Architectural Style __ Not Applicable

__ Art Deco/Streamline Moderne	__ Gothic Revival	__ Mission Revival	__ Pueblo	_x_Spanish-Pueblo Revival
__ Bungalow/Craftsman	__ International	__ Neo-Classical	__ Queen Anne	__ Territorial
__ Colonial Revival	__ Italianate	__ Northern NM	__ Ranch	__ Territorial Revival
__ Folk Victorian	__ Mediterranean	__ Prairie	__ Spanish-Colonial	__ Tudor Revival

Notes: __ Other: Vernacular

17. Documents Available and Their Locations

Historic Preservation Division
Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe
200 Lincoln Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 955-6605
https://www.santafenm.gov/land-use/historic-preservation

Archaeological Records Management Section
Laboratory of Anthropology
708 Camino Lejo
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 476-1320
https://nmhistoricpreservation.org/arms.html

S I T E:

18. Attached or Associated Properties

Are associated properties eligible for listing: N/A

19.Site Plan: Portion of 2004 survey plat. Courtesy Armijo Surveys Inc.



For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: November 30, 2025**

Architectural Description Continued

Setting

The former property of Ted and Josephine Lopez is located approximately 100 feet southeast of Old Pecos Trail, a busy and historic transportation corridor (Photo 2). Ruts of the historic Santa Fe Trail cross an adjacent property. For many years, the asphalt-surfaced road carried traffic associated with U.S. Highways 66 and 85. The subject property consists of two historically separate parcels that fit together like a puzzle, forming a roughly rectangular lot. The parcel containing the primary house is the larger of the two, and together the parcels comprise approximately 0.63 acres.

The land is generally level and remains in a largely natural condition at the rear, where a light scatter of historic domestic trash is present. The front yard retains remnants of a 1960s–1970s landscape design, including colored concrete walkways, gravel planting beds, and yucca and juniper plantings. The rear patio is of recent construction and includes a recently built, retroactively approved free-standing pergola (Photo 3). Much of the property is obscured from view by a non-historic privacy wall along East Coronado Road (Photo 4).

Primary Dwelling (507 East Coronado Road)

The primary dwelling is oriented parallel to the street but is largely obscured by the previously described privacy wall. The core block, a roughly rectangular adobe mass, encloses approximately 2,214 square feet with three bedrooms and two baths, and is constructed over a partial basement. An east-elevation portal was added in the 1970s and later modified, and a carport was appended in the 1980s (Fig. 1). The attached carport extends the building's street-facing façade.

South (Front) Elevation

The front elevation presents a typical Pueblo Revival composition of a planar façade with a portal and a projecting cubic volume (Photos 1 & 6). In this case, the portal is slightly larger than typical proportions. The façade begins at the west with a combination window set above a heavy stuccoed lug sill serving the sitting room (Photo 7). The window unit, of vinyl-metal construction, likely replaced an earlier steel sash unit

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: November 30, 2025**

typical of the house's construction period. Instead of geared casements, the end units operate as sliding sash. These windows recur throughout the house.

The house is approached by a short flight of steps flanked by a solid balustrade leading to the portal (Photo 8). The portal's decking and floor have been replaced, and the exterior beams and corbels are overly rustic in character, also suggesting replacement. The decorative wood-panel entry door is of recent vintage (Photo 9). The projecting volume at the east end of the façade contains the living room and, like the rest of the house, is fitted with a vinyl-metal combination window (Photo 10).

The carport, erected in 1983, is attached to the house at the roofline (Photo 11). The flat-roofed, parapeted structure rests on stout posts but incorporates undersized dimensional lumber for the decking. It is accessed from the east (Photo). In its shadow is the base of the home's primary chimney.

East Elevation

The east elevation is dominated by the carport and a long, shallow *portal* that was originally constructed in the 1970s and later modified, likely in conjunction with construction of the carport (Photo 12). The south end of the portal shelters a patio that is accessed from the house through two vinyl sliding doors (Photo 13). The design and placement of these doors are not characteristic of 1950s construction. The remainder of the elevation is fenestrated with vinyl-metal combination windows (Photo 14).

North Elevation

Based on aerial photographs, the short north elevation (Photo 15) was altered after 1978 with the insertion of glazed doors serving the primary bedroom (Photo 16) and the addition of a small bump-out providing exterior access to the basement (Photo 18). The remainder of the elevation retains one original opening and a secondary chimney introduced after 1978.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

West Elevation

Facing a neighboring property, this elevation includes only two window openings, one serving a bathroom and the other, the guest bedroom (Photo 18). Like the other windows on the house, these units are of vinyl-metal construction.

Casita (509 East Coronado Road)

Situated in the northeast corner of the conjoined lots is a roughly 750-square-foot passive-solar guesthouse (Photo 19). The building exhibits a design typical of its period, with a tall, south-facing façade incorporating clerestory glazing and a roof overhang presumed to be designed to provide summer shading. Both the front and rear elevations are sheltered by walled patios that provide privacy and assist with climatic tempering (Photos 20). The windows are metal, and the front entry doors incorporate exterior plastic grids (Photo 21). Likely constructed in the late 1980s, the building was originally used as a studio-workshop and later converted to a guesthouse.

Front Privacy Wall

Built along the front property line is a tall stucco-on-block privacy wall arranged in two sections (Photo 5). The western section, in front of the primary dwelling, reaches a height of 83½ inches at its west end and includes a pedestrian entry gate (Photo 22). Near the center of the wall is a Corten-steel vehicular gate, set back approximately 20 feet. The wall terminates at the east at a height of 74 inches. The privacy wall is of recent construction and does not appear on a 1978 aerial photograph (Fig. 23)

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

Historical Overview

The subject property emerged during the 1950s with the development of East Coronado Road. Although it shares the same street name as the segment west of Old Pecos Trail, the two sections have distinct histories. The western portion of Coronado Road began to develop during the 1920s as part of the Buena Vista Addition and featured three estate houses set on large landscaped tracts. By contrast, the land east of Old Pecos Trail remained raw, despite the fact that both sides of the road received sewer service in 1927.Except for a single house at its eastern terminus, East Coronado Road remained largely undeveloped into the mid-20th century. This began to change in the 1950s. In 1945, Ted M. Lopez, a power plant operator for the Public Service Company of New Mexico, acquired two adjacent and irregularly shaped tracts of unimproved land at the west end of East Coronado Road. It was here that he built an adobe house for himself and his family.

The Lopez Family

Born Teodoro Miquel Lopez on July 2, 1912, in Ocate, Mora County, Ted moved with his family to Pecos in the 1920s, where his father operated a grocery store. He married Josefina Letisia Bustamante, a Pecos native, in 1938. The couple moved to Santa Fe and initially rented a house on Dunlap Street.

In 1940, Ted secured employment with the Public Service Company of New Mexico (now PNM), working as a fireman at the company's Water Street power plant. The 1940 census records that he had worked 48 hours the week prior to enumeration and earned $950 annually—a figure lower than the national average of $1,368, but likely solidly positioned within the Santa Fe economy.

Five years later, Lopez purchased two adjacent parcels separately from the Sena and Herrera families. A 1948 aerial photograph shows the land remained in raw, undeveloped condition (Fig. 2). That same year, Lopez hired John Offield, an Oklahoma-born surveyor, to prepare a unified plat of the two tracts.

During the 1950s, the Lopez family moved to the 400 block of West Coronado Street, where they rented a house. The household had grown substantially by then, eventually including eight children.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

With an eye toward developing his land on the east side of Old Pecos Trail, Ted and Josephine filed a quiet-title action in 1956 to clear long-standing clouded interests held by heirs of the Quintana, Sena, Griego, and related families, whose undivided agricultural lands had historically extended across the area. Such suits were common as mid-20th-century homeowners sought to convert former family tracts into buildable residential parcels.

City directories confirm that the Lopez family continued to reside west of Old Pecos Trail in the late 1950s, but a 1958 aerial photograph shows that the house at 509 East Coronado Road was largely completed by that date (Fig 3).

Progress may have been slowed by the death of their youngest child, an infant daughter who passed away at St. Vincent's Hospital in late 1958. By 1960, however, the large Lopez family was living in their new adobe home on East Coronado Road. By that time, the street had filled in with seven houses—each owner-occupied, with most representing Hispanic homeownership.

In the 1960s, the older Lopez children married and established their own households, and newspaper accounts suggest they pursued stable and successful careers. During these same years, Josephine experienced a period of declining health. Hospital admission notices in the Santa Fe New Mexican document her repeated admission and release from St. Vincent's Hospital between 1965 and 1972.

Ted retired from the Public Service Company of New Mexico in 1974 after 34 years of service, having begun as a fireman in 1940 and ultimately advancing to power-plant operator (Fig. 4).

Ted and Josephine continued to occupy the property through the 1970s. The precise circumstances and timing of the subsequent transfer remain unclear, but by the late 1970s the property appears to have entered the holdings of the owner of Cliff's Liquors, whose commercial property abuts the site along Old Pecos Trail. Sometime between 1973 and 1978, a portal was added along the east side of the building (Fig .5). This was followed in 1983 by an application to the Historic Design Review Board (H-83-316) to construct a carport on the same elevation.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

Josephine died in 1992 at age 70; Ted passed 20 years later. The house was listed for sale in 1993 and has changed hands several times since. The current owner acquired the two parcels making up the former Lopez family property in early 2025.

Evaluation of Historical Status

Primary House (507 East Coronado Road)

Erected in the 1950s and subject to changes and portal and carport additions during the 1970s and 1980s, the primary house has retained its overall heated footprint and general façade configuration. The areas most affected by later alterations are the east and north elevations, which have experienced fenestration changes and, on the east side, the introduction of two covered porches. Despite these changes, the front of the building—excluding the carport—continues to convey its original suburban Pueblo Revival character associated with the Lopez family's period of ownership. For this reason, the recommendation is that the house be classified as Contributing, with the south elevation designated as the primary façade. The primary façade excludes non-historic windows and doors and the carport.

Casita (509 East Coronado Road)

The guesthouse is too recent in construction to be considered Contributing and does not exhibit characteristics associated with the pioneering period of passive solar design in Santa Fe. It is therefore recommended as Non-contributing.

Front Privacy Wall and Pergola

Neither of these structures has reached sufficient age nor does either possess architectural significance. Both are recommended as Non-contributing.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

Illustrations



Figure 1: Alterations made after 1978 to building footprint (red).

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Figure 2: October 25, 1948, aerial photograph. No structures present; trace of historic Santa Fe Trail visible.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**




Figure 3: November 10, 1958, aerial photograph.
Subject house with original footprint configuration.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**



RETIREMENT HONOR — Ted M. Lopez (left) was honored recently by fellow employees and by his supervisor, Paul Wherle (right), during a retirement party. Lopez retired from the Public Service Company after 34 years of service, where he began as a fireman in 1940. He vacates his current position as a power plant operator. Lopez and his wife, Josephine, have eight children and nine grandchildren.

Figure 4: 1974, Ted Lopez retires from PNM. Santa Fe New Mexican.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**




Figure 5: September 11, 1978, aerial photograph. First iteration of east portal has been added to east elevation. Note absence of casita and front privacy wall.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

Survey Photographs

(All images taken by John W. Murphey, on November 30, 2025).



Photo 2: Setting. East Coronado Road in front of property. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 3: Setting. Backyard. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**



Photo 4: Pergola. Camera facing southeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**



Photo 5: Front privacy wall. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**

Primary House (507 East Coronado Road)



Photo 6: South elevation. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 7: South elevation. West section at sitting room. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 8: South elevation. Portal. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

We'd



Photo 9: South elevation. Entry door. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 10: South elevation. Window at living room. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 11: South and east elevations. Carport. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 12: East elevation. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 13: East elevation. Covered patio with non-historic openings. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 14: East elevation. Non-historic portal. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 15: North elevation. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 16: North elevation. Non-historic opening at primary bedroom. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 17: North elevation. Non-historic basement entry.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 18: West elevation. Camera facing southeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**

Casita (509 East Coronado Road)



Photo 19: South elevation. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: **November 30, 2025**



Photo 20: East and north elevations. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**



Photo 21: South elevation. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**

Front Privacy Wall



Photo 22: West section, pedestrian section. Camera facing north.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Ted and Josephine Lopez Property**	**2. Location:** **507 and 509 East Coronado Road** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: N/A** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey:** **November 30, 2025**



Photo 23: Vehicular gate. Camera facing north.

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: March 24, 2026

TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director *MRM*
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager, *GM*

FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division *LgM*

2026-012025-HDRB. 507 & 509 Coronado Rd., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Steve McCormick, agent for Julia Dancy, owner, requests status review and primary façade designation (if applicable)

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

__x__ Historic Inventory Form

__x__ Zoning Review Sheet

____ Other:

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ Proposal Letter

__x__ Site Plan/Floor Plan

__x__ Elevations

__x__ Photographs

__x__ Other: [2026 HCPI]

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the historic status of the structure be upgraded to contributing with the south elevation (R1, R2, R3), including the portal with the pony walls, and excluding the non-historic windows, doors, and the carport as the primary façade, the casita, yard wall, and pergola as non-contributing per 14-04.06(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Sample motions:

Up to three motions may be required for this case.

Status (for each structure):

a. In case 2026-012025-HDRB, for 507 East Coronado Road, upgrade the main residence, as contributing and designate facades (numbers from façade diagram) as primary façade(s).
b. In case 2026-012025-HDRB, for 507 East Coronado Road, downgrade the main residence as non-contributing.
c. In case 2026-012025-HDRB, for 507 East Coronado Road, retain the casita residence as non-contributing.
d. In case 2026-012025-HDRB, for 507 East Coronado Road, designate the yard wall and pergola as non-contributing due to age.

The property lies within the River and Trails Archaeological Review District. See Chapter 14, SFCC, Article 14-3.13(B)(1). There may be archaeological concerns associated with this project, and archaeological clearance may be required.




Figure 1: Property Location

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Streetscape:
East Coronado Road is a short road with no sidewalks on the street. All of the properties have front yard walls at 4’ to 6’ in height. The houses are uniformly set back from the street, with what used to be a guest house set behind them. Most of the guest houses have been split off to be main residences on separate lots. The residences are of light color in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style.


Figure 2: 507 Coronado

Site Description:
The Ted and Josephine Lopez property at 507 and 509 East Coronado Street consists of two separately addressed parcels with the main residence at 507 and the casita at 509. Both residences are currently listed on the GIS map as non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Other structures on the property include a privacy wall and a pergola.

The main residence was constructed in the late 1950s and is in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style. The core of the main residence is constructed of adobe and is 2,214 sq. ft. on top of a basement. A portal was added to the east elevation in the 1970s and was later modified. A carport addition was added in the 1980s and extends the street-facing façade of the residence. The south is the front of the residence and contains a portal and a projecting mass. The carport and a long, shallow portal from the 1970s dominate the east elevation. The north elevation has a small bump-out addition for basement access and a chimney introduced after 1978. The west elevation is the least altered. The windows throughout the residence are a combination of metal and vinyl windows.

The 750 sq. ft. casita was built post-1978 and is characteristic of a passive-solar design from the late 1980s or early 1990s. The south elevation has clerestory glazing and a roof overhang. The south and north elevations are sheltered by walled patios that assist with temperatures. The windows are metal, and the front entry doors have exterior plastic grids.


Figure 3: 509 Coronado

The front privacy wall is a stuccoed block wall in two sections. The western section is in front of the main residence and is at 83” in height and includes a pedestrian entry gate. Near the center of the wall is a steel vehicle gate where the wall turns in by about 20’. The eastern wall is at 74” in height. The wall was constructed sometime after 1978.

The wood pergola is neither historic nor has any architectural significance to the property.

PREVIOUS CASE SUMMARIES:

ARC:
Archaeological clearance has not been issued for either property.

HDRB:
In 1983, both parcels were a single parcel addressed as 509 East Coronado, which was approved for a carport.

ADMINISTRATIVE:
507 East Coronado Road was approved for concrete to be poured under the carport to level it and the rear courtyard, and to demolish the yard wall on the northeast corner of the residence and construct a new yard wall with a new layout under case 2022-005924-ADMIN.

507 East Corondo Road was approved to install a skylight under case 2026-012040-ADMIN.

APPLICANT’S REQUEST:

The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

1) Status Review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a residential structure.
2) Status Review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a casita dwelling structure.
3) Status Review for yard wall and pergola.

The main residence has retained its original footprint and general configuration, even with the additions and portal from the 1970s and 1980s. The most affected areas are on the north and east elevations, which have had fenestration changes and the additions of covered portals. The front of the building, excluding the carport, continues to convey the original character of the building. Therefore, staff would recommend the main residence as a contributing structure with the south elevation including the portal and pony walls, and excluding the non-historic windows, doors, and the carport as the primary facades.

The casita is not yet 50 years of age and does not exhibit characteristics associated with the period of passive solar design in Santa Fe; the staff would recommend the status of non-contributing.

The yard wall and the pergola are not of sufficient age nor have architectural significance; therefore, the staff recommends the status of non-contributing.




Figure 4: Façade Diagram

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-4.6 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

A. General Provisions

1. Purpose

To promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of Santa Fe and to ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City, the Governing Body deems it essential to preserve the qualities relating to the history and culture of Santa Fe, maintain a harmonious outward appearance to preserve property values, and attract residents and tourists alike. The specific purposes of this section are to preserve qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, such as the following:

I. Continue the existence and preservation of historic areas and buildings;

II. Continued construction of buildings in Santa Fe's historic styles; and

III. General harmony as to architectural style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

B. Buildings with Significant or Contributing Historic Status

1. Purpose

Historic designation is intended to address the following:

I. Recognizing each structure as a physical record of its time, place, and use.

II. Preventing changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings;

III. Preserving and retaining changes to structures that have acquired historic importance in their own right, recognizing that most structures change over time;

IV. Preserving distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure; and

V. Avoiding making new additions and related or adjacent new construction in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

2. Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status

I. Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing," as defined in Section 14-9.3, *General*

Definitions. Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of structures located in the historic districts.

II. HDRB Authority to Review Status Designation

a. The HDRB may change the status of a structure or to designate a status for a structure that has no status designated.

b. A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through a survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."

c. When the HDRB designates a structure as contributing, it shall also specify which facades of the structure are primary.

III. Initiation of Review of Status Designation

The Board may review the status designation in response to the following:

a. An application for construction or demolition as outlined in Section 14-5.2 as follows:

1. Prior to the application being placed on a board agenda or before issuance of a construction permit, if Board approval is not required, staff shall determine whether the board should review the status of the structure. Staff's determination shall be made within thirty days of submitting the application. If the staff's determination is not completed within thirty days, the application shall be forwarded to the board. Review by the board as to the structure's status shall be made at the earliest practicable date. The board or staff (as applicable) may consider the application immediately following the determination of status. The application shall be reviewed based on the status of the structure following the determination of status.

2. Before action by the board on the application, the board itself may decide to review the status of the structure. The board's determination as to the status shall be made within forty-five days of the board's decision of the board to review the status. The board or staff (as applicable) may consider the application immediately following the determination of the status. The application shall be reviewed based on the status of the structure following the determination of status.

b. Request from the property owner;

c. A request initiated by the city. Staff shall notify the property owner before initiating the request.

IV. Notice of HDRB's Review of Status

a. Unless the review is requested by the property owner, staff shall mail notice to the property owner of the subject property no less than 15 days before the HDRB reviews a change in or designation of status.

b. In addition, staff shall send notice, by first-class mail, to all property owners within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property no less than fifteen days

before the board reviews a change in or designation of status if the review may result in the lowering of the structure's status. Staff shall retain an affidavit of mailing.

c. With the consent of the property owner, the city shall have posted on the property a poster obtained from the planning land use department. Otherwise, the city shall post the poster in the nearest available place to the city. Such poster shall be securely posted, prominently displayed, visible from a public street, at least fourteen days before the scheduled board hearing. The posting shall indicate the nature of the application, identification of the property affected, and the time, date, and place of the hearing. The poster shall be removed within thirty days of final action. Failure to do so may result in the city removing the sign at the applicant's expense. A civil fee of fifty dollars ($50.00) will be charged.

NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A structure, located in a historic district, that is less than 50 years old, or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the Historic district.

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

A structure, located in a historic district, approximately 50 years old or older, that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE

A structure located in a historic district that is approximately 50 years old or older, and that embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. For a structure to be designated as significant, it must retain a high level of historic integrity. A structure may be designated as significant for its association with events or persons that are important on a local, regional, national, or global level, or if it is listed on or is eligible to be listed on the State Register of Cultural Properties or the National Register of Historic Places.

PRIMARY FACADE

One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.

G. Additional District-Specific Design Standards

2. Downtown and Eastside Historic District

The governing body recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the city from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with adobe, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a development from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

I. Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with adobe, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

a. With rare exception, buildings are of one story, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the buildings are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight slope and surrounded on at least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the walls or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the walls except to cover an enclosed portal or porch formed by setting back a portion of the wall or to form an exterior portal, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns.

Two-story construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the floor of the second story. Facades are flat, varied by inset portales, exterior portales, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-sprouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved, and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, open slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding walls.

b. All exterior walls of a building are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under portales, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a wall under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color or have mural decorations.

c. Solid wall space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;

d. The rules as to flat roofs shall not be constructed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof structures, but such structures other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the street on which the building fronts;

e. True old Santa Fe style buildings are made of adobe with a mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the

adobe effect can be simulated is permissible, provided that the exterior walls are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight fa□ade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating adobe, laid on smoothly, is required; and

f. It is characteristic of Old Santa Fe style commercial buildings to place a portal so that it covers the entire sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

II. Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

a. No building shall be over two stories in height in any facade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks, or other design elements;

b. The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;

c. No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;

d. No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;

e. The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish, and of relatively smooth texture. Facade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complementary colors. Windows, doors, and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles, except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic, and

f. Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: March 24, 2026

TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director HLL
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director *MRM*
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager *GM*

FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division LgM

2026-011825-HDRB. 619 W. Alameda St. 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, and construct 40" high yard walls. An exception is requested to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

__x__ Historic Inventory Form

__x__ Zoning Review Sheet

__x__ Other: previous cases

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ Proposal Letter

__x__ Site Plan/Floor Plan

__x__ Elevations

__x__ Photographs

____ Other:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the exception to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure and recommends approval of the items that do not require an exception and finds that the application complies with 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(5) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.

Sample motions:

a. In case 2026-011825-HDRB, for 619 West Alameda Street, approve or deny the exception to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure.
b. In case 2026-011825-HDRB, 619 West Alameda Street, approve or deny the elements of the application that do not require an exception.

The property lies within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. See Chapter 14, SFCC, Article 14-3.13(B)(1). There may be archaeological concerns associated with this project, and archaeological clearance may be required.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Streetscape and Context:

The property at 619 West Alameda is located across from the Santa Fe River Park, which is a passive recreational area with landscaping, picnic tables, and a walking path. The park is bounded on one side by the ten-foot drop to the riverbed and on the other side by Alameda Street. This parkway was developed for the visual enhancement of the nature of the site.

Across from the Santa Fe River is the residential sector of Alameda Street. The houses range in style, with the most prominent styles being Spanish Pueblo Revival and Vernacular in this area. Most of the residences are lower single-story buildings with an average height on the streetscape of 12’8”. The street is lined with low yard walls with an average height of 46” (3’10”). The yard walls are stuccoed concrete masonry units that are colored to match the corresponding building.




Figure 1: Location of Property.

Site Description:
The 702 sq. ft. single-family residence at 619 W Alameda Street is listed as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The Spanish Pueblo Revival structure is constructed of adobe and pentile.




Figure 2: Residential Sections.

The adobe portion of the residence was constructed approximately around 1943, with the pen tile addition being constructed by 1951. The wood-framed addition appears to have been constructed in 1975 and collapsed in 2024which has been removed from the property. There are projecting vigas at the exterior of the adobe south walls, though the interior portion of the vigas appears to have been removed at some point. The north wall has projecting roof joists on the pen tile addition. Roof drainage is a single-sheet metal channel on the north elevation. The exterior walls are cement stucco on chicken wire with paint on the stucco.

All except one window are wood, double-hung hung single-glazed one-over-one windows. There are some wood screens, though not all windows have these screens. The two front doors on the south may be handmade wood, frame, and panel with a glazed flower petal design. The western rear door is a frame and panel, and the eastern rear door is a hollow-core wood door. All windows and doors are recessed about 6”, and the windows have projecting concrete sills. The two front doors have two small steps.

The property held a front wire fence with a wire gate, which has been removed. There is also a side chain link fence, short cast concrete posts, a couple of wood posts, and possible remains of a stone boundary. The residence is typical of the streetscape.



Figure 3: South Façade of Residence.

There is also a pentile-lined well on the west side of the property. The well is listed as a contributing structure.

PREVIOUS CASE SUMMARIES:

ARC:

No archaeological clearance has been issued for the property.

HDRB:

The property's status was reviewed on July 8, 2025, under case 2025-010664-HDRB. The residence was designated as contributing, and the south and west elevations as primary. The pentile-lined well was designated as contributing.




Figure 4: Primary Facades

ADMINISTRATIVE:
There are no administrative approval cases on record for the property in the Historic Preservation Division files.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:
The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

Existing Structure:
1) Remove the existing windows with frames and restore the windows and frames. The concrete windowsills shall be retained. Existing windows are double-hung wood with single-lite panes.
2) Remove the south doors and frames to reconstruct the frames and repair the doors.
3) Install a concrete bond beam on top of the adobe and pen tile walls. The bond beam will raise the height of the structure from 9'-4" to 10'-6½". The maximum allowable height is 14'-5". An exception to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure is requested.
4) Reconstruct the roof and install a new roof.
5) Install a new canale in the existing canale space on the northwest corner of the building.
6) Install two skylights. Skylights will be low profile and shall not be publicly visible.
7) Brace the southwest building corner to prevent the wall from continuing to move westward.
8) Construct a 132 sq. ft. 9'-6" high portal on the north elevation. The portal will be supported by wood columns and have wood headers, corbels, and a metal roof.
9) Replace both north pedestrian doors with half-lite wood doors with panels.
10) Install a ground mounted HVAC condenser on the southeast corner of the building (publicly visible).
11) Install a 40" high coyote fence to screen the HVAC condenser.
12) Install a 40" high masonry yard wall courtyard on the southeast corner of the building.
13) Install a 40" high stucco finished masonry yard wall along the east property line north of the residence.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV(b): The applicant requests an exception to increase the height of a contributing structure.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*
Applicant Response: The historic structure, Unit A in our proposal, will remain well below Ms. McCulley's maximum height (14'-5"), but we do request a height change to this structure. Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The Dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls. This increase in height will not affect the character of this historic structure or streetscape. It keeps the parapet at minimum height and secures the preservation of the existing structure for the foreseeable future.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. The height change is minimal, and the structure will have the same appearance but a bond beam will prevent further deterioration of the structure therefore, the character of the district will not be damaged.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: The historic structure, Unit A in our proposal, will continue to deteriorate without the addition of the proposed bond beam. The engineered bond beam, viga ceiling structure, r-49 insulation tapered insulation and roofing have been proposed to be installed directly atop the top of the existing historic walls. We cannot shorten the structure without reducing the height of the exterior walls. This will prevent undue hardship to the owner and injury to the public welfare from the continued deterioration of the structure of Unit A.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. The structure is at risk of full collapse and is not a viable living space at this time. To save the structure and make it a livable space a bond beam is necessary and will raise the height minimally. Bond beams are required by the current building code.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The Dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. This design option of a bond beam minimizes the impact to the structure and provides the necessary stability to rehabilitate the dilapidated structure.

(iv) *Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;*

Applicant Response: Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The Dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. The structure was not constructed with a uniform bond beam but would benefit from one. The bond beam will raise the height minimally but will make the building inhabitable.

(v) *Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and*

Applicant Response: The deterioration of the abandoned historic Unit A has been in process for decades. Mesa Verde Construction, LLC's remodel of this structure will save it for posterity and is not fault of the company's owner.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. The deterioration of the structure is a result of the structure being abandoned for years. Rehabilitation is necessary to make the structure a livable space. The bond beam that will raise the roof will stabilize the building and restore it to a livable space.

(vi) *Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).*

Applicant Response: The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls while preserving the overall appearance of the unit.

Staff Response: Staff find that this criterion is met. The approximately one-foot change in height is minimal and since the overall structure appearance is not changing, the impact of the change is the least negative impact.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-4.6 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

A. General Provisions

1. Purpose

To promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of Santa Fe and to ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City, the Governing Body deems it essential to preserve the qualities relating to the history and culture of Santa Fe, maintain a harmonious outward appearance to preserve property values, and attract residents and tourists alike. The specific purposes of this section are to preserve qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, such as the following:

I. Continue the existence and preservation of historic areas and buildings;

II. Continued construction of buildings in Santa Fe's historic styles; and

III. General harmony as to architectural style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

2. Conflicting Standards

I. Zoning District Regulations

All designated landmarks and all properties located in historic districts shall be subject to the regulations of the base zoning district in which they are located, except for height as regulated in Section 14-4.6E, *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts.* When the requirements of the base zoning district conflict with the requirements of this Section 14-4.6, *Historic Districts,* the more restrictive standard shall apply.

II. Multiple Overlay Regulations

When a designated landmark or property located in a historic district is also located within another overlay, and there is a conflict between the requirements of the historic district and the other applicable overlay district, the more restrictive standard shall apply.

5. Boundaries

a. The boundaries for the historic districts are as shown on the Official Zoning Map and incorporated in this Code by reference.

b. If the boundary line of a historic district bisects or crosses a property without encompassing the entire lot, the applicable requirements of the historic district shall be as determined by the Planning and Land Use Director.

6. Design of Buildings

Full responsibility for the design and development of structures is upon the applicant. The case file of any prior application related to a property is available for review by the applicant upon request.

7. Nonconforming Buildings and Structures

Any building or structure in the historic district that does not meet the standards for architectural style outlined in this section shall be considered nonconforming, and subject to the provisions of Section 14-1.13(), *Legal Nonconforming Structures,* unless given special approval by the HDRB for architectural or historic interest, or unless individually entered in the state register of cultural properties or in the national register of historic places or designated as significant on either register.

B. Minimum Maintenance Requirements

All historic landmarks and all buildings and structures in the historic districts shall be preserved against decay and deterioration and maintained free of structural defects.

C. Buildings with Significant or Contributing Historic Status

I. Purpose

Historic designation is intended to address the following:

I. Recognizing each structure as a physical record of its time, place, and use.

II. Preventing changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings;

III. Preserving and retaining changes to structures that have acquired historic importance in their own right, recognizing that most structures change over time;

IV. Preserving distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure; and

V. Avoiding making new additions and related or adjacent new construction in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

2. Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status

I. Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing," as defined in Section 14-9.3, *General Definitions.* Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of structures located in the historic districts.

II. HDRB Authority to Review Status Designation

a. The HDRB may change the status of a structure or designate a status for a structure that has no status designated.

b. A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through a survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."

c. When the HDRB designates a structure as contributing, it shall also specify which facades of the structure are primary.

V. Restoration of Status

If a property owner makes changes to a structure without the proper City approvals, which result in the lowering of the structure's status, staff or the Board may require the property owner to restore the structure such that its former status is restored.

3. Review by Historic Districts Review Board Required

I. Except where this chapter provides for review by staff, the HDRB shall review all applications for new construction, alteration, or demolition in the historic districts and of landmark structures throughout the city, based on the standards set forth in this section.

II. The historic board shall judge any proposed alteration or new structure for harmony with adjacent buildings, preservation of historical and characteristic qualities, and conformity to the standards for architectural style set forth in this section.

Ill. The HDRB may approve, deny, approve with conditions, or, with the consent of the applicant, postpone an application.

a. For applications approved with conditions, no permit shall be issued until the HDRB conditions have been met.

b. An application that is postponed shall be heard at a date agreed upon by the HDRB and the applicant.

IV. No permit shall be issued until the time for appeal to the Governing Body has expired.

4. Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All development located within the historic districts and subject to this section shall comply with all applicable general development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6E), *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts,* as well as any applicable specific development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6G), *Additional District-Specific Design Standards.*

D. Exceptions

The HDRB may grant an exception to the regulations set forth in this section, provided that such exception does not exceed the underlying zoning, except when the board of adjustment grants a variance. Staff shall determine whether an exception to general design and preservation standards described in Section 14-4.6E is required and shall recommend that the HDRB approve, approve with conditions, or deny the exception.

E. General Design Standards for All Historic Districts

These standards shall apply to all additions or alterations to existing structures in the Historic Districts. Contributing, significant, and landmark structures may be subject to specific additional restrictions and district-specific standards in Section 14-4.6G).

I. General

I. The historic status of a property with a historic status designation of significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status is prohibited.

II. If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application may be denied.

III. For the regulations of this subsection, all facades of a significant structure are primary facades.

2. Building Additions

I. Design

a. Building additions that meet the standards of Section 14-4.6G.2), *Downtown and Eastside Historic District,* shall continue to meet those standards, in addition to the standards set forth in this section.

b. Building additions shall have similar materials, architectural treatments and styles, features, and details as the existing structure, but shall be distinguishable from and not attempt to duplicate the existing structure.

II. Size and Location

a. Building additions are not permitted on primary facades.

b. All building additions shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the

primary facade.

c. Building additions shall not exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the building's historic footprint and shall not exceed 50 percent of the historic length in linear feet of the primary facade.
d. To the extent architecturally practicable, new building additions shall be attached to any existing non-primary facade of a structure rather than attaching them to the primary facade of a structure.

III. Height

a. The maximum height of building additions to significant and landmark structures shall be at least six inches lower than the parapet or equivalent roof feature of the existing adjacent connecting facade.
b. Building additions to contributing structures shall be no more than one additional story higher than the existing structure. To the extent architecturally practicable, two-story additions shall be set to the rear or the side rear of the structure. When an additional story is to be placed upon an existing contributing structure, that footprint may be no greater than fifty percent of the footprint of the existing structure, subject to the provisions of Subsection A(1) above. For the purposes of this paragraph, an additional story shall not exceed twelve (12) feet from the existing rooftop to the highest point of that story.

IV. Remodeling to Increase Height

a. For remodeling of an existing significant or landmark structure, no increase in height of the structure is permitted.
b. For remodeling an existing contributing structure, a height increase may be permitted through approval of an exception, as described in Section 14-4.6D.

V. Rooftop Equipment

Rooftop equipment, including but not limited to solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment, may only be installed on contributing and noncontributing structures and shall not be publicly visible, nor shall a parapet be raised to conceal such equipment.

3. Porches and Portals

Existing porches or portals on significant and landmark structures, and on primary facades of contributing structures, shall not be permanently enclosed.

4. Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

I. For all facades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary facades of contributing structures:

a. Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double-pane glass may be used. No window opening shall be widened or narrowed.
b. Window depth and other characteristics of window and door fenestration shall be preserved.

c. No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.
d. No historic opening shall be closed.

II. For all facades of contributing, significant, and landmark structures:
a. Architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows shall be repaired rather than replaced.
b. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities.
c. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical, or pictorial evidence.

5. Roofs

The existing historic roof styles and materials shall be maintained or replaced in kind if necessary. The addition of dormers or other roof features should only be considered when they are an existing historic feature of the structure.

6. Surface Cleaning

The surface cleaning of structures shall employ the gentlest means possible. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials are not permitted.

7. Archaeological Resources

Discovery of archaeological resources made during the development of a historic property shall be referred to the Archaeological Review Committee. See Section 14-2.1G.1.V.c, *Unexpected Discoveries.*

8. Signs

Sign applications and required submittals shall be reviewed by the Planning and Land Use Department. Approval or denial shall be indicated by the department on the application for the construction permit and on each of the required submittals.

9. Murals

If an application impacts a mural funded through the art in public places program or is otherwise within the scope of the arts commission's enabling responsibilities,

10. Pedestrian-Oriented Areas

I. The HDRB shall recommend to the Governing Body appropriate streets or portions of streets within the historic district to be set aside for pedestrian-oriented areas.

II. The Governing Body may set aside the areas recommended, provided that three-fourths of the property owners adjoining the street or portion of street affected have given consent thereto.

III. Such pedestrian-oriented areas shall be closed to vehicular traffic, and any improvements made by the City in the public right-of-way within the area shall be for pedestrian purposes.

IV. No pedestrian-oriented area shall be set aside unless there is adequate space available conveniently related to the area for vehicle parking. The HDRB's recommendation to the Governing Body shall include a statement of the available parking spaces.

F. Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Step backs.

The height, pitch, scale, and massing of any structure in a historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted elsewhere within this chapter.

G. Additional District-Specific Design Standards

5. Westside-Guadalupe Historic District

I. District Standards

Compliance with the following structural standards shall occur whenever those exterior features of buildings and other structures subject to public view from any public street, way, or other public place are erected, altered, or demolished.

a. Slump block, stucco, brick, or stone shall be used as exterior wall materials. Wood and other materials may be used for details. Aluminum siding, metal, panels, mirrored glass, and unstuccoed concrete block or unstuccoed concrete shall not be used as exterior wall materials;

b. The color of stuccoed buildings shall predominantly be in browns, tans, local earth tones, and soft pastels. Surfaces of stone or brick shall be in the natural color. Entryways, and portales or porches may be emphasized by the use of white or other colors. Painting of buildings with a color that causes arresting or spectacular effects, or with bold repetitive patterns, or using buildings as signs is prohibited. Murals, however, are permitted and may be referred to the city arts board for an advisory recommendation.

c. Roof form, slope, and shape. It is intended that the buildings be designed to be "wall-dominated". "Wall-dominated" means that the building's geometry is more defined by walls than by roofs. Buildings with flat, gabled, shed, or hipped roofs can be designed as "wall-dominated" solutions and are allowed. The height of the roof above the wall shall be no greater than the height of the wall. Folded plate, hyperbolic, or mansard roofs are not allowed;

d. The use of solar and other energy-collecting and conserving strategies is encouraged. The use of large glazed areas on south-facing walls for trombe walls or other solar collectors, direct gain, or other energy-collecting purposes is allowed. When in view from any public street, way, or other public place, solar equipment shall be screened as follows:

- raising the parapet;
- setting back from the edge of the roof;
- Framing the collector with wood.
- In the case of pitched roofs, by integrating the collector into the pitch;
- In the case of ground solar collectors, by a wall or vegetation;
- In the case of wall collectors, by enclosing or other walls;
- Other means that screen the collector or integrate it into the overall structure. Non-glare materials shall be used in solar collectors.

e. Mechanical, electrical, telephone equipment, microwave satellite receiving dishes, and other obstructive equipment shall be architecturally screened with opaque materials by raising the parapet, boxing in the equipment, or other appropriate means. The equipment shall be of a low profile to minimize the screening problems.

f. Walls and fences shall be of brick, adobe, masonry, rock, wood, coyote fencing, or similar materials. Wrought iron fences and slump block walls are allowed. Walls of unstuccoed concrete block, unstuccoed concrete, chain-link, metal wire, or similar materials are prohibited, except where the wall or fence is not in the street frontage.

g. Greenhouses;

h. Attached greenhouses that front on the street shall give the appearance of being integrated into the structure of the building or of being a substantive addition rather than having a lean-to effect. The use of corrugated fiberglass or rolled plastic for the external surface of attached or freestanding greenhouses that front on the street is prohibited. Greenhouses with slanting sides shall be bracketed at the ends, and that greenhouses made from enclosed porches or portals maintain the shape of the porch or portal.

i. Porches and portales are encouraged;

j. When parking spaces are required for commercial or multi-family residential buildings, they shall be placed to the rear or side of the building.

II. Walls; Fences; Solar Collectors: Administration

Applications for the erection, alteration, or demolition of walls, fences, and solar collectors and required submittals shall be reviewed by the planning and land use department. Approval, disapproval, or referral shall be indicated by the division on the application for the building permit and on each of the required submittals, all of which shall be signed by the division staff assigned to the review. The division staff shall report approvals, disapprovals, and referrals to the board at its next regular meeting as an informational item. (Ord. No. 2007-45 § 30, Ord. No. 2020-22

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM 1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only:
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #: 4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408

5. Property Type: Small single family residential structure on small city lot.

6. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025

7. Previous Survey Date(s): N/A

8. Name of Project: HDRB Status Review

9. Lat/Long: 35.689134, -105.950314



10. Photo Information: May 12, 2025 View: Looking northeast from sidewalk

11. Brief Description of the Property: This building is located in the City of Santa Fe, on a small city lot on West Alameda, in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Early documentation on the property is scarce. Reportedly, the house was built in 1943, but no actual documentation of this exists. The building is a small, simple, low Pueblo Revival style structure, with a flat roof. It is approximately square, measuring about 26-1/2 feet in either direction. The exterior walls are constructed of adobe and pen tile. The setback, size, scale, style, and detailing of the building is somewhat typical of other buildings on the street. A small rectangular wood framed addition had been added to the north side of the building, but it collapsed in late 2024 or early 2025. All that remains of this addition is the foundation.

Note: A detailed description of the property, and more documentation is included in the continuation sheets at the end of this document, beginning on page 5.


12. Who uses the property? Unused

13. Construction Date: 1940's
__Known _X_ Estimated
Source: MLS Listing, Property Recs (propertyrecs.com), Santa Fe County Clerk/Register of Deeds, City of Santa Fe GIS website, UNM Earth Data Analysis Center

14. Setting:
__Suburban __Rural __Village _X_ Urban If Urban: __Commercial __Industrial _X_ Residential __Public

15. Relationship to Surroundings: _X_ Similar __Dissimilar
Comments: N/A

16. Additional Perspective: (Photos, drawing, footprint, etc., indicate north arrow when possible)



17. Surveyor:

Mark L Mortier – Architect
1936 Cerros Colorados
Santa Fe, NM. 87501

505-231-5989
marklmortier@gmail.com

18. Owner: Maxfield Scott, Santa Fe, NM:

19. Is Property Endangered? __Unknown __No _X_ Yes How? Very weathered and deteriorated, vandalized, bottom of foundation is exposed, interior has been partially gutted, a portion of building has collapsed.

20. Significance to Current Community: _X_ Unknown __None __Low __Moderate __High
Describe: Unknown

21. Other Significance or Information of Interest (such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.): The setback, size, scale, style, and detailing of the building is somewhat typical of other buildings on the street.

22. National or State Register:

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? __Unknown _X_ No __Yes
If yes: __State__National
If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? _X_ No __Yes
Why? Unknown significance

23. National or State Historic District: City of Santa Fe

Is this property in a historic district? __Unknown __No _X_ Yes

If yes: __Significant ___Contributing _X_ Non-contributing

If 'yes', what is the name of the district? __State __National _X_ City of Santa Fe, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District

24. Supplemental Forms:
__None _X_ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) _X_ Continuation Sheets, # pages: 13

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: *Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, and May 12, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS:

6. Visible Construction Material:	7. Number of Stories: 1
Exterior - Poured concrete foundations, adobe walls, pen tile walls, cement stucco, asphalt or modified bitumen built-up roof. Wood doors and windows. Interior - Wood joist floor structure, with wood flooring, Wood joist ceiling/roof structure, with wood decking, gypsum plastered walls. Note: Viga ends visible at front facade, as well as cut off stubs inside of the front portion of the building. Projecting roof/ceiling joists at rear façade. One modern sheet metal canale at rear, can see where two other canales were closed off for wood framed addition.	8. Foundation: Shallow, board formed poured concrete foundation at portion of building still standing, top approximately level with grade, no footing; grout filled concrete block, on spread footing, at collapsed addition. 9. Roof: Nominally flat roof, covered with modern asphalt or modified bitumen built-up roof, with mineral surfaced cap sheet, running over top of parapet.

10. Windows: Wood double hung type, single glazed, 1 light over 1 light. Simple wood frames with parting bead and applied stop. No counterbalances or weights - may have had pins to hold them open. Paint finish. Some windows have crude wood screens. Cast concrete sills. Also one square window opening on rear of building, window has been removed.	11. Doors: Front doors, frame and panel type with glazed flower petal design near top. May be hand made. May not be original. Stained finish. Simple painted wood frames, have been modified for doors. West rear door manufactured wood frame and panel door, with three horizontal panels and 4 light glazed panel. Wood frame. All painted. East rear door, modern hollow core door in crude wood frame.
12. Chimneys: None.	13. Porches: None. Small poured concrete stoops at front doors.

14. Other Significant Features: None

15. Modifications: the building appears to have been built in three phases - first an original rectangular adobe walled portion located towards the front of property, then a rectangular "pen tile" addition on the back side of original portion, and finally a small addition on the back side of the pen tile addition. This last addition has collapsed, and only the foundation remains. Wood front doors appear to have been replaced.

(Continued from other side)

16. Primary Architectural Style: Spanish Pueblo Revival


17. Documents Available and Their Locations: Property Report - Property Recs (propertyrecs.com), Deeds and Plats - Santa Fe County Clerk/Register of Deeds, Aerial Photos, Map of Contributing Structures - City of Santa Fe GIS website, Aerial Photos - UNM Earth Data Analysis Center, Aerial Photos – Google Maps, Copies of MLS Listing - Owner.

SITE:

18. Attached or Associated Properties: None

Are associated properties eligible for listing: Not applicable

19.Site Plan:



Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025

This building is located in the City of Santa Fe, on a small residential lot on West Alameda, in the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. Early documentation on the property is scarce. Reportedly, the house was built in 1943, but no actual documentation of this exists. The earliest recorded deed for the property appears to be from 1945, conveying a 50-foot by 100-foot lot from a husband and wife living in Pilar, to a single owner in Santa Fe.

The building is a small, simple, low Pueblo Revival style structure, with a flat roof. It is approximately square, measuring about 26-1/2 feet in either direction. The setback, size, scale, style, and detailing of the building is somewhat typical of other older buildings on the street. A small rectangular wood framed addition had been added to the north side of the building, but it collapsed in late 2024 or early 2025. All that remains of this addition is the foundation.

The standing portion of the building appears to have been constructed in two phases – an original rectangular building on the front (south), and a full width rectangular addition on the back (north). A seam is visible on the side walls of the building, as well as a small step in the parapet height, where this addition joins the original building. The front half of the building, including the former north exterior wall, that now divides the two halves, was built with adobe blocks, on a shallow board formed poured concrete foundation, that was built without footings. The back half of the building was built with “pen tile,” also on a shallow board formed poured concrete foundation, built without footings. Both portions of the building have a flat roof/ceiling, framed with wood joists, and decked with wood boards. The roof appears continuous from above. Both halves have wood floor joists, over a shallow cavity, and were covered with wood flooring. The interior has been partially gutted.

Aerial photography, documenting the property, was obtained from the City of Santa Fe, the UNM Earth Data Analysis Center, and Google Maps. The earliest image, dated 1935, is too low resolution to be useful. A 1948 image is also low resolution, but appears to show a building on the property. However, its shape cannot be discerned. An image from 1951 clearly shows a building, which appears to be a square, suggesting the pen tile addition had been constructed by this time. The building footprint does not change in several photos from the 1960’s. The wood framed addition first shows up in a 1975 photo, and remains there in photos up to and including a dated May of 2023.

The exterior walls are covered with two layers of cement stucco, on chicken wire, which has been covered with a coat of thick paint or synthetic stucco. Each stucco layer has a visible cementitious color coat. An orange toned cementitious color coat, popular in the 1950’s and 1960’s, is seen just under the exterior coating, and a white cementitious finish coat is seen under that layer of stucco, on top of the base layer. The base layer of stucco has been applied directly to the substrate, without any building paper or other moisture barrier.

There are small, short projecting viga ends visible on the front façade of the building, which may be the remains of an original viga roof/ceiling structure for the front portion of the building. The stubs of the vigas can be seen on the interior of the front wall, and both sides of the rear wall of the original building, suggesting that the vigas have been cut off at the interior surface of the walls and removed. The rear façade has projecting roof/ceiling joists.

The roof appears to be covered with modern, mineral surfaced, asphalt or modified bitumen built up roofing, which has been run up and over the tops of the parapets. There is one modern sheet metal canale at the rear, you can see where two other canales were closed off for construction of the wood framed addition.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025

All but one of the windows are wood, double hung type, single glazed, 1 light over 1 light. They are simply constructed with wood frames, and sashes held in place by an applied parting bead and applied stops, which form the tracks. They are not counter balanced or weighted, and may have had pins that were used to hold them open. Some of the windows have crude wood screens. The windows have a paint finish, and they appear to be original. The windows have cast concrete sills, and are recessed several inches into the walls, with a curved stucco reveal.

There is also a small square opening in the north wall, recessed similar to the double hung windows, with a painted wood frame, which appears to have been a wood window. The window appears to have been removed, and the opening is covered with wood framed window screening on the exterior, and what appears to be gypsum board on the interior. (This may be the back side of the bath tub surround. It is not weather proof, but was enclosed in the wood framed addition, until the addition collapsed.)

The two front windows, as well as the two windows on the east facade of the building, measure approximately 24-inches by 47-inches. Two of these same windows are mulled together on the south portion of the west façade to create a double unit. Another window on the north portion of the west façade measures approximately 30-inches by 45-inches.

The two front doors are wood, frame and panel type, with a glazed flower petal design. They do not appear to be original, and may be hand made. They appear to have been stained and sealed. There have simply constructed wood frames, with applied stops, a screen mortise, and wood sills, which appear to be set directly on the foundation. The frames are recessed several inches into the walls, with a curved stucco reveal. The frames have been crudely modified to accept the doors, and have a paint finish. The doors have modern latches and deadbolts, modern metal thresholds, and there are screen door hinges on the frames.

The western rear door, is a manufactured frame and panel door, with a 3 horizontal panels, and a glazed, 4 light panel in the top. The wood frame and sill are similar to the front doors, with provisions for a screen door. The frame is recessed several inches into the walls, with a curved stucco reveal. The door and frame have a paint finish. This door may be original. It has modern hardware, and a metal sill.

Another door is visible at the rear – on the east side. This door was installed to provide access into the rear addition. This door is a modern hollow core wood door, in a crude wood frame, that is set in a rough opening that was cut into the pen tile.

The building has electrical service, phone service, city water and sewer, and natural gas service, although none of these services are connected or in use.

On site features at the front of the property include the remains of a chain link fence, a couple of short cast concrete posts – which may be from an old fence, a couple of wood posts, and possible remains of a stone landscape border. There is a chain link fence along the east and north boundary of the property. The west boundary is closed off by walls on the adjacent property. There are two small poured concrete stoops outside of the two front doors.

There is also what appears to be an old pen tile lined well, on the west side of the property. Note that the survey shows a shed along the rear of the west boundary of the property. This shed no longer exists.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



View from street – looking northeast - May 2025



South façade – looking north – May 2025

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Southwest corner – looking northeast – May 2025



West façade – looking east – May 2025

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Northwest corner – looking southeast – May 2025



North façade – looking south – May 2025

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Northwest corner – looking north – May 2025



East façade – looking west – May 2025

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Southeast corner– looking northwest – May 2025

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Wood framed addition – pre collapse - 2023



Wood framed addition – pre collapse - 2023

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Aerial view – 1948 – appears to show a building on the property

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Aerial view – 1951 – appears to show a square building

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Aerial view – 1967 – clearly shows a square building

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Aerial view – 1975 – clearly shows the third addition

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Continuation Sheet

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: 619 West Alameda	2. Location: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID #
		4. County: Santa Fe Parcel #12129408
		5. Date of Survey: May 6, 2025, May 12, 2025



Aerial View - 2023

H323

6/24/85 HMW SF 05161326Gb


SFHD 7 26Gb

619 W. ALAMEDA

SF

—

SL SFHD 7 22



P

SF DIR; NEIGHBOR

RES.

City of Santa Fe

Land Use Department
200 Lincoln Ave.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0909

PROJECT DESC: 2025-010664-HDRB, 619 W Alameda St., Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, non-contributing, Dura Build Construction, agent for Max Scott, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure.

CASE NUMBER: 2025-010664--HDRB

PROJECT TYPE: Historic Status Review

LOCATION: 619 W ALAMEDA ST
Santa Fe, NM 87501

CONTACTS:

Applicant	Max Scott
Property Owner	Max Scott

BOARD ACTION

This is to certify that the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) acted on your request at their hearing on Jul 22, 2025. The decision of the Board was to upgrade the residential structure to contributing and designate the south and west facades as primary and designate the pentile lined well as contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District.

For further information please call 505-955-6605.

Sincerely,

Lani McCulley

NOTE: Applicant can use this action letter to apply for construction permit, but the permit shall not be released until the end of the appeal period which starts on the date of filing of the Findings and Conclusions in the City Clerk's office (SFCC 14-3.17(D)). Your permit will be denied if any changes on plans that were not approved by the HDRB or if conditions of approval are not met. **Please attach copies of this letter to all sets when submitting for construction permits.**

Ver. 12 1/14/2020

619 W Alameda St

CITY OF SANTA FE

HISTORIC PRELIMINARY ZONING REVIEW

PLUD-20

PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to a public hearing in front of the Historic District Review Board (HDRB) all applicants must obtain Historic Districts Preliminary Zoning Review (HPZR) from the Current Planning Division. The HPZR does not grant zoning approval. Following design approval from the HDRB, final zoning review will be performed at the time of building permit.

Applicants must submit complete and accurate information for review. Incomplete submittals will not be processed. All HPZR requests must be submitted to Current Planning via zoningcounter@santafenm.gov

PROJECT INFORMATION

Date	11/14/2025	Property Owner of Record	Maxfield Scott				
Applicant/Agent Contact	Scott Irving						
Site Address	619 W Alameda						
Suite or Space #		Subdivision Name	N/A				
Lot #	Tract 3	Block #		Total Roof Area (square feet)	2200		
Lot Coverage %	37%	Lot Size (square feet)	4967				
Proposed Construction Description	Stabilize and repair existing 710ft. structure. Build rear unit.						
The following documents are required for review as applicable:	✓ Legal Lot of Record ✓ Building Plans ✓ Existing site plan w/ setbacks ✓ Proposed site plan w/ setbacks ✓ Existing & Proposed Elevations ✓ Development Plan						
Zoning District	R29	Overlay Districts	Escarpment	Flood Plain	Other		
Proposed Setbacks	Front	11ft	Rear	65ft	Left Side	20ft	Right Side 2.5ft
Required Setbacks	Front	7ft	Rear	15ft	Left Side	5ft	Right Side 5ft
Proposed Height	20'~~8~~'	Max Height	10'~~4~~'	Parking Required	3spcs	Provided	3sp~~c~~ Bike Parking Yes Provided Yes

Historic Planning Case Manager: Lani McCulley

If you selected "other," please write in the name of your case manager.

ADDITIONAL SUBMITALS (IF APPLICABLE)

Y N Affidavit Restricting Use of an Accessory Structure Containing a Bathroom or Kitchen		
Y N Setback Affidavit and Agreement		
Y N Site Visibility Triangle	Y N Escarpment Slope Analysis	Y N Flood Plain Grading Plan


This hereby certifies that the information provided for preliminary zoning review is accurate and will not be modified without consulting the Land Use Department staff prior to HDRB hearing.


Scottirving ○ Owner ✓ Applicant ○ Agent

To Be Completed by Land Use Department Staff

PRELIMINARY REVIEW STATUS

X Preliminarily Reviewed	Reviewed w/ conditions	Denied
Comments/Conditions: must comply w/ Ch.14 LDC at time of development.		
Preliminary Zoning Review completed by: Rachael Hamilton	Date: 12/09/2025	
Preliminary Zoning Review #: 2025-011663-PAR		


VILLA ALEGRE ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
W SAN FRANCISCO ST
JIMENEZ ST
CANDELARIO ST
QUINTANA ST
W ALAMEDA ST
ALTO ST
ALTO LN
MAYNARD ST
BARELA ST
CLOSSON ST
PENA P
619 W. Alameda
Total 149.2
Count 12
Avg 12.43
Max 14.5"


W SAN FRANCISCO ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
VILLA ALEGRE ST
W ALAMEDA ST
JIMENEZ ST
CANDELARIO ST
QUINTANA ST
ALTO ST
ALTO LN
IRVINE ST
AYNARD ST
CLOSSON ST
Total 298.2
count 24
Avg 12.43
Max 14.5
619 W. Alameda

OWNER SUBMITTAL
Property Owner: Maxfield Scott
619 West Alameda
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Date: 02/12/2025

To:
Historic Districts Review Board
City of Santa Fe Planning and Land Use Department
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Re: Historic Architectural Submittal – Stabilization and Rehabilitation
Property: 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Members of the Historic Districts Review Board,

This letter is submitted in support of the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) application for the proposed remodel of property located at **619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, New Mexico**, within the **Westside–Guadalupe Historic District**. This narrative is intended to serve as a complete written description of the scope of work and is provided to clearly describe each component of the proposed project, independent of the architectural drawings, in accordance with HDRB submittal requirements and standard review practices.

The proposed work has two primary components: 1. **Stabilization** of the existing historic structure and 2. **Rehabilitation** of such same structure.

The project is designed to preserve and reinforce the historic streetscape along West Alameda. This is accomplished through stabilizing and reviving the deteriorated historic building and sensitively revitalizing the character the building has left behind. The work will be in a manner that is compatible with the established architectural character of the historic district.

I. Architectural History of the Property

The property at 619 West Alameda contains a small, single-story Pueblo Revival–style residential structure that is believed to have been constructed in the early-to-mid 1940s. While documentation is limited, the earliest recorded deed dates to 1945, and aerial photography confirms the presence of a building on the site by 1948, with a square footprint visible by 1951.

The historic structure was constructed in phases: - An **original front (south) rectangular adobe structure**; - A **full-width rear (north) pen tile addition**, likely completed by the early 1950s; and - A **small wood-framed rear addition**, constructed no later than the mid-1970s, which collapsed in late 2024 or early 2025 and no longer exists beyond its foundation.

While the building's **West** and **South facades** have been **identified as contributing** to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, the rest of the building **does not** hold that title. Yet, this building's scale, design, and materials are typical of the surrounding historic residences on West Alameda. The building has suffered decades of deterioration, including roof failure, cracking of exterior walls, exposed foundations, vandalism, and partial interior collapse. The proposed work seeks to arrest this deterioration, stabilize the remaining historic fabric, and ensure the building's long-term preservation in accordance with accepted historic preservation practices.

II. Existing Site Conditions

- **Lot size:** Approximately 4,967 square feet
- **Zoning:** R-29
- **Existing lot coverage:** Approximately 14.3%
- **Setting:** Urban residential
- **Topography:** Relatively flat
- **Existing development:** One deteriorated single-story historic structure (Unit A), remnants of a collapsed wood-framed addition, perimeter fencing and yard walls of mixed age and condition

---

III. Proposed Scope of Work – Historic Structure

A. Use and Function

The existing historic structure will remain at the front of the property facing West Alameda and will be rehabilitated for use as a **one-bedroom, one-bath casita**.

B. Footprint and Square Footage

- **Existing footprint:** 892 square feet
- **Existing roofed area:** 710 square feet
- **Proposed footprint:** 710 square feet
- **Proposed roofed area:** 710 square feet
- **Unroofed / flat exterior surfaces:** None beyond existing grade-level areas
- **No expansion of footprint** is proposed for Unit A

C. Height

- **Existing height:** 9 feet 4 inches from finished grade to top of parapet
- **Proposed height:** 10 feet 6½ inches from finished grade to top of parapet

This modest increase in height results solely from the installation of a **new structural bond beam and reconstructed roof system**. This installation is necessary to stabilize the historic adobe and pen tile walls. The parapet height will remain minimal and consistent with traditional Pueblo Revival proportions.

D. Structural Stabilization

- Removal of the failing roof structure
- Installation of a reinforced concrete bond beam atop existing exterior walls to prevent further horizontal movement and cracking
- Reconstruction of a traditional viga roof system above the bond beam
- New roof decking, insulation, and roofing assembly

These measures are necessary to stabilize the historic structure, prevent continued structural failure, and allow for the retention of the existing historic walls and exterior appearance.

E. Roof

- **Type:** Flat roof with parapet
- **Drainage:** Traditional canales

F. Exterior Walls, Materials, and Finishes

- **Walls:** Existing adobe and pen tile walls retained
- **Finish:** Cement stucco, repaired and refinished to match existing historic texture
- **Color:** Suede stucco from El Rey (to be finalized in coordination with HDRB staff)

G. Windows and Doors

- **Windows:** Existing wood, double-hung, single-glazed windows retained and rehabilitated
    - Wood frames
    - Painted finish
    - Concrete sills
- **Doors:** Existing wood doors retained where feasible and repaired; non-original doors replaced in-kind with appropriate wood doors

No enlargement, relocation, or new openings are proposed for the historic structure.

H. Yard Walls and Site Elements (Unit A)

- 3 foot masonry yard wall facing street frontage

VI. Conclusion

The proposed project at 619 West Alameda is a **preservation-driven intervention** that stabilizes a deteriorated historic structure that additionally revitalizes it in a manner consistent with prior HDRB approvals for rehabilitation and contextual infill projects within the historic district. The design prioritizes:

- Long-term preservation of the historic building
- Minimal visual impact on the streetscape
- Compatibility with surrounding historic development
- Traditional materials and finishes

We respectfully request the Historic Districts Review Board's approval of this proposal.

Sincerely,

Maxfield Scott
Mesa Verde Construction, LLC

Date: March 10, 2026

To: Planning and Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe, NM

From: Scott Irving, Designer/Builder
Mesa Verde Construction, LLC
NM GB-98 #419455

Re: Request for height exceptions to proposed Remodel and Addition to property @ 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, NM

Max Scott, the President and Qualifying party for Mesa Verde Construction, LLC and the owner of record of the R-29 zoned property @ 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, New Mexico would like to request height exceptions for the historic single-family residence and additional dwelling unit proposed for 619 West Alameda, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner for the Historic Preservation Division of the City of Santa Fe Planning and Land Use Department identified the maximum height allowed by code for 619 West Alameda, without an allowance for exception, at 14'- 10" in an email on 11/18/2025. This request for exception is written in the format of the "Historic Districts and Historic Landmarks, Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks Exception Criteria" to explain the proposal's need for height exceptions.

(i) Do not damage the character of the streetscape

The historic structure, Unit A in our proposal, will remain well below Ms. McCulley's maximum height (14'-10"), but we do request a height change to this structure. Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls. This increase in height will not affect the character of this historic structure or streetscape. It keeps the parapet at minimum height and secures the preservation of the existing structure for the foreseeable future.

(ii) Prevent hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare

The historic structure, Unit A in our proposal, will continue to deteriorate without the addition of the proposed bond beam. The engineered bond beam, viga ceiling structure, r-49 insulation tapered insulation and roofing have been proposed to be installed directly atop the top of the existing historic walls. We cannot shorten the structure without reducing the height of the exterior walls.

This will prevent an undue hardship to the owner and injury to the public welfare from the continued deterioration of the structure of Unit A.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts

Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape.

Unit A's combination of adobe and pen-tile construction was built without a unifying bond beam atop the exterior walls. This has allowed horizontal movement at material joints and window and door rough openings, causing considerable cracking in the exterior walls. The original viga ceilings were removed at some point in the past and replaced with 2x roof rafters. These 2x rafters were undersized and failed under the weight of the roof years ago. The dutchmen patches used to prevent roof collapse are not providing adequate structure and are also failing. Mesa Verde wishes to remove the existing roof and place a stabilizing concrete bond beam atop the existing exterior wall. The bond beam will prevent further horizontal movement in the building's cracks and unify the adobe and pen tile structure thus preparing it for a new viga roof. The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not the result of the actions of the applicant

The deterioration of the abandoned historic Unit A has been in process for decades. Mesa Verde Construction, LLC's remodel of this structure will save it for posterity and is no fault of the company's owner.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1)

The resulting change in roof construction will change the building's height from: 9'- 4" from existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls, to: 10'- 6 1/2" from top of existing grade to top of stucco-finished parapet walls while preserving the overall appearance of the unit.

Sincerely,

Scott Irving
Mesa Verde Construction, LLC

a remodel for a historic & contributing structure @ 619 west alameda, santa fe, new mexico

sheet index


a1.1 title, sheet index, existing site plan, analysis of historic structure and repair work required
a1.2 proposed site plan
a2.1 619 west alameda proposed floor plan
a3.1 existing and proposed south & west exterior elevations
a3.2 existing and proposed north & east exterior elevations

notes documenting significant issues with the existing construction:

1. the center structures attachment (if there is one) is failing and significant cracks beteen these structures are beginning to open up between them on the east and west facades.
2. the home was constructed with no bond beam installed. ceiling heights in public space vary by 3". ceilings have been replaced at some time with the original structures vigas protruding from the south wall along west alameda.
3. the original southerly, adobe section of the single family residence has significantly over-spanned roof-rafters. they are sagging as much as 3" and several rafters on the western side of the structure have failed and been scabbed to prevent a complete structural failure.
4. the southerly, original adobe structure's lack of a bond beam causes a structural break in the wall at window and door headers that has and continues to enable significant movement in the structure manifesting as continuous cracks from top to bottom of wall.
5. the southwest corner of the building is separating from the south wall and moving west. the large % of openings towards the corner hasn't allow the walls to buttress the corner preventing movement. cracks inside the structure between the floor and exterior wall have opened allowing the floor to begin sinking along length of the existing west wall.

scope of work to repair/rebuild structure:

1. carefully remove the existing windows with frames and kitchen door and frame from the home. reconstruct windows as described in the submitted "window condition assessment" perpared by Scott Ernst.
2. the existing roof(s) and insulation below must be removed to completely clear the roof.
3. remove the existing roof decking and roof rafters.
4. construct the concrete bond beam detailed in the building permit submittal atop existing adobe & pen-tile walls.
5. brace the sw building corner to prevent futher western movement.
6. unused
7. construct new structural roof membrane per building permit submittal and attach to new bond beam below.
8. follow the instructions in construction documents included in the formal building permit submittal to complete reconstruction of the existing single family residence.



existing site plan

scale: 1/8" = 1'- 0"

N

sirvirnas dodgers
2504 camino alfredo, santa fe, nm 87501
dodgerfan2504@gmail.com 505-670-8149

drawn

checked


date: 2/12/2026

project: a remodel for 619 West Alameda santa fe, NM

sheet title: title, sheet index, existing site plan, analysis of historic structure and repair work required

revisions


sheet no. a1.1



sheet no.	revisions	sheet title	project	date:	drawn
a1.2		proposed site plan	a remodel for 619 West Alameda santa fe, NM	2/12/2026	

sirvino designs
2504 camino alfredo, santa fe, nm 87501
dodgerfan2504@gmail.com 505-670-8149

checked



proposed floor plan

scale: 3/8″ = 1′ - 0″

N

sirvinas design
drawn
2504 camino alfredo, santa fe, nm 87501
dodgerfan2504@gmail.com 505-670-8149
checked


date: 2/12/2026

project
a remodel for
619 West Alameda
santa fe, NM


sheet title
619 west alameda,
proposed floor plan

revisions

sheet no.
a2.1



west elevation




south (street) elevation


proposed elevations

scale: 1/4" = 1'- 0"

west elevation



west elevation



south (street) elevation

existing elevations

scale: 1/4" = 1'- 0"

sd
dodgerfan2504@gmail.com 505-670-8149
2504 camino alfredo, santa fe, nm 87501

drawn

checked


date: 2/12/2026

project
a remodel for
619 West Alameda
santa fe, NM


sheet title
existing & proposed,
south & west
exterior elevations

revisions

sheet no.
a3.1



east elevation




north elevation


proposed elevations

scale: 1/4" = 1'- 0"

west elevation



east elevation



north elevation

existing elevations

scale: 1/4" = 1'- 0"

birima basile
2504 camino alfredo, santa fe, nm 87501
dodgerfan2504@gmail.com 505-670-8149

drawn

checked

date: 2/12/2026

project
a remodel for
619 West Alameda
santa fe, NM

sheet title
existing & proposed, north & east exterior elevations

revisions

sheet no.
a3.2

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

8. **New Business**

a. 2025-010664-HDRB, 619 W Alameda St., Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, noncontributing, Dura Build Construction, agent for Max Scott, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the structure be upgraded to contributing with the south façade and the west façades (façades 3 and 4) as primary per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts. Staff also recommended a contributing status for the pen tile well to protect it per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Chair Rios asked about the date of the pentile addition and the terms of preserving it.

Ms. McCulley responded that it was constructed in 1951, and the west façade, as the primary façade, would be a way of preserving it by showing the transition from adobe to pen tile in the building.

Member Cherry asked why the east façade was not recommended as a primary façade.

Ms. McCulley responded that it was less visible than the west façade.

Scott Irving, 25504 Camino Alfredo, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Irving stated the applicant was okay with the staff's recommendation. They just need to know the status to proceed with the rehabilitation of the property because there have been many calls to the police over the past several years of ownership to help clear out homeless squatters, and they have even had to call in SWAT. However, the applicant would prefer that the well not be designated contributing because of the issues of its location and recent use for smoking fentanyl; the applicant would prefer not to preserve it. He also stated that he would be unclear on how to preserve the well.

Member Cherry suggested a barrier of some sort to protect the well.

Mr. Irving asked if the Board could approve some sort of steel cover over it because it alters it.

Member Cherry stated that the well is unique to that area, and it certainly warrants serious consideration for preservation, as it is a historic structure.

Mr. Cherry felt there could be a lot of different ways to protect it, to keep people out of it, and to keep people from falling into it, which are all concerns, and part of owning a historic property is preserving unique features like this.

Member Bienvenu called for a point of order that the preservation of the well is not part of the status case.

Chair Rios explained that this hearing was for the status, including the status of the well, and the applicant could bring up the preservation of the well at a subsequent hearing, where it could be discussed in detail with some more options. She clarified that there could certainly be ways of preserving the well was the point of the discussion.

Public Comment:
Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, supported staff's recommendation to make this a contributing building with the south and west as primary facades to protect the pentile and south side that faces the street contributes to the streetscape and is character-defining, and the fact that it transitions from adobe to pentile on the west is also important to preserve. Regarding the well, she felt it needed to be contributing. She explained she once owned the property at 604 Galisteo, which was from the 1890s, and in the 1930s, two rooms were added on the west side. When there was a leak from an iron pipe, she had to pull up the flooring, and under one of the bedrooms was a twenty-foot-deep rock and cedar-lined well that was not filled in. She stated that significant structures do get

covered over or lost in time, so it would be nice to keep visible or at least acknowledge the presence of the well and preserve and protect it.

Board Action:
Member Bienvenu moved in case 2025-010664-HDRB for 619 West Alameda to adopt staff's recommendations to upgrade the residence to contributing with the south façade and west façade, which are indicated as facades three and four in the diagram, as primary and designate the pen tile lined well as contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

b. [redacted]

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: July 22, 2025

TO: Historic Districts Review Board Members

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director MRM
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager GM

FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division LJM

2025-010664-HDRB, 619 W Alameda St., Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, non-contributing, Dura Build Construction, agent for Max Scott, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

__x__ Historic Inventory Form

__x__ Zoning Review Sheet

__x__ Other: [building and yard wall height calculations]

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ Proposal Letter

__x__ Site Plan/Floor Plan

__x__ Elevations

__x__ Photographs

____ Other: [2025 HCPI]

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the historic status of the structure be upgraded to contributing with the south façade and the west façades (façades 3 and 4) as primary per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts. Staff also recommends a contributing status for the pen tile well to protect it per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Sample motions:

a. In case 2025-010664-HDRB, for 619 West Alameda Street, upgrade the residential structure to contributing and designate the south façade (or other facades) as primary.
b. In case 2025-010664-HDRB, for 619 West Alameda Street, retain the residential structure as non-contributing.
c. In case 2025-010664-HDRB,for 619 West Alameda Street, status the pen tile well as contributing.
d. In case 2025-010664-HDRB, for 619 West Alameda Street, status the pen tile well as non-contributing

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Streetscape and Context:
The property at 619 West Alameda is located across from the Santa Fe River Park, which is a passive recreational area with landscaping, picnic tables, and a walking path. The park is bounded on one side by the ten-foot drop to the riverbed and on the other side by Alameda Street. This parkway was developed for the visual enhancement of the nature of the site.

Across from the Santa Fe River is the residential sector of Alameda Street. The houses range in style, with the most prominent styles being Spanish Pueblo Revival and Vernacular in this area. Most of the residences are lower single-story buildings with an average height on the streetscape of 12'8". The street is lined with low yard walls with an average height of 46" (3'10"). The yard walls are stuccoed concrete masonry units that are colored to match the corresponding building.



Figure 1: Location of Property.

Site Description:
The 702 sq. ft. single-family residence at 619 W Alameda Street is listed as non-contributing to the Westside-Guadalupe Historic District. The Spanish Pueblo Revival structure is constructed of adobe and pentile. A rectangular wood-framed addition previously located on the north side of the structure collapsed in 2024. Aside from its foundation, all parts of this addition have been removed from the property. Additionally, there was a shed on the property, which was also removed in 2024.




Figure 2: Residential Sections.

The adobe portion of the residence was constructed about 1943, with the pen tile addition being constructed by 1951. The wood-framed addition appears to have been constructed in 1975. There are viga ends at the exterior and interior of the adobe north and south walls, though the interior portion of the vigas appears to have been removed at some point. The north wall has projecting roof joists on the pen tile addition. All except one window are wood, double-hung hung single-glazed one-over-one windows. There are some wood screens, though not all windows have these screens. The two front doors on the south may be handmade wood, frame, and panel with a glazed flower petal design. The western rear door is a frame and panel, and the eastern rear door is a hollow-core wood door. All windows and doors are recessed, and the windows have projecting concrete windowsills. The two front doors have two small steps. Roof drainage is a single-sheet

metal canale on the north elevation. The exterior walls are cement stucco on chicken wire with paint on the stucco. The property holds a front wire fence with a wire gate, a side chain link fence, short cast concrete posts, a couple of wood posts, and possible remains of a stone boundary. The residence is typical of the streetscape.


Figure 3: South Façade of Residence.

There is also a pentile-lined well on the west side of the property. Its origin and details are not available, but given that it is of pen tile, it was most likely constructed at the time of the pen tile addition in 1951. The 1950s saw a significant increase in well drilling in part because the state allowed farmers to transition from dryland farming to more water-intensive crops like alfalfa, corn, and cotton, transforming the agricultural landscape. The state further allowed homeowners to drill and use a certain amount of water annually. This well may be a part of this step forward in water usage.

There are no cases on record for the property in the Historic Preservation Division files.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:

The applicant requests:

1) Status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, of residential structure.

The southern portion of the window holds the greatest historic integrity of the building, with the adobe construction, viga ends, double front doors with corresponding windows, inset windows and doors, and concrete windowsills. The front doors are handmade front doors. The west façade shows the growth of the building from adobe to the pen tile addition and holds historic inset wood

windows with concrete sills. The pen tile well is most likely from the 1950s and is unique to the Alameda streetscape.




Figure 4: Façade Diagram

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-5.2 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

(A) **General Provisions**

(1) General Purpose

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the *city* and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and *development* of the *city* , it is deemed essential by the *governing body* that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve *property* values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and *preservation* of historical areas and *buildings*;

(b) The continued construction of *buildings* in the historic styles; and

(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture and material between *buildings* of historic design and those of more modern design.

(C) **Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts**

(Ord. No. 2004-26)

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

(a) Each *structure* to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical *development*, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other *buildings*, shall not be undertaken;

(b) Changes to *structures* that have acquired historic *significance* in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most *structures* change over time;

(c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a *structure* be preserved; and

(d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic *property* and its environment would be unimpaired.

(2) Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status within Historic Districts

(a) Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing" based upon the definitions of these terms in Article 14-12. Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of *structures* located in the Historic Districts.

(b) Board Authority to Review Status Designation

(i) The Board is authorized to change the status of a *structure* or to designate a status for a *structure* with no status designated.

(ii) A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."

(e) Appeals (Ord. No. 2009-42 § 16)

Decisions made by the historic districts review board may be appealed to the *governing body* as set forth in Section 14-3.17.

(f) Restoration of Status

If a *property owner* makes changes to a *structure* without the proper *city* approvals which result in the lowering of the *structure's* status, staff or the board may require the *property owner* to restore the *structure* such that its former status is restored.

(4) Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All *development* located within the historic districts and subject to this Section 14-5.2 shall comply with all applicable general *development* standards set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(D), as well as any applicable specific *development* standards set forth in Subsections 14-5.2(E) through (I).

14-12 Significant Structure:
A structure located in a historic district that is approximately fifty years old or older, and that embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction. For a structure to be designated as significant, it must retain a high level of historic integrity. A structure may be designated as significant:

(A) for its association with events or persons that are important on a local, regional, national or global level; or

(B) if it is listed on or is eligible to be listed on the State Register of Cultural Properties or the National Register of Historic Places.

14-12 Contributing Structure:
A structure, located in a historic district, approximately fifty years old or older that helps to establish and maintain the character of that historic district. Although a contributing structure is not unique in itself, it adds to the historic associations or historic architectural design qualities that are significant for a district. The contributing structure may have had minor alterations, but its integrity remains.

14-12 Noncontributing Structure:
A structure, located in an H district, that is less than fifty years old or that does not exhibit sufficient historic integrity to establish and maintain the character of the H District.

14-12 Primary Façade:
One or more principal faces or elevations of a building with features that define the character of the building's architecture.

14-12 Historic Compound
An identifiable grouping of historic resources, including buildings, structures and landscaping elements, as described in Section 14-5.2(K)(2)(a). Historic compounds may be comprised of more than one lot.

(I) **Westside-Guadalupe Historic District**

(1) District Standards

Compliance with the following structural standards shall occur whenever those exterior features of *buildings* and other *structures* subject to public view from any public *street*, way, or other public place are erected, altered, or demolished:

(a) Slump block, stucco, brick, or stone shall be used as exterior *wall* materials. Wood and other materials may be used for details. Aluminum siding, metal panels, mirrored glass, and unstuccoed concrete block or unstuccoed concrete shall not be used as exterior *wall* materials;

(b) The color of stuccoed *buildings* shall predominantly be in browns, tans, local earth tones and soft pastels. Surfaces of stone or brick shall be in the natural color. Entryways, and *portales* or *porches* may be emphasized by the use of white or other colors. Painting of *buildings* with a color that causes arresting or spectacular effects or with bold repetitive patterns or using *buildings* as signs is prohibited. Murals, however, are permitted and may be referred to the *city* arts board for an advisory recommendation;

(c) Roof form, *slope*, and shape. It is intended that *buildings* be designed to be "wall dominated". "Wall dominated" means that the *building's* geometry is more defined by *walls* than by roofs. *Buildings* with flat, gabled, shed, or *hipped roofs* can be designed as "wall dominated" solutions and are allowed. The height of the roof above the *wall* shall be no greater than the height of the *wall*. Folded plate, hyperbolic or mansard roofs are not allowed;

(d) The use of solar and other energy collecting and conserving strategies is encouraged. The use of large glazed areas on south facing *walls* for trombe *walls* or other solar collectors, direct gain, or other energy collecting purposes is allowed. When in view from any public *street*, way, or other public place, solar equipment shall be screened as follows:

(i) raising the parapet;

(ii) setting back from the edge of the roof;

(iii) framing the collector with wood;

(iv) in the case of pitched roofs, by integrating the collector into the pitch;

(v) in the case of ground solar collectors by a *wall* or vegetation;

(vi) in the case of *wall* collectors, by enclosing by end or other *walls*;

(vii) other means that screen the collector or integrate it into the overall *structure*. Non-glare materials shall be used in solar collectors.

(e) Mechanical, electrical, telephone equipment, microwave satellite receiving dishes, and other obtrusive equipment shall be architecturally screened with opaque materials by raising the parapet, boxing in the equipment, or other appropriate means. The equipment shall be of a low profile to minimize the *screening* problems;

(f) *Walls* and fences shall be of brick, *adobe*, masonry, rock, wood, coyote fencing, or similar materials. Wrought iron fences and slump block *walls* are allowed. *Walls* of unstuccoed concrete block, unstuccoed concrete, chain-link, metal wire, or similar materials are prohibited, except where the *wall* or fence is not in the *street* frontage;

(g) *Greenhouses*

(h) Attached *greenhouses* that front on the *street* shall give the appearance of being integrated into the *structure* of the *building* or of being a substantive addition rather than having a lean-to effect. The use of corrugated fiberglass or rolled plastic for the external surface of attached or freestanding *greenhouses* that front on the *street* is prohibited. *Greenhouses* with slanting sides shall be bracketed at the ends and that *greenhouses* made from enclosed *porches* or *portales* maintain the shape of the *porch* or *portal*;

(i) *Porches* and *portales* are encouraged;

(j) When parking spaces are required for commercial or multi-family *residential buildings*, they shall be placed to the rear or side of the building.

(2) Walls; Fences; Solar Collectors; Administration

Applications for erection, alteration, or demolition of *walls*, fences, and solar collectors and required submittals shall be reviewed by the planning and land use department. Approval, disapproval or referral shall be indicated by the division on the *application* for the building *permit* and on each of the required submittals, all of which shall be signed by the division staff assigned to the review. The division shall report approvals, disapprovals, and referrals to the board at its next regular meeting as an informational item. (Ord. No. 2007-45 § 30; Ord. #2020-22, § 16)

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM 1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

Date of Form: August 8, 2025

For HPD Office use only:
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:

Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence

2. Location:

528 and 530 Calle Corvo
Downtown and Eastside Historic District
Santa Fe

3. Local Reference Number:
Santa Fe ID: H-640

4. County: Santa Fe
Parcel # 11911552

5. Property Type:
_x Buildings: two
_x Structures: walls
__ Site __ Object

6. Date of Survey:
July 31, 2025

7. Previous Survey Date(s):
_x_Yes: December 12, 1985, Michael Belshaw
__ No:

8. Name of Project:
HDRB Status Evaluation

9. Lat/Long:
35.680783,-105.9331077



10. Photo Information: Giulia Caporuscio, photographer. Photo 1: View of east elevation. Camera facing west.

11. Brief Description of the Property:

Erected in 1950, the property bearing the addresses 528 and 530 Calle Corvo exhibits an atypical floor plan for a modest adobe-style dwelling, suggesting it may have been conceived from the outset as a combined residence and apartment. The building retains several period steel combination windows. Other openings have been modified to accommodate greenhouse-style window boxes—an alteration made by a previous long-term owner to help keep her cacti warm during the winter months. The property also includes a former garage with an attached shop and storage area. The house and former garage are currently designated Non-contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. A later shop addition and the front yard wall are non-historic and carry no status. The property additionally includes a non-historic greenhouse and metal shed, which are not covered in this survey.

Continued on Page 5.

12. Who uses the property? Residence

13. Construction Date:
Date: c.1950_ _Known _x_ Estimated Source: deeds and city directories

14. Setting:
_x_ Suburban __ Rural __ Village __ Urban If Urban: __ Commercial __ Industrial _x_ Residential __Public

15. Relationship to Surroundings: _x_ Similar _x_ Dissimilar Spanish tile wrap-around porch
Comments: N/A

HCPI Base Form (FORM 1) *(Continued from other side)*

16. Additional Perspective: **(Photos, drawing, footprint, etc., indicate north arrow when possible)**



Source: Office of the Santa Fe County Assessor
Blue parcel lines are not accurate

17. Surveyor:
(your name, address, telephone number, and any group affiliation)

John W. Murphey
Architectural Historian
Architectural History Services
505-577-7593/707-583-7819
John@archhistoryservices.com
w/ Giulia Caporuscio

For: Current owner and Juicekitchen Design Workshop, LLC

18. Owner (if known) and other knowledgeable people:

Current owner: Susan Lamden
N/A

19. Is Property Endangered? **_x_ Unknown __ No __ Yes How?**

20. Significance to Current Community: **_x_ Unknown __ None __ Low __ Moderate __ High**
Describe: Unknown

21. Other Significance or Information of Interest: (such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.)
See Historical Overview.

22. National or State Register:

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? __ Unknown _x_ No __Yes
If yes: __ State __ National
If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? _x_ No __Yes
Why? See Evaluation of Historical Status

23. National or State Historic District: City of Santa Fe

Is this property in a historic district? __ Unknown __ No _x_ Yes
If yes: __ Significant __ Contributing _x_ Non-contributing: dwelling and former garage _x_ No Status workshop and walls
Per City of Santa Fe official designation map

If 'yes', what is the name of the district? __ State __ National _x_ City of Santa Fe:
Downtown and Eastside Historic District

24. Supplemental Forms:

__ None _x_ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) __ Continuation Sheets, # pages: _____

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2***
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-640
Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence	528 and 530 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS:

6. Visible Construction Material:

__Adobe __ Brick __ Composition _ x_ Concrete: Block

__ Concrete: Cast Stone __Concrete: Poured __ Earth Plaster __ Masonry: Simulated

__ Metal: Corrugated __ Metal: Structural Siding __ Metal: V-Crimp __ Stone: Random Ashlar

Stone:
__ Random Coursed __Stone: River Rock __Stone: Rusticated __ Stone: Tabular

_x_Stucco: __ Tile: Clay __ Vinyl Siding __ Wood: Board and Batten

Wood:
__ Horizontal Siding __ Wood: Jacal __ Wood: Log __ Wood: Shingle

__ Wood: Tongue and Groove __ Other:

7. Number of Stories: __ N/A
Number: _x_1 __11/2 __ 2
__ 21/2 Other:_____

8. Foundation: __ N/A
_x_ Not visible __ None
_ At Grade _ x_Raised:
Materials: _x_ Concrete: CMU __Stone
Other:
Notes

9. Roof: __ N/A

Shape: __Flat __Gabled
__ Hipped __ Pyramidal
__ Shed Other:
Pitch: _x_ None __ Low
__ Medium __ Steep
Features: __ Eave:
_x_ Parapets
Materials: __Asphalt
__ Earth
__ Composition shingle __ Metal: Pressed
__ Composition Roll __Metal: Corrugated
__ Metal: Standing Seam __Metal: Standing Seam
__ Tile: Terra Cotta __ Wood: Shingle
Other: Modified Bitumen

10. Window Types

Operation	Material	Glazing	Number
Hung Sash	Aluminum	1/1	1
Casement	Steel	1-1	1
Casement	Steel	3-1	2
Combination	Steel	3C–3F–3C | 3T	3
Combination	Steel	3C–6F–3C | 4T	1
Combination	Aluminum	1S-1F-1S	2

Abbreviations: C = casement, F = fixed, S = sliding , T = transom

11. Door Types

Type	Style	Material	Number
Single-Leaf	34-Panel	Wood	2
Single-Leaf	½ Light & Panel	Wood	2
Single-Leaf	Panel	Metal	2
Single-Leaf	Flush	Wood	1

12. Chimneys _x_ N/A

13. Porches __ N/A
Type: __ Entry __Partial-Width __ Full-Width _x_ Wrap

14. Other Significant Features N/A

15. Modifications: x __ No known modifications

#1 Date: pre-1975; addition of workshop to garage; aerial photograph
#2 Date: pre-1985; removal of garage door and installation of two pedestrian doors; 1985 HBI
#3 Date: post-1985; removal of two windows to incorporate greenhouse box extensions; 1985 HBI
#4: Date: c.2000s; replacement of front porch combination window; tenant memory.

16. Primary Architectural Style __ Not Applicable

__ Art Deco/Streamline Moderne	__ Gothic Revival	__ Mission Revival	__ Pueblo	_x_Spanish-Pueblo Revival
__ Bungalow/Craftsman	__ International	__ Neo-Classical	__ Queen Anne	__ Territorial
__ Colonial Revival	__ Italianate	__ Northern NM	__ Ranch	_x Territorial Revival
__ Folk Victorian	__ Mediterranean	__ Prairie	__ Spanish-Colonial	__ Tudor Revival

Notes: _x_ Other: Spanish Revival – tiled porch rooif

17. Documents Available and Their Locations

Historic Preservation Division
Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe
200 Lincoln Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 955-6605
https://www.santafenm.gov/land-use/historic-preservation


Archaeological Records Management Section
Laboratory of Anthropology
708 Camino Lejo
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 476-1320
https://nmhistoricpreservation.org/arms.html

S I T E:

18. Attached or Associated Properties

Are associated properties eligible for listing: N/A

19.Site Plan: 2025. Courtesy of Juicekitchen Design Workshop.



For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Architectural Description Continued

Setting

Occupying Lot 16, the subject property sits along Calle Corvo, directly across from what is now the parking lot of Acequia Madre Elementary School. The school was constructed after the residence was completed in 1950. The combined residence and apartment are positioned near the front of the lot, with a setback consistent with neighboring properties (Photo 2).

The landscaping is minimal. The front yard consists primarily of natural terrain and is anchored by a mature walnut tree—a rarity in Santa Fe. In the southwest corner, more than 50 potted cacti and succulents are clustered together in a collection originally assembled by the current owner's father (Photo 3). A plain gray concrete masonry wall defines the front yard (Photo 2).

The backyard includes small panels of lawn and is shaded by a mature apple tree. The dwelling shares a driveway with the adjacent property to the south.

House

Constructed of concrete masonry units, the building faces the street with a typical composition of a portal and a projecting volume. However, the south-facing door beneath the front portal provides access not to the main residence but to the apartment. The front door to the house is located on a secondary elevation at the south. The building is constructed of concrete masonry units faced with textured yellow stucco. The building has a flat roof and blocky cubic volumes suggestive of the Pueblo Revival style. However, its brick cornice detailing and a long wrap-around porch capped with Spanish clay tile roofing introduce a contrasting and more eclectic character.

East (Front) Façade

The east façade is defined by its hipped, clay-tile-roofed wrap-around porch (Photo 4). This L-shaped structure runs the full width of the façade and provides sheltered access to both the residence and the apartment.

The porch is supported by a slender metal post with integrated scrollwork and railing—typical of mass-produced ornamental ironwork used in the mid-20th century (Photo 5). This type of prefabricated support, advertised in the SANBUSCO catalog during the period, was commonly used in modest postwar homes for both structural and decorative purposes. Identical supports were once present on the house immediately to the south but were replaced with wood posts in the 2010s.

The porch roof is finished with S-shaped, or "Modern Spanish," clay tiles that provide visual texture (Photo 6). It is unclear whether these tiles are original, as their style contrasts with the Territorial Revival-style brick cornice that tops the parapet.

The porch walls are painted white. At the center, a newer window—replacing an original steel combination unit—has been installed (Photo 7). At the north end of the porch stands a 32-panel wood door providing access to the apartment (Photo 8).

North of the porch, the building projects eastward approximately seven feet to form a volume that contains the apartment. This portion is fenestrated with a projecting greenhouse window, which replaced an original steel combination unit (Photo 9).

South

The south elevation faces the shared driveway and reveals the functional, or service, side of the residence. The porch continues along this elevation for approximately 13 feet, running along an offset wall. This portion of the wall is blank except for a 32-panel wood door, which opens into the home's living room (Photo 10).

The rest of the façade includes three window openings (Photo 11). Two have been replaced with projecting greenhouse units. The third retains a standard 3C–3F–3C | 3T steel combination window. The lights are putty-glazed, and the casements open with exterior-mounted scissor hinges.

The building's CMU construction is visible through uniform horizontal coursing that telegraphs through the stucco finish. The parapet is trimmed with a decorative brick cornice laid in a header–stretcher–rowlock pattern (from top to bottom). Air vents located at the floor line indicate that the building is constructed over a crawlspace.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

West

The west elevation opens onto the backyard and more clearly reveals the building's duplex configuration (Photo 12). Each unit is accessed by a set of six concrete steps leading to identical half-light wood doors, both protected by aluminum screen doors (Photo 13). Surface-mounted utility conduit and dual electric meters further confirm the presence of two separate residential units. The arrangement evokes the rear elevation of a modest Pasadena garden court apartment.

The main residence, which occupies the longer portion of the west façade, features two original steel combination windows. The apartment is recessed approximately four feet and includes a single 3C–3F–3C | 3T steel combination window. The parapet along this elevation is capped with an exposed edge of modified bitumen and a single *canal* with an attached downspout provides roof drainage.

North

The north elevation sits close to the neighboring property and is difficult to photograph (Photo 14). It corresponds to the apartment side of the building and includes several window openings for the bedroom, bath, kitchen, and living room. All appear to be original steel combination units. These include a 3C–3F–3C | 3T window at the bedroom, as well as a larger 3C–6F–3C | 4T window at the living room (Photo 15). Other than the continuation of the brick cornice at the parapet, the elevation is flat and unarticulated.

Interior

The interior was not recorded as part of the site visit.

Storage Room / Workshop

Located at the end of the driveway is a former garage with an attached workshop (Photo 16). Constructed of CMU, the garage appears on a 1951 aerial photograph and is likely original to the site (Fig. 2). Its south wall is built at the zero-lot-line, adjoining the neighboring garage at 532 Calle Corvo. The original vehicular door was removed prior to 1985 and replaced with flush panel units (Fig. 7).

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Attached to the north side of the garage is a small workshop constructed of wood framing with a stucco finish (Photo 17). Added before 1975 (Fig. 6), this addition exhibits modest Pueblo Revival detailing. It features aluminum windows on the south and east elevations (Photo 17 and is entered from the north through a flush plywood door, located adjacent to a narrow sidelight composed of small glass blocks (Photo 18).

Walls

The property is enclosed by several distinct sections of plain, unstuccoed concrete block wall, each contributing modest visual structure to the lot. The front wall, which runs parallel to the sidewalk, consists of four courses and is capped with a rounded coping piece in a contrasting color (Photo 2). Square pilasters, spaced at regular intervals and constructed of the same material, lend the wall a degree of articulation. This section continues along the driveway toward the porch, where it steps down to three courses in height.

At the rear, a taller section defines the south end of the backyard, rising to six courses and similarly capped with rounded coping. A fourth section runs along the north property line and mirrors the front wall, with four courses and matching interval pilasters.

A 1958 aerial photograph confirms that all four wall sections were in place by that time (Fig. 3).

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Historical Overview

Hughes–Calle Corvo Subdivision Context

Calle Corvo—originally named Hughes Street—began to develop in the late 1940s as a compact neighborhood of modest Pueblo Revival homes situated on suburban-sized lots along a short, curving street.

The northern half of the subdivision was carved from several large lots historically owned by Levi A. Hughes, Sr., a prosperous wool buyer and former vice president of the First National Bank who died in 1934.

His eldest son, Levi A. Hughes, Jr. was vice president of the Santa Fe Builders Supply Company and sought to develop the family land with suburban-style housing. In 1937, he created the first Hughes Subdivision, consisting of 20 lots laid out along a gently curving road between Delgado Street and Acequia Madre—then known as East Manhattan Street. Following a contemporary trend of using picturesque Spanish names for new streets, Hughes named the road *Calle Corvo*, loosely translated as “curving” or “bent street.” The subdivision was replatted the following year as the Second Hughes Addition.

Development stalled during World War II. The first homes—519 and 521 Calle Corvo—were constructed after the war.

The initial lots were sold to individuals likely connected to Levi A. Hughes, Jr. or his mother, Christine L. Hughes, who was named as the grantor in many of the early deeds. Several buyers held their properties only briefly, with some constructing speculative houses before reselling. This early turnover contributed to the formation of a cohesive neighborhood, largely built out with modest, two-bedroom adobe houses—most in the Pueblo Revival style—with attached or detached single-car garages. While features such as low front yard walls and Pueblo-style detailing became common, these elements were not codified as deed restrictions in the earliest transactions.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

A 1958 real estate advertisement described a home in the neighborhood as an "Exclusive Little Home Area on a Clean, Paved Street near the Acequia!"[1] Behind this marketing language lay a harsher reality. Item "e" of the subdivision's eleven restrictive covenants was explicitly racist.

Using the standard phrasing of the time, it stated: "No person of African or Oriental descent shall be permitted to use or occupy any building in the above described subdivision, except this restriction shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants employed by an owner or a tenant."[2] While such language was common in mid-20th-century real estate documents, it reveals the broader—and often overlooked—history of racial exclusion in parts of Santa Fe's Eastside and South Capitol neighborhoods.

By the early 1960s, the subdivision was fully built out, with seventeen houses lining its curved road. The 1960 city directory shows a high rate of owner occupancy, with all but four homes occupied by their owners. The neighborhood reflected a nearly even mix of Anglo and Hispanic homeowners.[3]

Lot 16

The parcel that would later hold 528 and 530 Calle Corvo began to take shape in late 1938, when local surveyor Floyd Haak laid out a 55-foot by 134-foot lot designated as Lot 16 on a subdivision map completed that year (Fig. 1). Eight years later, in March 1946, Christine Hughes—who retained ownership of the surrounding subdivision—deeded the lot to Betty Sue Byous.[4]

Susie Anna Betty Byous, a native of Hamilton, Tennessee, had relocated to Santa Fe in the mid-1940s, where she operated the Coronado Beauty Shop and lived on Webber

[1] "Homes for Sale [advertisement]," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, January 23, 1958, 8.
[2] Restrictive Covenants, [Hughes Second Addition], Christine L. Hughes, recorded April 10, 1941, Book 21, Page 362, Instrument # 1941064933, Santa Fe County, New Mexico. This restriction was removed in 1990.
[3] Hudspeth Directory Company, Hudspeth Directory Company, *Santa Fe City Directory, 1960* (El Paso: Hudspeth Directory Company, 1960), 28.
[4] Warranty Deed, Christine Hughes to Betty Sue Byous, recorded March 19, 1946, Book 29, Page 395, Instrument # 80700, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-640**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025

Street.[5] It is unclear why she purchased the lot or whether she had any prior connection to the Hughes family, but by 1946 the property was in her name.

Byous, who had married local resident Severino Trujillo, held the property for only a few years before selling it in 1949 to Oscar L. Huddleston, a building contractor based in Albuquerque.[6] Huddleston likely constructed the house, which he sold the following year to Robert and Patt Berardinelli.

First Homeowners

Robert was the grandson of an Italian stonemason who had come to Santa Fe in the 19th century to help build the cathedral. A mortician by trade, he would go on to open Berardinelli Mortuary in 1969.

The Berardinellis lived in the Calle Corvo home for several years before relocating to a new house on Cadiz Road. Early in their occupancy, they added an apartment to the original structure, resulting in the assignment of a separate address: 528 Calle Corvo.[7] The 1950 federal census captured both households. Robert, 24, headed the primary residence, which included his wife, Patt, 21, and their one-year-old son, Robert Jr.[8]

At the time, Robert worked as a timekeeper for a building contractor, while Patt was employed as a representative for a cosmetics company. The apartment was occupied by Frank and Eve Melchoir, both originally from Ohio. Frank worked as a lawyer, and Eve also held a professional position.

---

[5] Hudspeth Directory Company, *Hudspeth Directory Company, Santa Fe City Directory, 1944* (El Paso: Hudspeth Directory Company, 1944), 90.

[6] Warranty Deed, Betty B. and Severino Trujillo to O. L. Huddleston, recorded October 18, 1949, Book 42, Page 272, Instrument # 95081, Santa Fe County, New Mexico

[7] It is possible that the building was originally designed to include an apartment. Interestingly, the 528 Calle Corvo address does not appear in early 1950s Santa Fe city directories, although it is recorded in the 1950 federal census. The first known advertisement for the apartment appears in the *Santa Fe New Mexican* in July 1952, offering a one-bedroom, carpeted unit with a garage. The ad notes that utilities were included, suggesting the building did not have separate meters.

[8] U.S. Census Bureau, National Archives at Washington, DC; Washington, D.C.; Seventeenth Census of the United States, 1950; Year: 1950; Census Place: Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Roll: 3578; Page: 68; Enumeration District: 26-5.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-640**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025

In 1954, the Berardinellis sold the Calle Corvo property to Arthur and Mary Ulibarri.[9] The Ulibarris retained it as an income property, renting out both the main house and its connected apartment. The house was leased to a succession of small families, most of whom were wage-earners employed in local businesses, while the apartment typically housed couples or individuals.

In 1955, the main house was occupied by Glenn and Jessie Smoot and their family. Glenn worked as sales manager at the local Chevrolet dealership.[10] That same year, Fred and Barbara DeCastro rented the apartment. The couple jointly operated the DeCastro Jewelry Shop on the Plaza, along with a picture framing business on San Francisco Street. By 1958, the DeCastros had moved into the main house, and the apartment was rented to Opal Kern, a bakery worker at Kaune's.[11]

The Filigree Jeweler's Retirement Home

After more than a decade as landlords, the Ulibarris sold the property in 1965 to Adolfo and Lola Ortiz. Like the DeCastros, Adolfo was a jeweler, but his background was more artisanal—he specialized in silver and gold filigree work. After nearly 50 years of producing filigree-style jewelry in a town increasingly known for tourist trinkets, he retired and moved into the Calle Corvo house.[12] His retirement from the trade drew wider attention: the story was picked up by United Press International and published in newspapers across the country.

Just a few months after settling in, however, a fire broke out in February 1966, sending one of the Ortiz children to the hospital with burns. According to newspaper accounts, the fire was confined to the kitchen.[13]

An aerial photograph taken four months later shows a building footprint largely consistent with the one seen today (Fig. 4). At the southeast corner, a hipped, L-shaped

[9] Warranty Deed, Robert L. and Patt H. Berardinelli to Arthur M. and Mary c de Baca Ulibarri, recorded March 23, 1954, Book 7, Page 367, Instrument # 117509, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[10] Hudspeth Directory Company, *Hudspeth Directory Company, Santa Fe City Directory, 1955* (El Paso: Hudspeth Directory Company, 1955), 304 and 363.
[11] Ibid, 1958: 195, 280, and 512.
[12] "Santa Fe Artist Says His Art is Dying," *The Albuquerque Tribune*, November 12, 1964, B-1.
[13] "Fine Work by Firemen [letter to the editor]," *The New Mexican*, February 18, 1966, 4.

porch is visible, with a discernible ridge at the junction. The roofing material appears to be a lighter type—not the dark tile seen in later images.

Adolfo Ortiz died in 1972 at the age of 78, having by then relocated to Arist Road. His sister, Lala Ortiz, acting as executor of his estate, deeded the Calle Corvo property to Adolfo's stepson, Bernard (Bernie) Chapman.[14] Chapman retained ownership for two years before selling the property. A 1973 aerial photograph shows the house much as it appeared seven years earlier (Fig. 4). The southeast porch remains discernible but lack may lack the tile roof.

A Home for Cacti

In 1974, Bernie and Toni Chapman sold the house and apartment to Lois C. Herrmann, a single woman and avid stamp collector.[15] Herrmann, born in 1927, served for several years in the U.S. Air Force following World War II.[16] According to an acquaintance, she was stationed in Germany and may have taught at U.S. schools for military dependents. A newspaper shows that she later held the rank of First Lieutenant in an Air Reserve Squadron based in Santa Fe.[17]

Herrmann moved to Santa Fe in late 1957, after visiting the area in the fall of 1956. She fell in love with the landscape and, somewhat impulsively, purchased 40 acres of land off Tano Road from Josef and Teresa Bakos.[18] Born Józef Gabryel Bakós, Josef was one of the *Cinco Pintores* painters of the 1920s. In 1937, he acquired nearly 480 acres of stock-raising homestead land northwest of town, where he and other artists built shacks and cabins.

[14] Warranty Deed, Lala Ortiz to Bernie Chapman, recorded October 22, 1972, Book 295, Page 2754, Instrument # 348056, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[15] Warranty Deed, Bernie and Toni Chapman to Lois C. Hermann [sic], recorded July 1, 1974, Book 313, Page 109, Instrument # 366181, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[16] Carl Troy, email communication with John W. Murphey, August 3, 2025. Given the limited availability of public records, substantial information on Lois Herrmann was provided to the author through personal correspondence with Troy, Susan Lamden, David Kozlowski, and Steven Drayton.
[17] "Village Gossip [column]," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, April 28, 1959, 1.
[18] Warranty Deed, Josef G. and Teresa Bakos to Lois Hermann, recorded January 1, 1957, Book 129, Page 167, Instrument # 220173, Santa Fe County, New Mexico; "Paso Por Aqui [column]," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, November 7, 1957, 9.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Herrmann hoped to build a home on one of these remote parcels and completed a house on Tano Road in the late 1950s.[19] She later taught at Acequia Madre School. However, finding the winter commute from Tano Road long and muddy, she quickly purchased the Calle Corvo home when it came up for sale.[20]

Herrmann was an avid stamp collector, specializing in stamps depicting Mesoamerican art and archaeology, and once served as president of the Santa Fe Stamp Club.

She also cultivated plants in the home's attached greenhouse window boxes and was an active birder. Over the years, she made modest adjustments to the house she lived in for nearly 50 years. Mobility challenges eventually prompted her move to a local assisted living facility.

Evaluation of Historical Status

Now more than 75 years old, the combined house and apartment have retained their overall footprint, massing, and essential architectural character. The L-shaped porch is visible in a 1958 aerial photograph and is considered part of the historic envelope.

For these reasons, the building is recommended for Contributing status, with the east (front) elevation identified as the primary façade. This elevation best conveys the building's architectural character and historical associations. The primary façade designation would exclude recent windows serving the residence and apartment living rooms.

The former garage, by contrast, has undergone significant alterations and no longer clearly communicates its original function. Accordingly, both the garage and the attached workshop are recommended for Non-contributing status.

While the concrete block yard walls are of historic age, they possess limited architectural significance and are also recommended as Non-contributing.

[19] Ibid., and city directories in 1958 and 1959
[20] David Kozlowski, email communication with John W. Murphey, August 3, 2025.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Illustrations




Figure 1: Hughes Second Addition, 1938. Floyd Haak. Subject lot highlighted.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**




Figure 2: May 26, 1951, aerial photograph. House, apartment, and garage present.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/ Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/ Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**




Figure 3: November 10, 1958, aerial photograph.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Figure 4: June 6, 1966, aerial photograph.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Figure 4: May 1, 1973, aerial photograph.
Note garage has no attachment, and large window across its north elevation.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**




Figure 5: April 6, 1975, aerial photograph. Note what appears to be the workshop in place.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Figure 7: December 2, 1985, HBI survey photograph. Michael Belshaw. Note absence of the two greenhouse window boxes along the south elevation.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**

Survey Photographs

(All images taken by Giulia Caporuscio, on July 31, 2025, unless otherwise noted)



Photo 2: Front yard wall and setting. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 3: Cacti and succulent collection. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 4: Setting and south and east elevations. Camera facing north.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 5: Porch on south elevation. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 6: Porch roofing material. Camera facing up.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 7: Porch. East elevation window. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**




Photo 8: Porch. East elevation entry door to apartment. David Kozlowski, August 5, 2025.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 9: East elevation. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 10: South elevation, east end. Camera facing north.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 11: South elevation, west end. Camera facing north.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 12: West elevation. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 13: West elevation. Camera facing east.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 14: North elevation. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 15: North elevation. Window at apartment living room. Camera facing south.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 16: Former garage. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 17: Workshop. East elevation. Camera facing west.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Robert & Patt Berardinelli/** **Adolfo & Lola Ortiz/** **Lois C. Herrmann Residence**	**2. Location:** **528 and 530 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District** **Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-640** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: July 31, 2025**



Photo 18: Workshop. North elevation. Camera facing south.

H640

building threatened? yes	surveyed date 12-12-85 by mb	county Santa Fe	ID no. 051611646
field map number SFHD-6-1646		UTM reference zone 12 13	easting northing

location description
528-30 Cotvo


city/town
Santa Fe

land grant/reservation

building name

legal description
twsp N S range E W sec ¼ ¼

tax roll by mb no. 23	negatives nos. 3	loc. or neg. [illegible]	plan shape



date of construction
P estimate actual

source

use
present residential
other
historic residential
other

condition
excellent good
fair deteriorating

degree of remodeling
minor moderate major
describe:

style

foundation material

wall material/surface

architectural features

surroundings
Res

relationship to surroundings
X similar not similar

district potential
yes no

significance
eligible of interest X none

if eligible, why?

comments

associated buildings? yes
what type?

if inventoried, list ID nos.

see back? yes

528-530 Calle Corvo

CITY OF SANTA FE

HISTORIC PRELIMINARY ZONING REVIEW

PLUD-20

PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to a public hearing in front of the Historic District Review Board (HDRB) all applicants must obtain Historic District Preliminary Zoning Review (HPZR) from the Current Planning Department. The HPZR does not grant zoning approval for a building permit.

Following design approval from the HDRB, final zoning review will be performed at the time of building permit.

Applicants must submit complete and accurate information for review. Incomplete submitals will not be processed. All HPZR requests must be submitted to Current Planning via zoningcounter@santafenm.gov

PROJECT INFORMATION

Date 9/17/25	Property Owner of Record Susan Lamden		
Applicant/Agent Contact Ju M Tan/505-920-9128			
Site Address	528 & 530 Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501		
Suite or Space #	Subdivision Name Hughes Second Subdivision		
Lot # 16	Block #	Total Roof Area (square feet) 2908 sf (Proposed)	
Lot Coverage % 39.5			
Proposed Construction Description	New 150 sf bedroom addition and 11 sf bay window addition to 528 Calle Corvo. New 200 sf west portal. Interic		
The following documents are required for review as applicable:	✓ Legal Lot of Record ✓ Building Plans ✓ Existing site plan w/ setbacks ✓ Proposed site plan w/ setbacks ✓ Existing & Proposed Elevations Development Plan		
Zoning District	Overlay Districts Escarpment Flood Plain ✓ Other Historic East Side		
Proposed Setbacks	Front 7'-0"	Rear 15'-0"	Left Side 5'-0" / Right Side 5'-0"
Required Setbacks	Front 7'-0"	Rear 15'-0"	Left Side 5'-0" / Right Side 5'-0"
Proposed Height	Max Height 14'-0'	Parking Required yes	Provided 2 / Bike Parking / Provided

Existing Height - 15'-6" max.

Historic Planning Case Manager Paul Duran

If you selected "other," please write in the name of your case manager. _____

ADDITIONAL SUBMITALS (IF APPLICABLE)

✓ Y N Affidavit Restricting Use of an Accessory Structure Containing a Bathroom or Kitchen		
Y ✓ N Setback Affidavit and Agreement		
Y ✓ N Site Visibility Triangle	Y ✓ N Escarpment Slope Analysis	Y ✓ N Flood Plain Grading Plan

This hereby certifies that the information provided for preliminary zoning review is accurate and will not be modified without consulting the Land Use Department staff prior to HDRB hearing.

Reason: none Owner ✓ Applicant ✓ Agent

To Be Completed by Land Use Department Staff

PRELIMINARY REVIEW STATUS

X Preliminarily Reviewed	Reviewed w/ conditions	Denied
Comments/Conditions	Nonconforming structure not expanded. Height set by Historic overlay District. Final Development must comply with Ch.14 of Land Development Code. Approved for 1 primary + 1 ADU.	
Preliminary Zoning Review completed by Rachael Lamun	Date 10/16/2025	
Preliminary Zoning Review # 2025-011378-PAR		


528-530 Calle Corvo Building Height Calculation

Total: 96.1 = 12.01' + 2' = 14'

Count: 8

Maximum Allowable: 14'

PAD 7/18/2025



JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP LLC
1219 Cerro Gordo Road
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505 920 9128
ju@juicekitchendesignworkshop.com

Date: 2/20/2026

Paul Duran
Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division
Planning and Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe
P.O. Box 909, Santa Fe, NM 87504

Re: Historic Review Submission for 528 (Primary Residence) & 530 (ADU) Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Paul,

On behalf of Susan M Lamden, the Owner of the above mentioned property, we are submitting this Application for Historic Board Review for the project. Attached is the application packet for Historic Review for the following scope of works:

1. Proposed 150 sf heated addition to 528 Calle Corvo – an extension of the bedroom for the Primary Residence.
2. Proposed 200 sf west portal to the residence with a hipped clay tile roof to match the existing east portal roof.
3. Replacement of existing wrought iron posts at the East/South Portal with new 6x6 wood posts. The exposed wood of the portal will be painted to match the proposed window color.
4. New wrought iron railings throughout to match the existing in style, material and color.
5. New and replacement of all exterior doors and windows in a custom color to the residence as well as the existing Studio structure with wood clad doors and windows as recommended in the attached Window Assessment performed by Rā Patterson & Associates.
6. Re-stucco of the entire residence including the existing Contributing front yard wall and all other existing yard walls.
7. The addition of exterior insulation over the entirety of the existing un-insulated main house structure **except** for the Primary Facades where the addition of insulation will be on the interior sides.
8. The overall scope of works includes comprehensive interior renovations of the residence with associated plumbing and electrical works as required. This reconfiguration designates 528 Calle Corvo as the Primary Residence and 530 Calle Corvo as the ADU for the lot.

We would like to request for Exceptions to the Historic Code Criteria for the following:

1. **(2) Exceptions for the removal of existing wrought iron posts and replacing them with 6x6 wood posts**
    a. Exception to ***14-5.2(D)(1)(a)*** *- The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.*
        i. No other existing residences along Calle Corvo feature wrought iron posts; hence we feel that the removal does not damage the existing character of the district.
        ii. Currently, the existing East/South portal requires some structural attention and at least 1 end is not properly attached to the building. The slenderness of the wrought iron posts

area also inadequate to hold up the roof of Spanish clay tiles. Furthermore, the existing post and beam on the west end of the portal are not connected at all to the house structure and hence need to be repaired/replaced properly. Several existing rafters also need to be replaced because of water damage. We feel that this extensive need for repair and refurbishment of the portal structure requires the replacement of the existing steel frame posts.

iii. By using wood posts, this expression actually strengthens and supports the visual character of the neighborhood.

b. Exception to ***14-5.2(D)(5)(b)*** - *For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures , architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.*

i. The wrought iron posts will be replaced with 6x6 wood posts (stained to match) which is now the commonly used method of supporting portals including the properties directly to the north and south of this property. The wood posts hence do not damage the existing character of the neighborhood and in fact, support and strengthen the heterogeneous character of the district.

ii. The proposed wood posts will serve as a much better structural element to support the existing roof. Also, see 1.a.ii above.

iii. See 1.a.iii above.

2. (2) Exceptions for the relocation of the existing concrete steps along the South portion of the existing East/South Portal.

a. Exception to ***14-5.2(D)(1)(a)*** - *The status of a significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a structure to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited*.

i. The relocation of the existing concrete steps on the east and south sides of the east portal will be replaced with material and finish in kind and hence will not damage the existing character of the district.

ii. The existing concrete steps need to be altered regardless of relocation as it is currently hazardous to users as currently configured (tripping and falling hazard). The currently location of the steps also narrows the driveway width, impeding the width of a required parking space along the driveway, especially with the impending construction of a yard wall by 532 Calle Corvo. Hence, it is a safety issue as well as a design efficiency issue to relocate the steps.

iii. The proposed location of the steps, being in the same style, material and finish of the existing will continue to strengthen the character of the neighborhood and of the existing primary facade.

b. Exception to ***14-5.2(D)(5)(b)*** - *For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures , architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and*

windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical or pictorial evidence.

i. The new relocated steps will be made of the same material, finish and style of the existing and hence will not damage the existing character of the district. The relocated steps will also relate to the proposed new entry door location more directly.
ii. The new steps will be configured in a safe manner to prevent the tripping and falling hazard of the current steps. Consolidating the existing 2 steps to a single location also serves to provide more space on the portal. Railings on both sides of the proposed steps will be provided. Also see 2.a.11 above.
iii. See 2.a.iii above.


Based on the above arguments, we hope that you can seriously consider granting us the Exceptions for our project. We believe that our proposed design will reinforce and enhance the existing character of the neighborhood.

This application packet includes:

1. This Proposal Letter.
2. Historic Review Application Form.
3. Warranty deed and recorded plat.
4. Drawings including:
    a. Existing and Proposed site plans
    b. Existing and Proposed floor plans
    c. Existing and Proposed exterior elevations
5. Assessment report for existing exterior windows and doors.
6. Technical specifications for the proposed wood clad windows.
7. Photographs of the exterior of the existing house.
8. PZR approval.
9. Proposed stucco and window colors.
10. Colored Drawing of the East Elevation illustrating the Proposed Colors.
11. Proposed exterior light fixture cut sheet.


Please feel free to contact me with any further questions. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,



Ju Tan – Architect
Mobile: (505) 920 9128 Email: ju@juicekitchendesignworkshop.com

Cc: Susan M Landen (Owner)



STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
COUNTY OF SANTA FE) SS.

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE

Be it known, that the subdivision of the lands included in this addition known as "HUGHES SECOND SUBDIVISION" as designated, numbered and described on this plat, is with the free consent and in accordance with the desire of the undersigned owner and proprietor, and that the streets shown on this plat are hereby declared to be public highways.

In witness whereof, the said owner has hereunto set her hand and seal this..... day of June, 1940.

Christine L. Hughes (SEAL)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
COUNTY OF SANTA FE) SS.

On this 22 day of June, 1940, before me personally appeared Christine L. Hughes, to me known to be the person who executed the above and foregoing owner's certificate and acknowledged that she executed the same as her free act and deed.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year last above written.

My commission expires:
Jan. 7, 1942

Dorothy Pattison
NOTARY PUBLIC

CERTIFICATE OF CITY OFFICIALS


The undersigned officials of the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico do hereby certify that this plat was duly presented to the Council of the City of Santa Fe and duly approved by three-fourths of the members thereof upon a showing to the owner that all conditions precedent to its approval has been satisfied, and that a true copy of this plat has been filed with the City Clerk.

Mayor of the City of Santa Fe

Clerk of the City of Santa Fe

I hereby certify that bearings and distances shown on the attached plat are a true and correct copy compiled from field notes of a survey made under my direction in Sept. 1938.

Flood Haake
FLOOD HAAKE
LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
AND LAND SURVEYOR
NP 119



PLAT OF RESUBDIVISION OF

HUGHES SECOND SUBDIVISION

SCALE 1" = 50'

Surveyed - June 1940

FILED
IN THE OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY CLERK OF SANTA
FE COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

1941 SEP 11 AM 11:45

E. J. MARTINEZ, COUNTY CLERK

BY _____ DEPUTY

GENERAL PROJECT DATA

LOT SIZE - APPROXIMATELY 7370 SF

TOTAL EXISTING ROOFED AREA - 2549 S.F.
- 528 CALLE CORVO - 670 S.F.
- 530 CALLE CORVO - 1006 S.F.
- BOX BAY WINDOWS - 22 S.F.
- EAST/SOUTH PORTAL - 246 S.F.
- STUDIO - 480 S.F.
- GREENHOUSE - 112 S.F.
- SHED - 35 S.F.

PROPOSED TOTAL ROOFED AREA - 2921 S.F.

PROPOSED AREA DISTRIBUTION:
- 528 CALLE CORVO - 934 S.F.
- 530 CALLE CORVO (ADU) - 832 S.F.
- EAST/SOUTH PORTAL - 246 S.F. (NO CHANGE)
- PROPOSED WEST PORTAL - 200 S.F.
- ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - 480 S.F. (NO CHANGE)
- GREENHOUSE - 112 S.F. (NO CHANGE)
- SHED - 35 S.F. (NO CHANGE)

PROPOSED NEW ROOFED AREAS -
- NEW BEDROOM ADDITION - 150 S.F. (528 CALLE CORVO)
- NEW WEST PORTAL - 200 S.F.

TOTAL ADDITIONAL ROOFED AREA - 350 S.F.

EXISTING LOT COVERAGE - 35%

PROPOSED LOT COVERAGE - 39.33% (OK)

ZONING DISTRICT - RC-8

OVERLAY DISTRICT - DOWNTOWN/EAST SIDE HISTORIC DISTRICT
HISTORIC BUILDING STATUS - NON-CONTRIBUTING

CODES: INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE 2021 IBC, 2021 IRC, 2021 IECC WHERE APPLICABLE

MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HT. OF STRUCTURE -
24' (PER SLDC TABLE 14-7.2-1: TABLE OF DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS)
14'-0" AS PROVIDED BY HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEPARTMENT

MAX. HEIGHT OF PROPOSED RESIDENCE - NO PROPOSED INCREASE IN HEIGHT

SETBACKS: PER SCLDC
- FRONT - 7'-0"
- SIDE - 5'-0"
- REAR - 15'-0"

RAINWATER DETENTION REQUIREMENTS (IF REQUIRED)

TOTAL ADDITIONAL ROOFED AREA - 373 S.F.
WATER RETENTION VOLUME REQUIRED = 0.16 X 373 S.F. = 60 C.F. OR 446 GALLONS

WATER RETENTION PROVIDED: (1) 6'X10'X1' RETENTION POND AS SHOWN

TOTAL RETENTION PROVIDED = 60 C.F.

7 PROJECT DATA

GENERAL SCOPE OF WORKS

1. NEW 150 SF BEDROOM ADDITION TO 528 CALLE CORVO.
2. NEW 200 SF WEST PORTAL.
3. NEW INTERIOR RENOVATIONS THROUGHOUT INCLUDING MODIFICATION OF DIVIDING WALL BETWEEN 528 AND 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO TO RECONFIGURE AND REDISTRIBUTE SPACES.
4. NEW BATHROOM IN EXISTING STUDIO STRUCTURE.
5. NEW WINDOW AND DOOR INCLUDING REPLACEMENTS THROUGHOUT ALL STRUCTURES EXCEPT THE EXISTING GREENHOUSE.
6. NEW STUCCO THROUGHOUT.
7. PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL WORKS AS SHOWN.


GENERAL NOTES

1. THESE DRAWINGS ARE THE PROPERTY OF JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP LLC (JKDW) AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF JKDW.
2. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO ALL RELEVANT CODES REFERENCED BY SANTA FE COUNTRY, NM. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO IBC 2021, IRC 2021.
3. IF THERE ARE ANY CONFLICTS WITH THE CODES REFLECTED IN THE DRAWINGS, THE CONTRACTOR IS TO INFORM THE JKDW IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
4. DO NOT SCALE THE DRAWINGS. THE CONTRACTOR/SUB CONTRACTORS SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, THEY ARE TO BE REPORTED TO JKDW IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
5. CONTRACTORS SHALL MAINTAIN A SAFE AND ORGANIZED WORKING ENVIRONMENT ON THE SITE. DAILY CLEANING, ORGANIZATION AND PROTECTION OF MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AS NECESSARY. CONTRACTORS SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING JOB RELATED SAFETY STANDARDS
6. ALL EXISTING STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS OF EXISTING BUILDINGS SHALL NOT BE MODIFIED BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS PROJECT WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE OWNER, JKDW AND A QUALIFIED STRUCTURAL ENGINEER (IF NEEDED).
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SCHEDULE PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETINGS WITH ALL SUB CONTRACTORS AS NECESSARY TO CLARIFY THE WORK SCOPE AND EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK..
8. REGULAR CONSTRUCTION MEETINGS SHALL BE SCHEDULED (AS NECESSARY) WITH ALL RELEVANT PARTIES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO RELEVANT SUB CONTRACTORS.
9. A CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE SHALL BE FURNISHED AND ADHERED TO BY THE CONTRACTOR. ANY PROPOSED CHANGES SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE OWNER AND JKDW.
10. FINAL PUNCHLIST - AT SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION, A FINAL PUNCHLIST SHALL BE MADE UP BY JKDW OR THE OWNER. ALL ITEMS ON THE PUNCHLIST SHALL BE PERFORMED BY THE CONTRACTOR WITHIN AN AGREED PERIOD OF TIME BEFORE HANDOVER TO THE OWNERS.
11. FINAL GRADING - ENSURE THAT ALL GRADE SURROUNDING THE NEW ADDITION SLOPES AWAY FROM THE BUILDING A MINIMUM OF 1/4"/FT FOR A MINIMUM OF 48".
12. FINAL CLEANING - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM FINAL CLEANING TO ALL AFFECTED AREAS TO "MOVE IN" CONDITION BEFORE HANDING OVER TO THE OWNERS.
13. MAKE ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE OWNERS REGARDING USE OF TOILET OR PROVIDE A PORTABLE TOILET ON SITE.
14. WARRANTY - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL WARRANT ALL WORK FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR FROM THE DATE OF COMPLETION.

6 GENERAL NOTES

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SCALE
CVR	COVER SHEET/SITE PLAN	AS NOTED
A101	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A102	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF PLANS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A200	EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A201	EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A202	EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS	1/4" = 1'-0"

5 DRAWING LIST



3 LOCATION MAP

ADDITIONS & RENOVATIONS TO THE LAMDEN RESIDENCE + ADU 528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO SANTA FE, NM 87501

HISTORIC SUBMISSION


2/20/2026

- A.F.F. - ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR
- B.O. - BOTTOM OF
- T.O. - TOP OF
- B.O.W. - BOTTOM OF WALL
- T.O.W. - TOP OF WALL
- T.O.P. - TOP OF PARAPET
- V.I.F. - VERIFY IN FIELD
- S.F. - SQUARE FEET
- C.F. - CUBIC FEET
- GAL. - GALLONS
- PSF - PER SQUARE FEET
- EL. - ELEVATION
- EQ. - EQUAL (USED IN EQUALLY SPACED DIMENSIONS)
- W, H (HT.) - WIDTH, HEIGHT
- O.C. - CENTER TO CENTER DIMENSIONS
- DIMS. - DIMENSIONS
- C.L. - CENTERLINE
- P.L. - PROPERTY LINE
- L.O. - LINE OF
- MAX. - MAXIMUM
- MIN. - MINIMUM
- TYP. - TYPICAL
- OPNG. - OPENING
- R.O. - ROUGH OPENING
- FIN. FLR. - FINISHED FLOOR
- N.T.S. - NOT TO SCALE
- GWB - GYPSUM WALL BOARD
- GCB - GYPSUM CEILING BOARD
- G.D. - WOOD GRAIN DIRECTION
- R.S. - ROUGH SAWN WOOD
- D.S. - DOUNSPOUT
- C.B. - CATCH BASIN
- T.O.C. - TOP OF CONCRETE
- T.O.G. - TOP OF GRADE


MATERIAL ABBREVIATIONS

- TL - TILE
- WD - WOOD
- DF - DOUGLAS FIR
- PL - PLASTER
- PTD - PAINTED
- ST - STAINED

4 COMMON ABBREVIATIONS



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP
1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501
505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REV #1

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 2/20/2025


COVER SHEET / SITE PLAN

LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

CVR



EXISTING FLOOR PLAN



NEW WALLS

NOTE:

ADD 2" RIGID INSULATION TO EXTERIOR OF HOUSE EXCEPT ALONG PRIMARY EAST FACING FACADES AS SHOWN WHERE THE INSULATION IS ON THE INTERIOR SIDE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS.

PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

1 EXISTING & PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP

1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501

505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 2/20/2026


EXISTING & PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS

LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501


A101




3 EXISTING EAST ELEVATION



1 EXISTING WEST ELEVATION



4 PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION



2 PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP

1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501

505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - 1/4" = 1'-0"

DATE - 2/20/2026

EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS


LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A200



1 EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" - 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" - 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP

1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501

505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 2/20/2026

EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS


LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A201



1 EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" - 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" - 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP

1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501

505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JJUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 2/20/2026


EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A202



1 EXISTING STUDIO EAST ELEV. SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED STUDIO EAST ELEV. SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP

1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501

505.920.9123
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM
WWW.JJUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH

SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 1/26/2026

EXISTING AND PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS


LAMDEN RESIDENCE & ADU
528, 530 (ADU) CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A203

528/530 (ADU) Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501
Lamden Residence

Colored Exterior (East) Elevation

:2/20/2026



528 & 530 (ADU) Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501
Lamden Residence

Proposed Exterior Wall Sconce

10/24/2025



Forte Lighting 1773-01-04 Exterior Wall Light with Honey Glass Shades, Black

Materials & Care


Material Type	Glass, Metal
Finish Types	Black
Shade Material	Glass

APPROXIMATE OVERALL HEIGHT/LENGTH - 11"

528/530 (ADU) Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501
Lamden Residence

Driveway Gate Elevation

:2/20/2026






Inspiration

528, 530 (ADU) Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501
Lamden Residence

Proposed Exterior Colors

11/28/25

Primary Exterior Stucco Color



Fawn
117 (45)

Exterior Stucco Color under Portals Only

Cream
128 (70)

Custom Blue Color for Exterior Windows and Doors and exposed wood of Portals



Custom Blue
R - 35
G - 99
B - 137

RPA & Associates, LLC.

PRESERVING OUR HISTORY

508 Ortega Rd NW Los Ranchos de Albuquerque, NM 87114
P.O. Box 10328 Albuquerque, NM 87184
505-379-7900
rpahistoric@gmail.com

TO Shuli Lamden
528-530 Calle Corvo
Santa Fe, NM 87501
slamden@rocketmail.com



JOB	DATE
528 – 530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501	09/04/2025

LOCATION	DESCRIPTION
SOUTH	
A	54” x 50” STEEL CASEMENT WITH STORMS (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H
B	38” x 38” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO
C	46” x 46” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO
DR #1	36” x 80” – RH ALL WOOD DOOR 32-PANEL
EAST	
D	17”/56”/17” x 62” LSR CASEMENT/PICTURE/CASEMENT 1-LT BRONZE COMPOSITE WINDOW JELD-WEN
SOUTH	
DR #2	36” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 32-PANEL
EAST	
E	60” x 60” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO
NORTH	
F	69” x 50 ½” STEEL CASEMENTS WITH STORMS (69” x 38 ½”/12 TRANSOM) $^{4W1H}/_{1W3H}$/2W3H/1W3H
G	32” x 38” LR STEEL CASEMENT 1W3H 12L/20R
H	19” x 38” L STEEL CASEMENT 1W3H OBSCURE
I	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H

JOB	DATE
528 – 530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501	09/04/2025

LOCATION	DESCRIPTION
WEST	
J	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H
DR #3	32” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 1-HORIZONTAL PANEL/1-LT/3-HORIZONTAL PANEL
K	38” x 50” LR STEEL CASEMENT (38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{2W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H
DR #4	32” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 1-HORIZONTAL PANEL/1-LT/3-HORIZONTAL PANEL
L	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H
WESTSIDE	
GREENHOUSE	DETACHED (NON-HISTORIC)
GARAGE EAST	
G-DR #5	32” x 80” LH INSWING 6-PANEL METAL DOOR WITH FINGER JOINTED WOOD JAMB
G-DR #6	32” x 80” RH INSWING 6-PANEL METAL DOOR WITH FINGER JOINTED WOOD JAMB
SOUTH	
G-M	35” x 34” ALL ALUMINUM BRONZE SINGLE HUNG 1/1
EAST	
G-N	84” x 84” PICTURE HORIZONTAL SLIDER ALL ALUMINUM MILL FINISH 1-LT
NORTH	
G-DR #7	36” x 80” RH FLUSH BIRCH SOLID CORE VENEER DOOR WITH WOOD JAMB
G-O	8” x 64” 1W8H GLASS BLOCK

In closing, my professional opinion is as follows:

Windows B, C, D, E, Greenhouse, G-M, G-N, G-O are non-historic.

Doors #1, #2, #5, #6 and #7 are non-historic.

Doors #3 and #4 are historic, however are unrestorable.

Windows A, F, G, H, I, J, K and L are historic, however they cause significant damage to the interior plaster and the structure.

The residence to the north had all the windows replaced with white vinyl windows (526 Calle Corvo).

The residence to the south had all the windows at one time replaced with 2 layers of all aluminum storm windows (534 Calle Corvo).

The house two houses to the south from this address had aluminum clad/wood divided lite installed at some point (536 Calle Corvo).

It would be my opinion to allow the owners of this residence to replace with clad/wood and divided lite to match the configuration of the existing steel casements of that era.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 505-379-7900.

Assessment prepared by: *Ra N. Patterson*

RPA & ASSOCIATES, LLC | WINDOW & DOOR CONDITION AND INTEGRITY CODES

CODE	CONDITION AND INTEGRITY CODES
P = PREMIUM	EXTERIOR FINISHES AND SASH, FRAME, AND CASING MEMBER IN PREMIUM OR VERY GOOD CONDITION.
	PUTTY GLAZE INTACT.
	ONLY COSMECTIC TOUCH-UP, IF NEEDED.
S = SATISFACTORY	EXTERIOR FINISHES FADING AND WORN IN PLACES BUT STILL ADHERED TO THE WINDOW MEMBERS.
	PUTTY GLAZING CRACKING BUT INTACT AND ALL SASHES, FRAMES, AND CASING MEMBER WITH LESS THAN 30% –
	40% DETERIORATION.
F = FAIR	EXTERIOR FINISHES HAVE CRACKED & PEELED. MISSING TO BARE SURFACE.
	PUTTY GLAZING CRACKING AND MISSING IN 30% – 40% OF THE SASHES. ALL SASHES, FRAMES, AND CASINGS HAVE
	SOME MEMBERS 30% – 40% COMPLETELY DETERIORATED.
U = UNSATISFACTORY	EXTERIOR FINISHES HAVE COMPLETELY DETERIORATED.
	PUTTY GLAZING MOSTLY MISSING. ALL SASHES, FRAMES, AND CASING MEMBERS HAVE MORE THAN 30% - 40%
	DETERIORATION, BEYOND REPAIR.

NOTES:

LABEL	WINDOW & DOOR DESCRIPTION	CONDITION & INTEGRITY CODE	HISTORIC/NON-HISTORIC - AGE
A	54” x 50” STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
B	38” x 38” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO	F	NON-HISTORIC – ALL THE INSULATED GLASS HAS FAILED (1998)
C	46” x 46” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO	F	NON-HISTORIC – ALL THE INSULATED GLASS HAS FAILED (1998)
DR #1	36” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 32-PANEL	S	NON-HISTORIC – FIR MANUFACTURED DOOR (1995)
D	17”/56”/17” x 62” LSR BRONZE COMPOSITE WINDOW – CASEMENT/PICTURE/CASEMENT JELD-WEN	P	NON-HISTORIC – (2015)
DR #2	36” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 32-PANEL	S	NON-HISTORIC – FIR MANUFACTURED DOOR (1995)
E	60” x 60” GARDEN WINDOW 1-LT BRONZE ALUMINUM ALENCO	F	NON-HISTORIC – ALL THE INSULATED GLASS HAS FAILED (1998)
F	69” x 50 ½” STEEL CASEMENT (69” x 50 ½”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/2W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
G	38” x 38” LR STEEL CASEMENT (12L/20R) 1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.

NOTES:

LABEL	WINDOW & DOOR DESCRIPTION	CONDITION & INTEGRITY CODE	HISTORIC/NON-HISTORIC – AGE
H	19” x 38” L STEEL CASEMENT 1W3H OBSCURE	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
I	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
J	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
DR #3	32” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 1-HORIZONTAL/1-LT/3-HORIZONTAL PANEL	U	HISTORIC – PANEL CROSS RAILS CUT DOOR, WEAKENING THE STRUCTURE
K	38” x 50” LR STEEL CASEMENT (38”/12 TRANSOM) 2W1H/1W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
DR #4	32” x 80” RH ALL WOOD DOOR 1-HORIZONTAL/1-LT/3-HORIZONTAL PANEL		HISTORIC – PANEL CROSS RAILS CUT DOOR, WEAKENING THE STRUCTURE

NOTES:

LABEL	WINDOW & DOOR DESCRIPTION	CONDITION & INTEGRITY CODE	HISTORIC/NON-HISTORIC – AGE
L	54” x 50” LSR STEEL CASEMENT (54” x 38”/12 TRANSOM) $^{3W1H}/_{1W3H}$/1W3H/1W3H	F	HISTORIC – METAL HAS RUSTED EXCESSIVE CONDENSATION TO THE STEEL CAUSING PLASTER DAMAGE. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF LEAKING IN THE WALL STRUCTURE.
	GREENHOUSE DETACHED	F	NON-HISTORIC – (1995)
GARAGE			
G-DR #5	32” x 80” LH INSWING 6-PANEL METAL DOOR WITH FINGER JOINTED JAMB	S	NON-HISTORIC – (2008)
G-DR #6	32” x 80” RH INSWING 6-PANEL METAL DOOR WITH FINGER JOINTED JAMB	S	NON-HISTORIC – (2008)
G-M	35” x 34” SINGLE HUNG BRONZE ALUMINUM SKOTTY	S	NON-HISTORIC – (1988)
G-N	84” x 48” PICTURE HUNG SLIDER MILL FINISH ALL ALUMINUM	S	NON-HISTORIC – (1977)
G-DR #7	36” x 80” RH FLUSH BIRCH SOLID CORE VENEER DOOR WITH WOOD JAMB	U	NON-HISTORIC – DOOR DELAMINATION
G-O	8” x 64” 1W8H GLASS BLOCK	S	NON-HISTORIC – (2010)

NOTES:

GENERAL PROJECT DATA

LOT SIZE - APPROXIMATELY 7310 SF

TOTAL EXISTING ROOFED AREA - 2547 S.F.
MAIN HOUSE (HEATED) - 1675 S.F.
PORTAL - 249 S.F.
STUDIO - 459 S.F.
GREENHOUSE - 112 S.F.
SHED - 39 S.F.

PROPOSED NEW ROOFED AREA -
NEW TOTAL ROOFED AREA -

TOTAL ADDITIONAL ROOFED/IMPERVIOUS AREA =

EXISTING LOT COVERAGE - 35%

PROPOSED LOT COVERAGE =

ZONING DISTRICT - RC-8

OVERLAY DISTRICT - DOWNTOWN/EAST SIDE HISTORIC DISTRICT
HISTORIC BUILDING STATUS - NON-CONTRIBUTING

CODES: INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE 2021 IBC, 2021 IRC, 2021 IECC WHERE APPLICABLE

MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HT. OF STRUCTURE - 24' (PER SLDC TABLE 14-5.2-1: TABLE OF DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS)

MAX. HEIGHT OF PROPOSED RESIDENCE - NO PROPOSED INCREASE IN HEIGHT

SETBACKS PER SLDC
FRONT - 15'-0"
SIDE - 5'-0"
REAR -

RAINWATER DETENTION REQUIREMENTS (IF REQUIRED)

TOTAL ADDITIONAL ROOFED AREA = S.F.
WATER RETENTION VOLUME REQUIRED = 0.16 X S.F. =


WATER RETENTION PROVIDED

TOTAL RETENTION PROVIDED =

7 PROJECT DATA



3 LOCATION MAP



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

GENERAL SCOPE OF WORKS

2. PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL WORKS AS SHOWN.

GENERAL NOTES

1. THESE DRAWINGS ARE THE PROPERTY OF JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP LLC (JKDW) AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF JKDW.
2. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL CONFORM TO ALL RELEVANT CODES REFERENCED BY SANTA FE COUNTY, NM. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO IBC 2021, IRC 2021.
3. IF THERE ARE ANY CONFLICTS WITH THE CODES REFLECTED IN THE DRAWINGS, THE CONTRACTOR IS TO INFORM THE JKDW IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
4. DO NOT SCALE THE DRAWINGS. THE CONTRACTOR/SUB CONTRACTORS SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, THEY ARE TO BE REPORTED TO JKDW IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
5. CONTRACTORS SHALL MAINTAIN A SAFE AND ORGANIZED WORKING ENVIRONMENT ON THE SITE DAILY CLEANING, ORGANIZATION AND PROTECTION OF MATERIALS SHALL BE PERFORMED AS NECESSARY. CONTRACTORS SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING JOB RELATED SAFETY STANDARDS
6. ALL EXISTING STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS OF EXISTING BUILDINGS SHALL NOT BE MODIFIED BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS PROJECT WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE OWNER, JKDW AND A QUALIFIED STRUCTURAL ENGINEER (IF NEEDED).
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SCHEDULE PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETINGS WITH ALL SUB CONTRACTORS AS NECESSARY TO CLARIFY THE WORK SCOPE AND EXPECTATIONS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK.
8. REGULAR CONSTRUCTION MEETINGS SHALL BE SCHEDULED (AS NECESSARY) WITH ALL RELEVANT PARTIES INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO RELEVANT SUB CONTRACTORS.
9. A CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE SHALL BE FURNISHED AND ADHERED TO BY THE CONTRACTOR. ANY PROPOSED CHANGES SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE OWNER AND JKDW.
10. FINAL PUNCHLIST - AT SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION, A FINAL PUNCHLIST SHALL BE MADE UP BY JKDW OR THE OWNER. ALL ITEMS ON THE PUNCHLIST SHALL BE PERFORMED BY THE CONTRACTOR WITHIN AN AGREED PERIOD OF TIME BEFORE HANDOVER TO THE OWNERS.
11. FINAL GRADING - ENSURE THAT ALL GRADE SURROUNDING THE NEW ADDITION SLOPES AWAY FROM THE BUILDING A MINIMUM OF 1/4"/FT FOR A MINIMUM OF 48".
12. FINAL CLEANING - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM FINAL CLEANING TO ALL AFFECTED AREAS TO "MOVE IN" CONDITION BEFORE HANDING OVER TO THE OWNERS.
13. MAKE ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE OWNERS REGARDING USE OF TOILET OR PROVIDE A PORTABLE TOILET ON SITE.
14. WARRANTY - THE CONTRACTOR SHALL WARRANT ALL WORK FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR FROM THE DATE OF COMPLETION

6 GENERAL NOTES

RENOVATIONS TO THE LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

PROGRES SSET

4/3/2025

2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

COMMON ABBREVIATIONS

- A.F.F. - ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR
- B.O. - BOTTOM OF
- T.O. - TOP OF
- B.O.W. - BOTTOM OF WALL
- T.O.W. - TOP OF WALL
- T.O.P. - TOP OF PARAPET
- V.I.F. - VERIFY IN FIELD
- S.F. - SQUARE FEET
- C.F. - CUBIC FEET
- GALL. - GALLONS
- PSF - PER SQUARE FEET
- EL. - ELEVATION
- EQ. - EQUAL (USED IN EQUALLY SPACED DIMENSIONS)
- W, H (ETC.) - WIDTH, HEIGHT
- O.C. - CENTER TO CENTER DIMENSIONS
- DIMS - DIMENSIONS
- C.L. - CENTERLINE
- P.L. - PROPERTY LINE
- L.O. - LINE OF
- MAX - MAXIMUM
- MIN - MINIMUM
- TYP. - TYPICAL
- OPNG - OPENING
- R.O. - ROUGH OPENING
- FIN. FLR. - FINISHED FLOOR
- N.T.S. - NOT TO SCALE
- GWB - GYPSUM WALL BOARD
- GCB - GYPSUM CEILING BOARD
- G.D. - GOOD GRAIN DIRECTION
- R.S. - ROUGH SAWN WOOD
- D.S. - DOWNSPOUT
- C.B. - CATCH BASIN
- T.O.C. - TOP OF CONCRETE
- T.O.G. - TOP OF GRADE

MATERIAL ABBREVIATIONS

- TL - TILE
- GD - GOOD
- DF - DOUGLAS FIR
- PL - PLASTER
- PTD - PAINTED
- ST - STAINED

5 COMMON ABBREVIATIONS

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SCALE
CVR	COVER SHEET/SITE PLAN	AS NOTED
A100	SELECTIVE DEMOLITION PLAN FOUNDATION PLAN	1/4" = 1'-0" 1/4" = 1'-0"
A101	PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN	1/4" = 1'-0"
A102	MISC. FLOOR PLANS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A300	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS & BUILDING SECTIONS	1/4" = 1'-0"
A310	KITCHEN DETAIL FLOOR PLAN & INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	1/2" = 1'-0"
A400	WALL SECTIONS & DETAILS	AS NOTED
A500	DOOR & WINDOW SCHEDULE & DETAILS	AS NOTED
MEP100	MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING DIAGRAMS	1/4" = 1'-0"

4 DRAWING LIST

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP
1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501
505.920.8126
JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REV #1 - 3/27/25 - PERMIT REVISIONS

NORTH

SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 4/3/2025

COVER SHEET / SITE PLAN

LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

CVR

1

EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" - 1'-0"

A101

FLOOR PLANS

NORTH


LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

SCALE - AS NOTED


DATE - 4/1/2025

REVISION

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP



1 EXISTING EAST ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE



1 EXISTING WEST ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

1 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

1 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP
1218 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501
505.920.9128
JUICE@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 4/1/2025

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A200



1 EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

1 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN
DESIGN
WORKSHOP
1210 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501
505.820.9138
JU@JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH


SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 4/1/2025

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A201



1 EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

1 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

JUICEKITCHEN DESIGN WORKSHOP
1219 CERRO GORDO RD.
SANTA FE, NM 87501
505.920.0128
JUICEKITCHENDESIGNWORKSHOP.COM

REVISION

NORTH

SCALE - AS NOTED

DATE - 4/1/2025

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LAMDEN RESIDENCE
528-530 CALLE CORVO, SANTA FE, NM 87501

A202

South Elevation Window A

South Elevation Window B

South Elevation Window C



South Elevation Door #1

East
Elevation
Window
D

South
Elevation
Door
#2

East
Elevation
Window
E

North
Elevation
Window
F

North
Elevation
Window
G

North
Elevation
Window
H



North
Elevation
Window
I

West
Elevation
Window
J

West
Elevation
Door #3

West
Elevation
Window
K

West Elevation Door #4

West
Elevation
Window
L

528-530 Calle Corvo
East Elevation

528-530 Calle Corvo
South
Elevation



528-530 Calle
Corvo
North Elevation

528-530 Calle Corvo
East
Elevation

528-530 Calle Corvo
West
Elevation

GreenHouse



East
Elevation
G-DR- #5

East
Elevation
G-DR#6

South
Elevation
Window
G-M

East
Elevation
Window
G-N

North
Elevation
G-DR#7

North
Elevation
Window
G-O

Garage
East
Elevation


Garage
East Elevation

Garage
North
Elevation

Garage
South
Elevation

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: March 24, 2026

TO: Historic Districts Review Board

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director *MRM*
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager, *GM*

FROM: Lani McCulley, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Division *LgM*

2026-011997-HDRB, 528 and 530 Calle Corvo, Downtown and Eastside Historic District, Contributing. Ju Tan, agent for Susan Lamden, owner, requests approval for the proposed remodel, including a 150 sq. ft. addition to the west elevation, a 200 sq. ft. portal addition to the west elevation, replacement of all exterior doors and windows, removal of wrought iron posts with wood posts, relocation of the existing concrete steps, and other minor alterations. An exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited for the wrought iron posts.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

__x__ Historic Inventory Form

__x__ Zoning Review Sheet

__x__ Other: Previous Case Documents

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ Proposal Letter

__x__ Site Plan/Floor Plan

__x__ Elevations

__x__ Photographs

____ Other:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the exception criteria have not been met and recommends denial of the exception to section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for the replacement of the wrought iron columns with wood columns. Otherwise, the staff recommends approval of the other elements of the application, which do not require an exception, 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.

Sample motions:

Up to two motions may be required in this case.

a. In case 2026-011997-HDRB, for 528 and 530 Calle Corvo, approve/deny the exception to section 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) for the replacement of the wrought iron columns with wood columns, finding that the exception criteria have/have not been met.
b. In case 2026-011997-HDRB, for 528 and 530 Calle Corvo, approve or deny the elements of the application that do not require an exception as submitted.

Should the Board deny the exception request, the applicant shall return with an alternative proposal for review and approval before proceeding to a building permit.

The property lies within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. See Chapter 14, SFCC, Article 14-3.13(B)(1). There may be archaeological concerns associated with this project, and archaeological clearance may be required.



Figure 1: Property Location

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

Streetscape:

The general streetscape at 528 and 530 Calle Corvo consists of a mix of Spanish Pueblo Revival and Territorial architectural designed structures constructed from the 1930s to 1950s. The structures are generally constructed of adobe block, wooden vigas, wood frame, and concrete masonry blocks with low raised stucco yard walls from the street to the entry of the residences. Several structures have red terra-cotta tiles for portal and entry-way roof material, making this a uniquely special characteristic on this street. Common architectural elements include but are not limited to round parapets, brick coping, bullnosed corners, wrought iron elements, recessed picture, and divided lite windows. Most of the structures in the streetscape are one-story, but two-story structures are visible. The area is highly vegetated with mature trees and seasonal plants.



Figure 2: 528 and 530 Calle Corvo

Site Description:

The multi-residential property includes the main residence at 528 Calle Corvo and the casita at 530 Calle Corvo. Though the property has two addresses, it is a single parcel and a single building. There is also a workshop located at the rear of the property. The workshop was originally a shared garage with the residents at 532 Calle Corvo. It is partitioned in half, and access is from the east elevation. There are two non-historic greenhouses and metal shed structures constructed at the rear of the property.

The main residence was constructed of concrete masonry units in the 1950s. The building retains the steel combination windows and the east-facing portal with ornamental iron details. There is a greenhouse-style window on the south elevation of the casita portion of the building. The portal roof is clay tile, which contrasts with the Territorial Revival-style brick coping on the residences' parapet tops.

The workshop and storage structure in the rear of the property is a former garage with an attached workshop and was constructed in 1951 of concrete masonry units. The south of the structure is at the zero-lot-line and is connected to the garage at 532 Calle Corvo. The garage door was replaced in 1985.

The property is enclosed with several concrete block yard walls. The front is a low four-course wall with a rounded coping in a contrasting color and evenly spaced square pilasters. In the rear, a taller section defines the south of the back yard with six courses capped with rounded coping. The north property line mirrors the front wall with four courses and matching pilasters.

PREVIOUS CASE SUMMARIES:

ARC:

No archaeological clearance has been issued for the property.

HDRB:

The Historic Districts Review Board designated the main residence as contributing with the east and southeastern facades including the portal and excluding the non-historic doors and windows as the primary facades as indicated as numbers one and two on the façade drawing, designate the workshop and garage as non-contributing for the reasons given by staff, and designate the yard wall as contributing noting that it is exposed CMU and that the contributing status relates to the design and dimensions of the wall that are historic but not to the fact that it is not covered with stucco and that designation should not preclude stuccoing the walls which is consistent with the ordinance on September 9, 2025 under case 2025-011043-HDRB.



Figure 3: Façade Diagram

ADMINISTRATIVE:
There are no administrative approval cases on record for the property in the Historic Preservation Division files.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:
The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

Main Residence:

1) Construct a 150 sq. ft. addition on the west elevation. The elevation will be to a height of 15'-4", where the maximum allowable height is 14'0". The addition will match the existing height of the rear of the structure, which is at a lower slope than the east elevation (front), which will remain at the height of 14'1". The addition will have brick coping at the parapet to match the original structure.
2) Construct a 200 sq. ft. portal addition to the west elevation. The portal will be constructed to a height of 13'8". The portal will have a hipped clay tile roof to match the existing east portal roof. Wood posts and wrought iron railing.
3) Replace all exterior doors and windows with wood-clad doors and windows as recommended in the attached Window Assessment.
    a. Install a new full-lite entry door with divided lites to the 528 Calle Corvo unit under the east portal. The door will be on the south elevation.
    b. Replace the box bay window on the east elevation with a deeper unit.
    c. Install a new box bay window on the west elevation addition.
    d. Install a new half-lite entry door with divided lites to 530 Calle Corvo under the east portal on the south elevation.
    e. Decrease the size of the westernmost window on the northern elevation to accommodate the addition.
    f. Decrease the size of the middle south elevation window.
    g. Install two sliding doors under the new portal on the west elevation.
    h. Install two west-facing windows in the western addition.
4) Remove the wrought iron posts and replace them with wood posts painted to match the windows. An exception to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) is requested for the removal of historic materials.
5) Replace wrought iron railings to replicate those existing on the east portal.
6) Install wrought iron railings to replicate the east portal's on the west portal.
7) Install exterior insulation on the entirety of the existing uninsulated main house, except for the primary façades, where the insulation will be interior.
8) Remove the concrete steps on the south of the east portal and fill in the deck area with additional wrought iron railing.
9) Install east-facing concrete steps on the southeast corner of the east portal and open the wrought iron

railing at this location.

10) Replace and install new canales and downspouts.
11) Install a fence and pedestrian gate at the end of the driveway on the south of the residence. Fence and gate will be constructed of wood to a height of 4'-0".
12) Stucco the residence, studio, and yard walls, including the front yard wall.
13) Exterior lighting at all doorways as required by code.

Studio:

14) Construct a 32 sq. ft. entry portal on the east elevation of the studio. The portal will have wood columns and a parapeted roof.
15) Install a new French door on the south elevation of the studio.
16) Infill the door currently in the studio on the south elevation. The glass block next to the door will remain.
17) Install a new door with a single lite in the existing opening of the north elevation of the studio.
18) Install a new double door with a single lite in a new opening on the north elevation of the studio.
19) Replace the southern door on the east elevation of the studio with a small single-lite double-hung window.
20) Replace the window on the eastern elevation of the studio.
21) Replace the entry door on the east elevation.
22) Exterior lighting will be added next to each door as required by code.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to 14-5.2(D)(1)(a) is requested: The applicant requests an exception to remove historic materials and alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status for removing the wrought iron posts.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: No other existing residences along Calle Corvo feature wrought iron posts; hence, we feel that the removal does not damage the existing character of the district.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The wrought iron posts and railing are part of the details that designate this portal as part of the primary façade. To change the feature of the portal would change the status of the building and the character of the district.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: Currently, the existing East/South portal requires some structural attention, and at least one end is not properly attached to the building. The slenderness of the wrought iron posts is also inadequate to hold up the roof of Spanish clay tiles. Furthermore, the existing post and beam on the west end of the portal are not connected at all to the house structure and hence need to be repaired/replaced properly. Several existing rafters also need to be replaced because of water damage. We feel that this extensive need for repair and refurbishment of the portal structure requires the replacement of the existing steel frame posts.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The frame has held the roof up for over fifty years. While it requires repairs, it is not a hardship to do the repairs rather than replace the posts with posts that are not replicated.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: By using wood posts, this expression actually strengthens and supports the visual character of the neighborhood.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is/is not met. The applicant did not consider that the feature being removed is part of what was designated as a primary façade, and has not suggested other means of strengthening the support for the portal roof, such as replacing the columns with replicated columns.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-5.2 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

(A) **General Provisions**

(1) General Purpose

To promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of the *city* and to ensure the harmonious, orderly and efficient growth and *development* of the *city*, it is deemed essential by the *governing body* that the qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, and a harmonious outward appearance, which preserve *property* values and attract tourists and residents alike, be preserved, some of these qualities being:

(a) The continued existence and *preservation* of historical areas and *buildings*;

(b) The continued construction of *buildings* in the historic styles; and

(c) A general harmony as to style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between *buildings* of historic design and those of more modern design.

(C) **Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures in the Historic Districts**

(Ord. No. 2004-26)

(1) Purpose and Intent

It is intended that:

(a) Each *structure* is to be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical *development*, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other *buildings*, shall not be undertaken.

(b) Changes to *structures* that have acquired historic *significance* in their own right shall be retained and preserved, recognizing that most *structures* change over time;

(c) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a *structure* be preserved; and

(d) New additions and related or adjacent new construction be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic *property* and its environment would be unimpaired.

(4) Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All *development* located within the historic districts and subject to this Section 14-5.2 shall comply with all applicable general *development* standards set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(D), as well as any applicable specific *development* standards set forth in Subsections 14-5.2(E) through (I).

(D) **General Design Standards for All H Districts**

In any review of proposed additions or alterations to *structures* that have been declared significant or contributing in any historic district or a *landmark* in any part of the *city*, the following standards shall be met:

(1) General

(a) The status of a significant, contributing, or *landmark structure* shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a *structure* to lose its significant, contributing, or *landmark* status, the *application* shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status shall be prohibited.

(b) If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent *structure* to lose its significant, contributing, or *landmark* status, the *application* may be denied.

(2) Additions

(a) Additions shall have similar materials, architectural *treatments,* and styles, features, and details as the existing *structure*, but shall not duplicate those of the existing *structure* in a manner that will make the addition indistinguishable from the existing *structure*.

(b) Additions to *buildings* that meet the standards of Subsection 14-5.2(E) shall continue to meet those standards set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(E) in addition to the standards set forth in this section.

(c) Additions are not permitted to *primary façades*.

(d) Additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary facade. The addition shall not exceed fifty percent of the square footage of the existing footprint, and shall not exceed fifty percent of the existing dimension of the primary facade. To the extent architecturally practicable, new additions shall be attached to any existing noncontributing portion of *structures* instead of attaching them to the significant or contributing portion.

(e) The height of additions:

(i) For significant and *landmark structures, there* shall be a minimum of six (6) inches less than the parapet or equivalent roof-feature of the existing adjacent connecting facade.

(ii) For contributing *structures, there* shall be no more than one additional *story* higher than the existing *structure*. To the extent architecturally practicable, two-story additions shall be set to the rear or the side rear of the *structure*. When an additional *story* is to be placed upon an existing contributing *structure*, that footprint may be no greater than fifty percent of the footprint of the existing *structure*, subject to the provisions of Subsection A(1) above. For the purposes of this paragraph, an additional *story* shall not exceed twelve (12) feet from the existing rooftop to the highest point of that *story*.

(3) Remodeling to Increase Height; Rooftop Appurtenances

(a) For *remodeling* of existing significant and *landmark structures*, no increase in height of the *structures* is permitted. (For standards relating to additions to existing *structures*, see paragraph (2) above.)

(b) For significant and *landmark structures*, *publicly visible* rooftop appurtenances, including but not limited to solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment, shall not be added, nor shall the parapet be raised to conceal the *rooftop appurtenances*. For contributing *buildings,* solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment that are *publicly visible* shall not be added.

(4) Porches and Portals

Existing *porches* or *portals* shall not be enclosed.

(5) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

(a) For all facades of significant and *landmark structures* and for the primary facades of contributing *structures*:

(i) Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double-pane glass may be used. No opening shall be widened or narrowed.

(ii) No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.

(iii) No existing opening shall be closed.

(b) For all façades of significant, contributing, and *landmark structures*, architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows shall be repaired rather than replaced. In the event *replacement* is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. *Replacement* or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical, or pictorial evidence.

(6) Roofs

The existing roof styles and materials shall be maintained or replaced in kind if necessary. The addition of dormers or other roof features should only be considered when they are an existing or historical feature of the *structure*.

(8) Archaeological Resources

Discovery of archaeological resources made during the historic districts review process shall be referred to the archaeological review committee.

(9) Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks

The height, pitch, *scale*, and massing of any *structure* in a historic district, as defined in this section, shall be limited as provided for in this section, unless further restricted within this chapter.

(a) Applicability

The following sections identify specific areas and specific *projects* subject to this section. Planning and land use department staff shall determine whether or not properties are included within this section. (Ord. No. 2007-45 § 30; Ord. #2020-22, § 16)

F. When the proposed *building*, *yardwall*, or fence is located in a *streetscape* that includes no *buildings*, *yardwalls*, or fences, the height of the proposed *building* shall not exceed sixteen (16) feet. *Yardwalls* and fences in this *streetscape* shall not exceed five (5) feet in height.

(c) Height

(ii) In exercising its authority under this section, the board shall limit the height of *structures* as outlined in this section. Heights of existing *structures* shall be as set forth on the official map of *building* heights in the historic districts.

A. If a proposed *building* has a parapet, the façade shall not be in excess of two (2) feet of the average of the height of the façades in the *streetscape*.

B. If the proposed *building* has a pitched roof, the ridge height of the proposed *building* shall not be in excess of two (2) feet above the average of the ridge height of the pitched roofs in the *streetscape*.

C. *Yardwalls* and fences shall be limited to a height that does not exceed the average of the height of other *yardwalls* and fences in the *streetscape*.

D. Pursuant to Section 14-7.4(C), the height of any other *structure* shall be limited to the allowable *building* height within the applicable *streetscape*, as defined in this section. (Ord. No. 2002-37 § 26)

E. The height and dimension of signage are as set forth in Section 14-8.10(H).

F. The board may increase the allowable height for proposed *buildings* and additions located on a sloping site where the difference in the natural *grade* along the *structure's* foundation exceeds two (2) feet. In no case shall the height of a façade exceed four (4) feet above the allowable height of the applicable *streetscape* measured from natural or finished *grade*, whichever is more restrictive. This increase in height shall be constructed only in the form of *building* stepbacks from the *street*.

(d) Pitch

If the determined *streetscape* includes over fifty percent of *buildings* with pitched roofs, the proposed *building* may have a pitched roof. A pitched roof is defined as a gable, shed, or *hipped roof*. The pitch of the roof shall match the predominant pitch extant in the *streetscape*.

(e) Scale

The height of a proposed *building* or addition, its façade length, and its roof form and pitch shall appear to be in proportion to the height, façade length, and roof form and pitch of *buildings* in the applicable *streetscape*, or the *building* on which the addition is proposed.

(f) Massing and Floor Stepbacks

The Board may require that upper floor levels be stepped back, to carry out the intent of this section; provided that the board in making such determinations shall take into account whether the height of the proposed *building*, *yardwall*, fence, or proposed stepback of upper floor levels is in harmony with the massing of the applicable *streetscape* and *preservation* of the historic and characteristic visual qualities of the *streetscape*. The Board shall also require that the *publicly visible* façades of the *structure* be in conformance with Subsections 14-5.2(E) through (H), and in meeting those requirements, may require that different floor levels be stepped back.

(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards

The *governing body* recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the *city* from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with *adobe*, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another

style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a *development* from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

(1) Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with *adobe*, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

(a) With rare exception, *buildings* are of one *story*, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the *buildings* are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight *slope* and surrounded on at least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the *walls* or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the *walls* except to cover an enclosed *portal* or *porch* formed by setting back a portion of the *wall* or to form an exterior *portal*, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns. Two-story construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the floor of the second *story*. Façades are flat, varied by inset *portales*, exterior *portales*, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-spouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved, and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, often slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding *walls*;

(b) All exterior *walls* of a *building* are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under *portales*, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a *wall* under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color or have mural decorations.

(c) Solid *wall* space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;

(d) The rule as to flat roofs shall not be construed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof *structures*, but such *structures* other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the *street* on which the *building* fronts;

(e) True old Santa Fe style *buildings* are made of *adobe* with a mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the *adobe* effect can be simulated is permissible, provided that the exterior *walls* are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating *adobe*, laid on smoothly, is required; and

(f) It is characteristic of old Santa Fe style commercial *buildings* to place a *portal* so that it covers the entire sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

(2) Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic *buildings* by *retention* of a similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of *adobe* construction, prescribed as follows:

(a) No *building* shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed *portales*, *setbacks,* or other design elements.

(b) The combined door and window area in any *publicly visible* façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a *portal*. No door or window in a *publicly visible* façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;

(c) No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof *treatment* described below;

(d) No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any *publicly visible* façade shall be *adobe* finish or stucco simulating *adobe* finish. The balance of the *publicly visible* façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for *building permits*;

(e) The *publicly visible* façade of any *building* and of any adjoining *walls* shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish, and of relatively smooth texture. Façade surfaces under *portales* may be of contrasting or complementary colors. Windows, doors, and *portals* on *publicly visible* portions of the *building* and *walls* shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles, except that *buildings* with *portals* may have larger plate glass areas for windows under *portals* only. Deep window recesses are characteristic, and

(f) Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

memo

DATE: March 24, 2026

TO: Historic Districts Review Board

VIA: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director
Maggie Moore, Assistant Land Use Director
Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Manager

FROM: Heather Lamboy, Planning & Land Use Department Director

---

2026-011886-HDRB. 521 Calle Corvo. Downtown and Eastside Historic District. Contributing. Rajah Bose, agent for Louis Pepper and Ruth Williamson, owners, request approval for a 348 sq. ft. addition to a height of 14'-05" where the maximum allowable height is 16'-4", window, door, and portal replacement. Exceptions are requested to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible, 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c) no new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence, and 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced.

REFERENCE ATTACHMENTS (Sequentially):

CITY SUBMITTALS

____ District Standards & yard wall & fence standards.

__x__ Historic Inventory Form

__x__ Zoning Review Sheet

__x__ Other: Previous Case Documents

APPLICANT SUBMITTALS

__x__ Proposal Letter

__x__ Site Plan/Floor Plan

__x__ Elevations

__x__ Photographs

____ Other:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the exception criteria for 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible, 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c) no new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence, and 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced have not been met and recommends denial of these exception requests. Otherwise, staff recommends approval of the 348 sq. ft. addition to a height of 14'-05", re-stucco, re-roof, and other elements of the application that do not require an exception as they comply with 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Sample motions:

Four motions will be required in this case.

a. In case 2026-011886-HDRB, for 521 Calle Corvo, approve or deny the application as submitted.
b. In case 2026-011886-HDRB, for 521 Calle Corvo, approve/deny the exceptions to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible, 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c) no new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence, and 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced, finding that the exception criteria have not been met.
c. In case 2026-011886-HDRB, for 521 Calle Corvo, approve/deny the elements of the project that do not require an exception.

Should the Board deny the exception and application requests, the applicant shall return with an alternative proposal for review and approval before proceeding to a building permit.

The property lies within the Historic Downtown Archaeological Review District. See Chapter 14, SFCC, Article 14-4.2. There may be archaeological concerns associated with this project, and archaeological clearance may be required.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:

The single-family residence at 521 Calle Corvo is listed as contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District with the south façade designated as primary. The GIS map, 1984 Historic Cultural Properties Inventory, and historic cases refer to the structure as contributing. However, there is no record of a status review. Most likely, the status is a result of the mass inventory of the historic districts in the early 1980s.

The structure was built in 1946 in the Territorial Revival architectural design style, as seen by the red brick coping on top of the parapet, recessed wooden framed picture windows, and terra-cotta tile on the entry portal, commonly observed on the Calle Corvo streetscape. In September of 2025, Mr. John Murphey conducted a Historic Cultural Property Inventory (HCPI) survey form on the property and concluded that since the main residential structure has maintained its original footprint since 1958, the structure should remain contributing and further that the south façade should be designated as primary (Murphey 2025:12).Based on aerial evidence and the 1984 HCPI, the garage (521A) was constructed between 1984 and 1992. No garage was noted in the 1984 HCPI.

PREVIOUS CASE SUMMARIES:

On January 13, 2026, in Case No. 2025-011537-HDRB, the Historic Districts Review Board (Board) adopted staff's recommendation to maintain the status of the house as contributing and facades 1, 2, 3, and 4, including the portal as primary, excluding doors and windows that are demonstrated to satisfaction to the Board as non-historic and that would apply as well to window openings and door openings, also adopting staff's recommendation that the garage structure be designated as non-contributing due to age, and the yard wall be designated as non-contributing for the same reason.

On May 29, 2001, in Case No. H-01-72, the Board made a motion to conditionally approve the request to build a 685 sq. ft. addition to the non-primary north façade.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST:

The applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

1) Construct a 348 sq. ft. addition to the height of 14'-05" to the northwest corner of the structure.
2) Re-stucco in cementitious stucco color "Suede".
3) Re-roof with TPO roofing system.
4) New Exterior wood stain color "Dark Walnut".
5) New metal clad wood frame windows color "Dark Bronze". An exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible is requested for the proposed wholesale window replacement.
6) Narrow a window on the south primary façade from 4' high by 4' wide to 3' high by 4' wide and requests an exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) no window opening shall be widened or narrowed.
7) Replace terra-cotta roof on the south primary façade including the portal and requests an exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced.




Figure 1. Existing Site Plan.




Figure 2. Proposed Site Plan.



EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
"DESIGNATED PRIMARY FACADES" INDICATED BY ORANGE LINE

Figure 3. Existing Floor Plan.




Figure 4. Proposed Floor Plan.




Figure 5. Existing and Proposed South Elevation.




Figure 6. Existing and Proposed West Elevation.




Figure 7. Existing and Proposed North Elevation.




Figure 8. Existing and Proposed East Elevation.

EXCEPTION CRITERIA AND RESPONSES:

Exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible: The applicant requests an exception to replace historic windows on the south primary façade.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: We believe the proposed new window package not only prevents any damage to the district, but actually brings the house into better compliance with the district's design values, most specifically relating to the divided-lite windows. You will see in our proposal elevations that the eastern most window on the south façade, window unit "C" (see elevations), was at some point replaced with a picture window.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The proposed wholesale window replacement with divided-lite windows on the south primary façade change the historic conception and give a false sense of history on this streetscape where many of the homes on Calle Corvo were constructed with picture windows.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: The hardship inflicted on the client by having to repair all of the existing windows rather than replace them with windows of today's construction and energy standards is multifold. In the case of this particular house, the first hardship is a tandem issue of energy and finances. The thermal and air infiltration of new windows is substantially better than windows made between 1940-1980, which is the approximate range of units we're dealing with. The notion of repairing the disjointed set of windows on the south façade, just for them to ultimately cost the owner more through energy loss, is an undue hardship that can be easily avoided. From the perspective of design congruence and the ultimate durability of the whole window system, it would also be silly to replace the rest of the windows, which are permitted to be changed, and not those on the southern façade. Anyone familiar with Santa Fe's climate and strong sun knows that metal clad windows are a standard here due to metal's ability to resist the sun and extreme dryness, especially on southern facades.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The applicant poses a good argument, however given the current code citation which states, "historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible" on the primary facades the applicant has not provided sufficient information to justify the removal of historic windows and more information is needed for the Board to determine the current condition of these historic doors and windows.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: In terms of design options, the alternative to the proposed full window package would be to somehow repair or replace in-kind the windows that are existing – windows that wouldn't comply with the HPD standards to begin with, like window "C". Rather than play that game, we believe it is the most reasonable option to allow a full new window package, during which previously made design anomalies and compliance issues would be ironed out in one fell swoop, whilst enhancing the beauty of the streetscape and enabling the owners to inhabit the district comfortably. This will ultimately contribute to the district's longevity (which suffers from many second-home-ers (empty houses), lack of young families, etc.) via their investment and full-time presence.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The applicant proposes another relative argument, however the applicant has not provided the Board a full range of design options to consider, rather they have

chosen to present a whole-sale window replacement with limited information on the repairability of the historic windows. Additional information is needed for the Board to make a decisive decision for the proposed window replacement.

Exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) no opening shall be widened or narrowed: The applicant requests an exception to narrow a historic window opening from 4' high by 4' wide to 3' high by 4' wide.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: We believe the proposed new window package not only prevents any damage to the district, but actually brings the house into better compliance with the district's design values, most specifically relating to the divided-lite windows. You will see in our proposal elevations that the eastern most window on the south façade, window unit "C" (see elevations), was at some point replaced with a picture window.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. Given the Board's recent status review and primary façade designation for the subject property, the current request to narrow the picture window would adversely impact the primary façade and the streetscape and additional information is needed to assess the current condition of the historic window opening.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: The hardship inflicted on the client by having to repair all of the existing windows rather than replace them with windows of today's construction and energy standards is multifold. In the case of this particular house, the first hardship is a tandem issue of energy and finances. The thermal and air infiltration of new windows is substantially better than windows made between 1940-1980, which is the approximate range of units we're dealing with. The notion of repairing the disjointed set of windows on the south façade, just for them to ultimately cost the owner more through energy loss, is an undue hardship that can be easily avoided. From the perspective of design congruence and the ultimate durability of the whole window system, it would also be silly to replace the rest of the windows, which are permitted to be changed, and not those on the southern façade. Anyone familiar with Santa Fe's climate and strong sun knows that metal clad windows are a standard here due to metal's ability to resist the sun and extreme dryness, especially on southern facades.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. No hardship has been found to change the current dimensions of the picture window on the primary façade.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: In terms of design options, the alternative to the proposed full window package would be to somehow repair or replace in-kind the windows that are existing – windows that wouldn't comply with the HPD standards to begin with, like window "C". Rather than play that game, we believe it is the most reasonable option to allow a full new window package, during which previously made design anomalies and compliance issues would be ironed out in one fell swoop, whilst enhancing the beauty of the streetscape and enabling the owners to inhabit the district comfortably. This will ultimately contribute to the district's longevity (which suffers from many second-home-ers (empty houses), lack of young families, etc.) via their investment and full-time presence.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The applicant has not provided the Board a full range of design options to consider, additional information is needed for the Board to make a decisive decision for the proposed narrowing of the historic window opening.

Exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced : The applicant requests an exception to replace the terra-cotta portal roof tile with a metal standing seem roof.

(i) *Do not damage the character of the district*

Applicant Response: We believe the metal roof and the terra cotta roof share a similar level of importance when it comes to authentically representing the history of New Mexico. While terra cotta is a historic material in many parts of the world, it was always used as a superficial material in New Mexico and California to trigger a Mediterranean look and feel. Truthfully, metal roofs have a much longer history in our region, where they have been regularly used for hundreds of years. Especially studying the history of northern New Mexican architecture, you will find much more metal roofing than terra cotta tiles, probably due to metal's much enhanced durability-to-price ratio. Secondly, in terms of the district's character and the typical material palates, one can find many instances of territorial brick coping on the parapets, paired with metal awnings over portals, etc. This palette is exactly what we suggest.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The defining character of the Calle Corvo streetscape is what needs to be taken into consideration and several properties have portals with the terra cotta tiling as roofing material. There are no properties along this streetscape that have metal standing seem portal roofs publicly visible on Calle Corvo.

(ii) *Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare*

Applicant Response: Terra cotta is unfortunately a very brittle material and is susceptible to impact damage as well as freeze-thaw expansion damage. Terra cotta was never meant to be used on roofs where snow loads are expected, though it can endure lots of sunlight. Our terra cotta roof eave detailing is also often not done well, which has led to water damage below on the carrying wood structure. A metal roof would give us the chance to properly flash the assembly, as well as install metal gutter to keep water away from the entry and foundation of the house. It would be an undue hardship on the owner not to be able to improve the building assembly in this way, especially considering the expense of roof and water damage in the future.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. No hardship has been found to change the roofing material from terra cotta tile to a metal standing seem roof.

(iii*) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts*

Applicant Response: Needless to say, the only other option here is to leave the terra cotta roof as it is. While we understand the primary façade nature of the portal, the metal roof seems like a reasonable solution to improving the longevity of the house, maintaining and improving the character of the district, and ensuring the occupants are able to remain in the historic district, contributing to its longevity and quality as a neighborhood. Attempts to modify the terra cotta roof to perform better according to the grievances above also may not result in an architecturally pleasing outcome, which we believe the HPD would not appreciate, and why we suggest it be avoided.

Staff Response: Staff finds that this criterion is not met. The applicant has not provided a full range of roof options for the current terra cotta tile portal. A metal standing-seem roof option seems to be an extreme change

to the historic portal that currently exists. Additional information may need to be requested to clearly identify the best options for re-roofing the portal with the proper material.

RELEVANT CODE CITATIONS:

14-4.6 HISTORIC DISTRICTS

A. General Provisions

1. Purpose

In order to promote the economic, cultural, and general welfare of the people of Santa Fe and to ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the City, the Governing Body deems it essential to preserve the qualities relating to the history and culture of Santa Fe, maintain a harmonious outward appearance to preserve property values, and attract residents and tourists alike. The specific purposes of this section are to preserve qualities relating to the history of Santa Fe, such as the following:

I. Continue the existence and preservation of historic areas and buildings;

II. Continued construction of buildings in Santa Fe's historic styles; and

III. General harmony as to architectural style, form, color, height, proportion, texture, and material between buildings of historic design and those of more modern design.

2. Conflicting Standards

I. Zoning District Regulations

All designated landmarks and all properties located in historic districts shall be subject to the regulations of the base zoning district in which they are located, except for height as regulated in Section 14-4.6E, *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts.* When the requirements of the base zoning district conflict with the requirements of this Section 14-4.6, *Historic Districts,* the more restrictive standard shall apply.

II. Multiple Overlay Regulations

When a designated landmark or property located in a historic district is also located within another overlay, and there is a conflict between the requirements of the historic district and the other applicable overlay district, the more restrictive standard shall apply.

5. Boundaries

a. The boundaries for the historic districts are as shown on the Official Zoning Map and incorporated in this Code by reference.

b. If the boundary line of a historic district bisects or crosses a property without encompassing the entire lot, the applicable requirements of the historic district shall be as determined by the Planning and Land Use Director.

6. Design of Buildings

Full responsibility for the design and development of structures is upon the applicant. The case file of any prior application related to a property is available for review by the applicant upon request.

7. Nonconforming Buildings and Structures

Any building or structure in the historic district that does not meet the standards for architectural style outlined in this section shall be considered nonconforming, and subject to the provisions of Section 14-1.13(), *Legal Nonconforming Structures,* unless given special approval by the HDRB for architectural or historic interest, or unless individually entered in the state register of cultural properties or in the national register of historic places or designated as significant on either register.

B. Minimum Maintenance Requirements

All historic landmarks and all buildings and structures in the historic districts shall be preserved against decay and deterioration and maintained free of structural defects. The owner or other person having legal custody and control of the building or structure shall repair such building or structure if any of the following defects are found:

1. Parts attached to a building or structure in a manner that they may fall and injure people or property;
2. Deteriorated or inadequate foundation;
3. Defective or deteriorated flooring or floor supports or flooring for floor supports of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
4. Walls or parts of walls, partitions, gates, fences, or other vertical supports that split, lean, list, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration or that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
5. Ceilings or parts of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports, or other horizontal components that sag, split, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration, or that are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads safely;
6. Fireplaces or chimneys that list, bulge, or settle due to defective material or deterioration, or that are of insufficient size or strength to carry imposed loads safely;
7. Deteriorated, crumbling, or loose plaster or stucco;
8. Deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, foundations, or floors, including broken windows or doors;
9. Lack of weather protection or defective weather protection for exterior wallcovering, including lack of paint, or weathering due to lack of paint or other protective covering; or
10. Any fault or default in the building or structure that renders it structurally unsafe or not properly watertight.

C. Buildings with Significant or Contributing Historic Status

I. Purpose

Historic designation is intended to address the following:

I. Recognizing each structure as a physical record of its time, place, and use.
II. Preventing changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as the addition of conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings;
III. Preserving and retaining changes to structures that have acquired historic importance in their own right, recognizing that most structures change over time;
IV. Preserving distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a structure; and
V. Avoiding making new additions and related or adjacent new construction in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

2. Designation of Significant, Contributing, or Noncontributing Status

I. Status Designation

Structures within historic districts may be designated a status of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing," as defined in Section 14-9.3, *General Definitions.* Staff shall maintain a record as to the current status of structures located in the historic districts.

II. HDRB Authority to Review Status Designation

a. The HDRB may change the status of a structure or designate a status for a structure that has no status designated.
b. A change in status or the designation of a status shall be based upon an evaluation of data provided through survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of "significant," "contributing," or "noncontributing."
c. When the HDRB designates a structure as contributing, it shall also specify which facades of the structure are primary.

V. Restoration of Status

If a property owner makes changes to a structure without the proper City approvals, which result in the lowering of the structure's status, staff or the Board may require the property owner to restore the structure such that its former status is restored.

3. Review by Historic Districts Review Board Required

I. Except where this chapter provides for review by staff, the HDRB shall review all applications for new construction, alteration, or demolition in the historic districts and of landmark structures throughout the city, based on the standards set forth in this section.

II. The historic board shall judge any proposed alteration or new structure for harmony with adjacent buildings, preservation of historical and characteristic qualities, and conformity to the standards for architectural style set forth in this section.

Ill. The HDRB may approve, deny, approve with conditions, or, with the consent of the applicant, postpone an application.

a. For applications approved with conditions, no permit shall be issued until the HDRB conditions have been met.
b. An application that is postponed shall be heard at a date agreed upon by the HDRB and the applicant.

IV. No permit shall be issued until the time for appeal to the Governing Body has expired.

4. Compliance with General and Specific Design Standards Required

All development located within the historic districts and subject to this section shall comply with all applicable general development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6E), *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts,* as well as any applicable specific development standards set forth in Section 14-4.6G), *Additional District-Specific Design Standards.*

D. Exceptions

The HDRB may grant an exception to the regulations set forth in this section, provided that such exception does not exceed the underlying zoning, except when the board of adjustment grants a variance. Staff shall determine whether an exception to general design and preservation standards described in Section 14-4.6E is required and shall recommend that the HDRB approve, approve with conditions, or deny the exception.

1. Height

   If an applicant requests approval of a height in the historic district that exceeds the underlying zoning district requirement, the applicant shall first receive an exception to this section. If the HDRB approves a requested height exception, the applicant shall proceed to the Board of Adjustment or other applicable city body for consideration of the proposed variance, as described in Section 14-2.1H.1.

2. Design Standards

   The HDRB may review and grant or deny requests for exceptions to all provisions of Section 14-4.6E, *General Design Standards for All Historic Districts* (except provisions regarding Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks).

14-4.6G) for construction or alterations within the historic districts, and Section 14-7.61) for signs in historic districts. Exceptions are project-specific and do not apply to the subject property in perpetuity.

I. Procedure

When requesting exceptions, the applicant shall use the procedures for public notice and hearing in Section 0), unless the applicant also requests a variance to the underlying zoning. In such a case, the applicant for the historic ordinance exception shall not be required to publish a separate legal ad in the local newspaper. Publication of the agenda is still required.

II. Approval Criteria

To approve an exception, the HDRB shall make findings of fact that the applicant conclusively demonstrated that the requested exceptions comply with all the criteria listed as follows:

a. Do not damage the character of the district;
b. Are required to prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare; and
c. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

3. Height, Pitch, Scale, Massing, and Floor Stepbacks

The HDRB is responsible for reviewing and granting or denying requests for exceptions from regulations in Section 14-4.6F. The HDRB may grant exceptions and impose conditions thereon to Section 14-4.6F) for the height of structures within the historic districts as specified in Section 14-4.6F.1).

Exceptions are project-specific and do not apply to the subject property in perpetuity.

I. Procedure

When requesting exceptions, the applicant shall use the procedures for public notice and hearing in Section 0), unless the applicant also requests a variance to the underlying zoning. In such a case, the applicant for the historic ordinance exception shall not be required to publish a separate legal ad in the local newspaper. Publication of the agenda is still required.

II. Approval Criteria

To approve an exception, the HDRB shall make findings of fact that the applicant conclusively demonstrated that the requested exceptions comply with all the criteria listed as follows:

a. Do not damage the character of the streetscape;
b. Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare;
c. Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts;
d. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape;
e. Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant; and
f. Provide the least negative impact with respect to the Purpose of this section as set forth in Section 14-4.6A.1.

E. General Design Standards for All Historic Districts

These standards shall apply to all additions or alterations to existing structures in the Historic Districts. Contributing, significant, and landmark structures may be subject to specific additional restrictions and district-specific standards in Section 14-4.6G).

I. General

I. The historic status of a property with a historic status designation of significant, contributing, or landmark structure shall be retained and preserved. If a proposed alteration will cause a property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application shall be denied. The removal of historic materials or alteration of architectural features and spaces that embody the status is prohibited.

II. If a proposed alteration or new construction will cause an adjacent property to lose its significant, contributing, or landmark status, the application may be denied.

Ill. For the regulations of this subsection, all facades of a significant structure are primary facades.

2. Building Additions

I. Design

a. Building additions that meet the standards of Section 14-4.6G.2), *Downtown and Eastside Historic District,* shall continue to meet those standards, in addition to the standards set forth in this section.
b. Building additions shall have similar materials, architectural treatments and styles, features, and details as the existing structure, but shall be distinguishable from and not attempt to duplicate the existing structure.

II. Size and Location
   a. Building additions are not permitted on primary facades.
   b. All building additions shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the primary facade.
   c. Building additions shall not exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the building's historic footprint and shall not exceed 50 percent of the historic length in linear feet of the primary fa<; ade.
   d. To the extent architecturally practicable, new building additions shall be attached to any existing non-primary fa<; ade of a structure rather than attaching them to the primary facade of a structure.

III. Height
   a. The maximum height of building additions to significant and landmark structures shall be at least six inches lower than the parapet or equivalent roof feature of the existing adjacent connecting facade.
   b. Building additions to contributing structures shall be no more than one additional story higher than the existing structure. To the extent architecturally practicable, two-story additions shall be set to the rear or the side rear of the structure. When an additional story is to be placed upon an existing contributing structure, that footprint may be no greater than fifty percent of the footprint of the existing structure, subject to the provisions of Subsection A(1) above. For the purposes of this paragraph, an additional story shall not exceed twelve (12) feet from the existing rooftop to the highest point of that story.

IV. Remodeling to Increase Height
   a. For remodeling of an existing significant or landmark structure, no increase in height of the structure is permitted.
   b. For remodeling an existing contributing structure, a height increase may be permitted through approval of an exception, as described in Section 14-4.6D.

V. Rooftop Equipment

Rooftop equipment, including but not limited to solar collectors, clerestories, decks, or mechanical equipment, may only be installed on contributing and noncontributing structures and shall not be publicly visible, nor shall a parapet be raised to conceal such equipment.

3. Porches and Portals

Existing porches or portals on significant and landmark structures, and on primary facades of contributing structures, shall not be permanently enclosed.

4. Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features

   I. For all facades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary facades of contributing structures:

      a. Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double-pane glass may be used. No window opening shall be widened or narrowed.
      b. Window depth and other characteristics of window and door fenestration shall be preserved.
      c. No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence.
      d. No historic opening shall be closed.

   II. For all facades of contributing, significant, and landmark structures:

      a. Architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows shall be repaired rather than replaced.
      b. In the event replacement is necessary, the use of new material may be approved. The new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities.
      c. Replacement or duplication of missing features shall be substantiated by documentation, physical, or pictorial evidence.

5. Roofs

   The existing historic roof styles and materials shall be maintained or replaced in kind if necessary. The addition of dormers or other roof features should only be considered when they are an existing historic feature of the structure.

6. Surface Cleaning

   The surface cleaning of structures shall employ the gentlest means possible. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials are not permitted.

7. Archaeological Resources

   Discovery of archaeological resources made during the development of a historic property shall be referred to the Archaeological Review Committee. See Section 14-2.1G.1.V.c, *Unexpected Discoveries.*

8. Signs

   Sign applications and required submittals shall be reviewed by the Planning and Land Use Department. Approval or denial shall be indicated by the department on the application for the construction permit and on each of the required submittals.

9. Murals

If an application impacts a mural funded through the art in public places program or is otherwise within the scope of the arts commission's enabling responsibilities,

The HDRB may refer the application to the City Arts Commission. If a proposed mural does not meet the criteria in the historic ordinance, an exception is required.

10. Pedestrian-Oriented Areas

I. The HDRB shall recommend to the Governing Body appropriate streets or portions of streets within the historic district to be set aside for pedestrian-oriented areas.

II. The Governing Body may set aside the areas recommended, provided that three-fourths of the property owners adjoining the street or portion of street affected have given consent thereto.

III. Such pedestrian-oriented areas shall be closed to vehicular traffic, and any improvements made by the City in the public right-of-way within the area shall be for pedestrian purposes.

IV. No pedestrian-oriented area shall be set aside unless there is adequate space available conveniently related to the area for vehicle parking. The HDRB's recommendation to the Governing Body shall include a statement of the available parking spaces.

F. Additional District-Specific Design Standards

2. **Downtown and Eastside Historic District**

The governing body recognizes that a style of architecture has evolved within the city from the year 1600 to the present characterized by construction with adobe, hereafter called "old Santa Fe style", and that another style has evolved, hereafter called "recent Santa Fe style", which is a development from, and an elaboration of the old Santa Fe style, with different materials and frequently with added decorations.

I. Old Santa Fe Style

Old Santa Fe style, characterized by construction with adobe, is defined as including the so-called "pueblo" or "pueblo-Spanish" or "Spanish-Indian" and "territorial" styles and is more specifically described as follows:

a. With rare exception, buildings are of one story, few have three stories, and the characteristic effect is that the buildings are long and low. Roofs are flat with a slight slope and surrounded on at least three sides by a firewall of the same color and material as the walls or of brick. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the walls except to cover an enclosed portal or porch formed by setting back a portion of the wall or to form an exterior

portal, the outer edge of the roof being supported by wooden columns.

Two-story construction is more common in the territorial than in other sub-styles, and is preferably accompanied by a balcony at the level of the
floor of the second story. Facades are flat, varied by inset portales, exterior portales, projecting vigas or roof beams, canales or water-sprouts, flanking buttresses and wooden lintels, architraves and cornices, which, as well as doors, are frequently carved, and the carving may be picked out with bright colors. Arches are almost never used except for nonfunctional arches, open slightly ogive, over gateways in freestanding walls.

b. All exterior walls of a building are painted alike. The colors range from a light earth color to a dark earth color. The exception to this rule is the protected space under portales, or in church-derived designs, inset panels in a wall under the roof, in which case the roof overhangs the panel. These spaces may be painted white or a contrasting color or have mural decorations.
c. Solid wall space is always greater in any façade than window and door space combined. Single panes of glass larger than thirty (30) inches in any dimension are not permissible except as otherwise provided in this section;
d. The rules as to flat roofs shall not be constructed to prevent the construction of skylights or installation of air conditioning devices, or any other necessary roof structures, but such structures other than chimneys, flues, vents and aerials, shall be so placed as to be concealed by the firewall from the view of anyone standing in the street on which the building fronts;
e. True old Santa Fe style buildings are made of adobe with mud plaster finish. Construction with masonry blocks, bricks, or other materials with which the adobe effect can be simulated is permissible, provided that the exterior walls are not less than eight (8) inches thick and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. Mud plaster or hard plaster simulating adobe, laid on smoothly, is required; and
f. It is characteristic of Old Santa Fe style commercial buildings to place a portal so that it covers the entire sidewalk, the columns being set at the curb line.

II. Recent Santa Fe Style

Recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials, color, proportion,

and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction, prescribed as follows:

a. No building shall be over two stories in height in any façade unless the façade shall include projecting or recessed portales, setbacks, or other design elements;
b. The combined door and window area in any publicly visible façade shall not exceed forty percent of the total area of the façade except for doors or windows located under a portal. No door or window in a publicly visible façade shall be located nearer than three (3) feet from the corner of the façade;
c. No cantilevers shall be permitted except over projecting vigas, beams, or wood corbels, or as part of the roof treatment described below;
d. No less than eighty percent of the surface area of any publicly visible façade shall be adobe finish, or stucco simulating adobe finish. The balance of the publicly visible façade, except as above, may be of natural stone, wood, brick, tile, terra cotta, or other material, subject to approval as hereinafter provided for building permits;
e. The publicly visible façade of any building and of any adjoining walls shall, except as otherwise provided, be of one color, which color shall simulate a light earth or dark earth color, matte or dull finish, and of relatively smooth texture. Facade surfaces under portales may be of contrasting or complementary colors. Windows, doors, and portals on publicly visible portions of the building and walls shall be of one of the old Santa Fe styles, except that buildings with portals may have larger plate glass areas for windows under portals only. Deep window recesses are characteristic, and
f. Flat roofs shall have not more than thirty (30) inches overhang.

City of Santa Fe

Land Use Department
200 Lincoln Ave.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0909

PROJECT DESC: 2025-011537-HDRB, 521 Calle Corvo, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Rajah Bose, agent for Louis Pepper & Ruth Williamson, owners, request status review with primary façade(s) designation if applicable.

CASE NUMBER: 2025-011537--HDRB

PROJECT TYPE: Historic Status Review

LOCATION: 521 CALLE CORVO
Santa Fe, NM 87501

CONTACTS:

Applicant	Rajah Bose
Property Owner	louis pepper

BOARD ACTION

This is to certify that the Historic Districts Review Board (HDRB) acted on your request at their hearing on Jan 13, 2026. The decision of the Board was to adopt staff's recommendations to maintain the status of the house as contributing and facades 1, 2, 3, and 4, including the portal as primary, excluding doors and windows that are demonstrated to satisfaction to the Board as non-historic and that would apply as well to window openings and door openings, also adopting staff's recommendation that the garage structure be designated as non-contributing due to age, and the yard wall be designated as non-contributing for the same reason.

For further information please call 505-955-6605.

Sincerely,

Paul Duran

NOTE: Applicant can use this action letter to apply for construction permit, but the permit shall not be released until the end of the appeal period which starts on the date of filing of the Findings and Conclusions in the City Clerk's office (SFCC 14-3.17(D)). Your permit will be denied if any changes on plans that were not approved by the HDRB or if conditions of approval are not met. **Please attach copies of this letter to all sets when submitting for construction permits.**



Figure 1: Proposed Façade Diagram for 521 Calle Corvo.

Primary Façade:

Non-primary Façade:

521 Calle Corvo

CITY OF SANTA FE

HISTORIC PRELIMINARY ZONING REVIEW

PLUD-20

PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to a public hearing in front of the Historic District Review Board (HDRB) all applicants must obtain Historic Districts Preliminary Zoning Review (HPZR) from the Current Planning Division. The HPZR does not grant zoning approval. Following design approval from the HDRB, final zoning review will be performed at the time of building permit.

Applicants must submit complete and accurate information for review. Incomplete submittals will not be processed. All HPZR requests must be submitted to Current Planning via zoningcounter@santafenm.gov

PROJECT INFORMATION

Date 08/01/2025	Property Owner of Record PEPPER/WILLIAMSON TRUST/ LOUIS PEPPER & RUTH WILLIAMSON		
Applicant/Agent Contact RAJAH BOSE			
Site Address 521 & 521 A CALLE CORVO			
Suite or Space #	Subdivision Name Hughes Second Subdivision		
Lot # 7	Block #	Total Roof Area (square feet) 2,680	
Lot Coverage % 37%	Lot Size (square feet) 7,251 SF		
Proposed Construction Description	Interior remodel and addition and complete new window package; ADU remodel and new window package		
The following documents are required for review as applicable:	Legal Lot of Record Building Plans Existing site plan w/ setbacks Proposed site plan w/ setbacks Existing & Proposed Elevations Development Plan		
Zoning District RC8	Overlay Districts Escarpment Flood Plain Other		
Proposed Setbacks	Front 7'-0"	Rear 10'-0"	Left Side 5'-0" / Right Side 5'-0"
Required Setbacks	Front 7'-0"	Rear 5'-0"	Left Side 5'-0" / Right Side 5'-0"
Proposed Height 15-'3	Max Height 24'-0"	Parking Required 2 / Provided 3	Bike Parking 0 / Provided 0

Historic Planning Case Manager Lani McCulley

If you selected "other," please write in the name of your case manager. _____

ADDITIONAL SUBMITALS (IF APPLICABLE)

Y N Affidavit Restricting Use of an Accessory Structure Containing a Bathroom or Kitchen		
Y N Setback Affidavit and Agreement		
Y N Site Visibility Triangle	Y N Escarpment Slope Analysis	Y N Flood Plain Grading Plan

This hereby certifies that the information provided for preliminary zoning review is accurate and will not be modified without consulting the Land Use Department staff prior to HDRB hearing.

RAJAH BOSE 8/6/25 Owner ✓Applicant ✓Agent

To Be Completed by Land Use Department Staff

PRELIMINARY REVIEW STATUS

Preliminarily Reviewed X	Reviewed w/ conditions	Denied
Comments/Conditions Legal lot of record provided. Setbacks + max height standards met per Ch. 14-7.		
Preliminary Zoning Review completed by Rachael Manwaring	Date 08/15/2025	
Preliminary Zoning Review # 2025-011023-PAR		

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Base Form (FORM 1)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

Date of Form: October 9, 2025

For HPD Office use only:
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:

**Catherine D. Janney/
Waldo and Ernestine Anton/
Henry and Virginia Wicks House**

2. Location:

**521 Calle Corvo
Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**

3. Local Reference Number:
Santa Fe ID: H-632

4. County: Santa Fe
Parcel # 13018752

5. Property Type:
_x Buildings: House
_x Structures: Front Yard Wall
__ Site __ Object



6. Date of Survey:
September 28, 2025

7. Previous Survey Date(s):
_x_Yes: December 12, 1984, Michael Belshaw
__ No:

8. Name of Project:
HDRB Status Evaluation

9. Lat/Long:
35.6819669,-105.9329764

10. Photo Information: Giulia Caporuscio, photographer. Photo 1: View of south elevation. Facing northwest.

11. Brief Description of the Property:

Possibly the second house built in the Calle Corvo subdivision, 521 Calle Corvo is a roughly 1,346-square-foot Territorial Revival residence constructed primarily of adobe. The property includes an attached one-car garage and a short front yard wall. The house exhibits restrained architectural detailing, with features characteristic of the subdivision, including brick corbelling and a tiled roof over the entry portal. Fenestration consists of a mix of original and replacement units. A secondary dwelling, 521 A, stands at the rear of the lot; it is of more recent construction and not included in this survey. The main house is designated Contributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The yard wall has no status.

Continued on Page 5.

12. Who uses the property?


13. Construction Date:
Date: 1946-47
_ _Known _x_ Estimated Source: deeds and newspaper account

14. Setting:
_x_ Suburban __ Rural __ Village __ Urban If Urban: __ Commercial __ Industrial _x_ Residential __Public

15. Relationship to Surroundings: _x_ Similar __ Dissimilar
Comments: N/A

HCPI Base Form (FORM 1) *(Continued from other side)*

16. Additional Perspective: **(Photos, drawing, footprint, etc., indicate north arrow when possible)**



Source: Office of the Santa Fe County Assessor
parcel lines are not accurate

17. Surveyor:
(your name, address, telephone number, and any group affiliation)

John W. Murphey
Architectural Historian
Architectural History Services
w/ Giulia Caporuscio

For: Current owner:

18. Owner (if known) and other knowledgeable people:

Current owner: Pepper/Williamson Trust

N/A

19. Is Property Endangered? **_x_ Unknown __ No __ Yes How?**

20. Significance to Current Community: **_x_ Unknown __ None __ Low __ Moderate __ High**
Describe: Unknown

21. Other Significance or Information of Interest: (such as historical, legendary, structural, former ownership, etc.)
See Historical Overview.

22. National or State Register:

Is this property individually listed on a historic register? __ Unknown _x_ No __Yes
If yes: __ State __ National
If 'no' or unknown, do you think this property is eligible for listing? _x_ No __Yes
Why? See Evaluation of Historical Status

23. National or State Historic District: City of Santa Fe

Is this property in a historic district? __ Unknown __ No _x_ Yes
If yes: __ Significant _x_ Contributing: Primary House __ Non-contributing _x_ No Status: Front Yard Wall
Per City of Santa Fe official designation map

If 'yes', what is the name of the district? __ State __ National _x_ City of Santa Fe:
Downtown and Eastside Historic District

24. Supplemental Forms:

__ None _x_ HCPI Detail Form (FORM 2) __ Continuation Sheets, # pages: _____

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2***
HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D

1. Name of property:	2. Location:	3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632
Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House	521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe	4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS:

6. Visible Construction Material:

_x_Adobe __ Brick __ Composition __ Concrete: Block

__ Concrete: Cast Stone __Concrete: Poured __ Earth Plaster __ Masonry: Simulated

__ Metal: Corrugated __ Metal: Structural Siding __ Metal: V-Crimp __ Stone: Random Ashlar

Stone: __ Random Coursed __Stone: River Rock __Stone: Rusticated __ Stone: Tabular

_x_Stucco: __ Tile: Clay __ Vinyl Siding __ Wood: Board and Batten

Wood: __ Horizontal Siding __ Wood: Jacal __ Wood: Log __ Wood: Shingle

__ Wood: Tongue and Groove _x_ Other: Frame (garage)

7. Number of Stories: __ N/A
Number: _x_1 __11/2 __ 2
__ 21/2 Other:_____

8. Foundation: __ N/A
_x_ Not visible __ None
__ At Grade __Raised:
Materials: __ Concrete: __Stone
Other:
Notes

9. Roof: __ N/A

Shape: _x_Flat __Gabled
__ Hipped __ Pyramidal
_x_Shed Other:
Pitch: __ None __ Low
__ Medium __ Steep
Features: __ Eave:
_x_ Parapets
Materials: __Asphalt
__ Earth
__ Composition shingle __ Metal: Pressed
__ Composition Roll __Metal: Corrugated
__ Metal: Standing Seam __Metal: Standing Seam
__ Tile: Terra Cotta __ Wood: Shingle
Other: membrane and Spanish tile

10. Window Types

Operation	Material	Glazing	Number
Hung Sash	Wood	1/1	2
Hung Sash	Wood	2/2	1
Hung Sash	Wood	3/1	1
Hung Sash	Wood	6/6	1
Combination	Wood	8c-1F-8c	1
Fixed (picture)	Wood	1	1
Fixed (barn) sash	Wood	8	1

11. Door Types

Type	Style	Material	Number
Single-Leaf	15-panel	Wood	1
Single-Leaf	Faux Plank	Wood	1
Single-Leaf	15-light	Wood	1
Double	French- 15-light	Wood	1
Overheard	Segmental	Steel	1

12. Chimneys _x_ N/a

13. Porches _x_ N/A
Type: __ Entry _x_Partial-Width __ Full-Width __ Wrap

14. Other Significant Features N/A

15. Modifications: x __ No known modifications

#1 Date: Unknown; introduction of glazed doors; possible window replacement; visual evidence.
#2 Date: Post-1984; introduction of front yard wall; 1984 survey and aerial photographs.

16. Primary Architectural Style __ Not Applicable

__ Art Deco/Streamline Moderne	__ Gothic Revival	__ Mission Revival	__ Pueblo	__ Spanish-Pueblo Revival
__ Bungalow/Craftsman	__ International	__ Neo-Classical	__ Queen Anne	__ Territorial
__ Colonial Revival	__ Italianate	__ Northern NM	__ Ranch	_x_Territorial Revival
__ Folk Victorian	__ Mediterranean	__ Prairie	__ Spanish-Colonial	__ Tudor Revival

Notes: __ Other: Vernacular

17. Documents Available and Their Locations

Historic Preservation Division
Land Use Department
City of Santa Fe
200 Lincoln Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87504
(505) 955-6605
https://www.santafenm.gov/land-use/historic-preservation

Archaeological Records Management Section
Laboratory of Anthropology
708 Camino Lejo
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 476-1320
https://nmhistoricpreservation.org/arms.html

S I T E:

18. Attached or Associated Properties

Are associated properties eligible for listing: N/A

19.Site Plan: Not available.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Architectural Description Continued

Setting

Occupying Lot 7 of the Calle Corvo Addition, the property lies along the curve of the subdivision's namesake street, resulting in an irregular parcel that tapers to a narrow point at the southeast corner. The primary house is positioned near the center of the roughly 0.2-acre lot, oriented to the southwest (Photo 2). The front yard features brick and flagstone pathways and two mature pine trees, with older foundation plantings that lend a sense of established character. The rear yard consists primarily of a brick patio enclosed by low yard walls.

South (Front) Elevation

The primary house has a modified H-plan with a symmetrical façade (Photo 1). Its composition centers on an inset portal flanked by cubic projections (Photo 2). The arrangement recalls the influence of the historic Roque Lobato House, whose form was repeatedly adapted to organize small Territorial-style dwellings. The Territorial theme continues in the brick coping laid in a stretcher–rowlock–stretcher pattern extending along all sides of the house.

The west projection contains a sitting area with paired six-over-six double-hung sash set closely together without a mullion (Photo 4). Like many of the house's windows, these are covered by exterior storm units. The east projection contains a modern fixed window that lights a small dining room (Photo 5). Between these two bays lies the *portal*—a four-foot-deep space with a brick floor and a shed roof tiled in clay Spanish units. The use of clay tile over entry roofs is uncommon in the subdivision and contributes to the house's distinctive appearance.

A broad combination window—composed of eight-light casements flanking a fixed center panel—illuminates the living room. The casements are simple wood sash, hung on barrel hinges and operated by small surface latches. The main entry is a fifteen-panel wood door painted turquoise.

To the east of the living area, slightly recessed and of lower height, is a one-car garage (Photo 6). It is fitted with a sectional metal overhead door. The integration of an

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

attached garage into the main body of the house during the late 1940s parallels early tract houses built by Allen Stamm and reflects similar scale and placement within the building's composition.

East Elevation

The short east elevation faces a small side yard and contains a single eight-light wood-sash window set deeply within the adobe wall (Photo 6).

North Elevation

The rear of the house opens onto a brick patio shaded by a mature tree. Its general composition echoes the front façade but with less refinement, as the rectangular volumes of the modified H-plan converge more tightly.

At the east end, the garage extends outward from the house and is fenestrated with an eight-light wood-sash window and a large paneled wood door painted blue (Photo 7). West of the garage is a four-over-four wood double-hung sash lighting the laundry room. The central portion of the elevation includes a small portal that shelters a pair of fifteen-light French doors opening to the living room (Photo 8). The façade terminates in a projecting bay that encloses the primary bedroom, entered from the exterior through a fifteen-light wood door.

West Elevation

This elevation parallels a graveled side yard and contains several wood-sash windows serving the primary bedroom, bathroom, and sitting room (Photos 9 and 10).

Interior

The interior was not inspected during the survey; however, online real estate photographs indicate that the living room features large vigas running north to south.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Front Yard Wall

A roughly three-foot-high, two-foot-wide adobe wall extends along the front property line (Photo 2). Near the center, a steel entry gate opens onto a brick walkway leading to the main entrance. Comparison with a 1978 aerial photograph and the 1984 HBI suggests that the wall is relatively recent, replacing what had historically been a hedge (Figs. 4 & 5). The rear patio walls are also of modern construction.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Historical Overview

Hughes–Calle Corvo Subdivision Context

Calle Corvo—originally named Hughes Street—developed in the late 1940s as a compact enclave of modest Territorial and Pueblo Revival houses on suburban-sized lots along a short curving street.

The northern portion of the subdivision was created from several large parcels once owned by Levi A. Hughes Sr., a prosperous wool buyer and former vice president of the First National Bank who died in 1934. His home off Canyon Road adjoins the subject property.

His eldest son, Levi A. Hughes Jr., vice president of the Santa Fe Builders Supply Company, sought to convert the family land to residential use. In 1937 he platted the first Hughes Subdivision, laying out twenty lots along a gently curved road between Delgado Street and Acequia Madre—then called East Manhattan Street. Following the era's penchant for picturesque Spanish names, he renamed the street Calle Corvo, loosely meaning "curving" or "bent street." The area was replatted the next year as the Second Hughes Addition.

Early lots were sold to individuals connected to Hughes Jr. or his mother, Christine L. Hughes, who appears as grantor on many early deeds. Several buyers briefly held or developed their lots speculatively, resulting in a cohesive neighborhood of modest two-bedroom adobe dwellings—mostly Pueblo Revival in style—with attached or detached single-car garages. Common features such as low front walls and Pueblo-style detailing reflected shared taste rather than formal deed restrictions.

A 1958 real estate ad promoted the area as an "Exclusive Little Home Area on a Clean, Paved Street near the Acequia!" Yet the subdivision's restrictive covenants, filed earlier, expose its limits of exclusivity. Item "e" prohibited occupancy by "any person of African or Oriental descent," except as a domestic servant. Typical of mid-20th-century real estate language, this clause underscores the racial barriers embedded within Santa Fe's Eastside and South Capitol neighborhoods.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

By the early 1960s, the subdivision was fully built out, with seventeen houses lining its curved road. The 1960 city directory shows a high rate of owner occupancy, with all but four homes occupied by their owners. The neighborhood reflected a nearly even mix of Anglo and Hispanic homeowners.[1]

Lots 6 & 7

Elery G. and Olga Cooper (1946–1947)

On February 26, 1946, Christine Hughes sold adjacent Lots 6 and 7 in the Calle Corvo Subdivision to Elery G. Cooper and his wife, Olga, recent arrivals from Los Angeles.[2] Cooper was born in Indiana in 1878 and had moved west early in life, working in a Meade, Kansas grocery before marrying Ola Fick, daughter of German immigrants.[3]

The couple relocated to Trinidad, Colorado, where Cooper served as assistant manager for a lumber company, gaining building experience that later shaped his contracting work. In the 1920s they attempted homesteading near Sofia in Union County, New Mexico, before settling in Los Angeles.

In Santa Fe, Cooper launched a contracting business with his son, Elery R. Cooper. Though the firm's longevity is uncertain, they were credited with remodeling the Sweetbriar clothing store on San Francisco Street in 1947 (later demolished) and with constructing the first two houses in the Calle Corvo Subdivision.[4]

The Coopers sold both lots to Lemuel Charles and Jane Farley White of Tesuque.[5] Lemuel, an attorney, likely provided the capital for their speculative development. The completed homes, in Territorial Revival style with clay tile-covered porches, set a template for later construction in the subdivision.

---

[1] Hudspeth Directory Company, Hudspeth Directory Company, *Santa Fe City Directory, 1960* (El Paso: Hudspeth Directory Company, 1960), 28.
[2] Warranty Deed, Christine Hughes to Elery G. and Ola H. Cooper, recorded March 8, 1946, Book 29, Page 375, Instrument # 80529, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[3] Federal census data and news accounts informed the Cooper's biographical sketch.
[4] "Fire Started in New House," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, April 22, 1946, 7.
[5] Quitclaim Deed, Jane Farley and Charles Lemuel White to Sarah R. Janney, recorded May 20, 1947, Book 24, Page 301, Instrument # 85380, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632**
		4. County: Santa Fe
		5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025

Early Homeowners

Catherine D. Janney (1947–1954)

In 1947 Sarah Janney of Medford, Oregon, purchased Lot 7 and its house for her daughter, Catherine D. Janney (Fig. 2).[6] Catherine relocated to Santa Fe around this time and briefly worked as a "beauty counselor." The 1950 census recorded her, age thirty-six, living alone in the house and unemployed.[7] She remained there through the early 1950s. In 1954, her mother sold the property to newlyweds Waldo and Ernestine Anton, ending the family's brief ownership.[8]

Waldo and Ernestine Anton (1954–1960)

Waldo Anton, Jr., son of mail carrier Waldo Anton, Sr., grew up on Hillside Avenue. In 1952 he married Ernestina Baca, a Loretto Academy graduate and Fiesta court princess (Fig. 2).[9] Anton worked for the State Comptroller before joining the State Health Department, where he advanced to director of the business management division in 1958. The couple raised their young family at the Calle Corvo property, which they sold two years later to a pair of teachers.[10]

Henry and Virginia Wicks (1960–1987)

Henry W. Wicks arrived in Santa Fe in February 1944 from New York City, though the reason for his move remains unclear. He was born in Herkimer, New York, where he

[6] Quitclaim Deed, Jane Farley and Charles Lemuel White to Sarah R. Janney, recorded May 20, 1947, Book 24, Page 301, Instrument # 85380, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[7] U.S. Census Bureau, National Archives at Washington, DC; Washington, D.C.; Seventeenth Census of the United States, 1950; Year: 1950; Census Place: Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Roll: 3578; Page: 68; Enumeration District: 26-5.
[8] Warranty Deed, Sarah H. Janney (aka Ryan) to Waldo Jr. and Ernestine Anton, recorded April 5, 1954, Book 73, Page 451, Instrument # 8117710, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.
[9] "Baca-Anton Pair Engaged," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, November 30, 1952, 13.
[10] Warranty Deed, Waldo Jr. and Ernestine Anton to Henry W. and Virginia Mainz Wicks, recorded December 23, 1960, Book 173, Page 541, Instrument # 245396, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

grew up in a multi-generational household headed by his grandfather, a German immigrant employed in a desk factory.[11] His father, Howard, worked as a fishmonger. According to his wedding announcement. Henry established himself as an accomplished accountant, with experience at DuPont and the Remington Arms Company. He also pursued writing and aspired to become a novelist.

In Santa Fe, Henry married Mabel C. Hart in 1945. Hart, an abstractor, was a founder of the Capital City Business and Professional Women's Club. Henry gained employment at St. Michael's College, where he taught psychology.

After Mabel's death in 1957, Henry remarried, wedding Virginia Lujan Mainz (Fig. 2), a public-school teacher from Las Vegas. Following the sale of the house Henry had owned with Mabel, the couple acquired a residence on Calle Corvo two days before Christmas in 1960. Henry later became director of guidance for Santa Fe County Schools. He published one Southwest-themed novel and contributed three reviews to the *Santa Fe New Mexican* of children's books by Ann Nolan Clark.

Henry W. Wicks died at his Calle Corvo home on April 24, 1978. Virginia remained in residence through the 1980s. In 1987, as her health declined, she was declared a protected person and a conservator was appointed, who subsequently sold the 521 Calle Corvo property.[12] The new owner, Tara Tucker, went before the HDRB in 2001 to build the addition to 521 A. The property has changed hands several times since.

[11] Federal census data and news accounts informed the Wicks' biographical sketch.

[12] Warranty Deed, Lucille Fernandez, Virginia Mainz estate to Pasqual Narod and Tara Tucker, recorded October 22, 1987, Book 594, Page 999, Instrument # 634765, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Evaluation of Historical Status

Erected in 1946–47, the house at 521 Calle Corvo has retained its massing and footprint since at least 1958, as confirmed by an aerial photograph from that year (Fig. 3). Although windows and doors have likely been replaced, the fenestration openings appear to remain in their original dimensions. The front yard wall, while compatible with the Calle Corvo streetscape, was constructed after 1984.

For these reasons, the primary house is recommended to retain Contributing status. The south (front) elevation best expresses the property's modest Territorial Revival character and architectural details. This elevation, including the attached garage, is recommended as the primary façade. The front yard wall, being of more recent construction, is recommended as Non-contributing.

© John W. Murphey / Architectural History Services. All rights reserved. This Historic Cultural Property Inventory form is the intellectual property of the author and is provided for regulatory review purposes only. No reproduction, distribution, or other use is permitted without the author's written consent, except as required by the City of Santa Fe Historic Preservation Division and related governmental review bodies.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Illustrations




Figure 1: Hughes Second Addition, 1938. Floyd Haak. Subject lot highlighted.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 2: The Women of 521 Calle Corvo: Top: Catherine (Cathy) Janney, c. 1930; middle; Ernestina (Ernestine) Baca Anton, 1952; bottom: Virginia Lujan Mainz Wicks, c.1940s.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Figure 3: November 10, 1958, aerial photograph. Shed is present.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 4: September 11, 1978, aerial photograph.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Figure 5: December 12, 1984, HBI survey photograph. Michael Belshaw. Note front yard wall.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**

Survey Photographs

(All images taken by Giulia Caporuscio, September 28, 2025, unless otherwise noted)



Photo 2: House and setting. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 3: 521 A Calle Corvo. Newer building not included in survey. Camera facing southeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 4: South (front) façade, west and center sections. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/** **Waldo and Ernestine Anton/** **Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 5: South (front) façade, center and east sections. Camera facing northeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 6: West elevation. Camera facing northwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 7: North (rear) elevation, east and center sections. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: HCPI No._____ District No._____	***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D	
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/** **Waldo and Ernestine Anton/** **Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 8: North (rear) elevation, center and west sections. Camera facing southwest.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number: Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**



Photo 9: West elevation. Camera facing southeast.

Historic Cultural Properties Inventory (HCPI) Detail Form (FORM 2)

Historic Preservation Division, New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs

For HPD Office use only: ***Please complete HCPI FORM 1 before completing FORM 2*** HCPI No._____ District No._____ ___NRHP ___SRCP Criteria __A __B __C __D		
1. Name of property: **Catherine D. Janney/ Waldo and Ernestine Anton/ Henry and Virginia Wicks House**	**2. Location:** **521 Calle Corvo** **Downtown and Eastside Historic District – Santa Fe**	**3. Local Reference Number:** **Santa Fe ID: H-632** **4. County: Santa Fe** **5. Date of Survey: September 28, 2025**




Photo 10: West elevation. Camera facing northeast.

H632

building threatened? yes | surveyed date 12-12-84 by mb | county Santa Fe | ID no. 05161657

field no. SFHD-6-1657 | number | UTM reference zone 12 13 | easting | northing

location description: 521 Corvo

city/town: Santa Fe


land grant/reservation

building name

legal description: twsp N S range E W sec

ph. roll by mb no. 23 | negative nos. 14 | loc. of neg. MRB

plan shape





date of construction: 1935-45 estimate ____ actual

source: BD

use
present: residential
other:
historic: residential
other:

condition
excellent | X good
fair | deteriorating

degree of remodeling
X minor | moderate | major
describe:

style: Territorial Rev

foundation material: NV

wall material/surface: Adobe Stucco

architectural features
Roof - Shed over porch. Sp. tile. Rafters exp
Elsewhere - Flat - Brick parapet. - Strchr hdr, strchr. 5 mtl flues
Windows - d/h 6/6. Picture. Turquoise trim. Bullnose frame. Under porch - 8 lite csmt, picture 8 lite csmt).
Door - Wd panel
comments: Porch. Corbels + lintel supp by wall. Wrought iron grill.

surroundings: Res

relationship to surroundings
X similar | not similar

district potential
yes | no

significance
eligible | X of interest | none

if eligible, why? contrib. mayoral date

associated buildings? yes
what type?

if inventoried, list ID nos.

see back? yes

H633

building threatened? yes	surveyed date 12-12-84 by mb	county Santa Fe	ID no. 051611658
field map number SFHD-6-1658		UTM reference zone 12 13	easting northing

location description
521½ Curve


city/town
Santa Fe

land grant/reservation

building name

legal description
twsp ___ N S range ___ E W sec ___ ¼ ¼

ph. roll by mb no. 23	negative nos. 15	loc. of neg. HPO	plan shape



date of construction
P ___ estimate ___ actu
source

use
present residential
other
historic residential
other

condition
___ excellent ___ good
___ fair ___ deteriorating

degree of remodeling
___ minor ___ moderate ___ major
describe:

style

foundation material

wall material/surface

architectural features

surroundings
Res

relationship to surroundings
___ similar ___ not similar

district potential
___ yes ___ no

significance
___ eligible ___ of interest ___ none

if eligible, why?

comments

associated buildings? ___ yes
what type?

if inventoried, list ID nos.

see back? ___ yes

To: HPD Staff, City of Santa Fe
Re: 521 Calle Corvo Remodel
February 5, 2026

Dear HPD Staff & to whom it may concern,

Please see the following letter describing our case and application for the remodel of a single family residence on 521 Calle Corvo. The letter is organized as follows:

1. Brief history & context
2. Overall vision
3. Proposed details
4. Exceptions requested

___

Brief history & context:

Full address:	521 Calle Corvo, Santa Fe, NM 87501
District**:**	East Side Historic District
Architectural Style:	Territorial Revival
Status:	Contributing
Primary Facades:	Designated, see board action letter attached

The home was originally part of the 'Hughes Second Subdivision' established in 1940. The home itself was built in 1942. See attached HCPI report by John Murphey for full historic details.

Today, the building features a mixture of new and old windows, conforming and nonconforming - all improvements performed out of permit over the years. Some windows are original divided lite single pane wood windows, others are more recent aluminum and vinyl solutions.

Overall vision:

The goal of the design team and the client is to breathe new life into a beautiful historic structure that the owner couple has purchased in order to live near their children, who plan to marry and have children of their own soon. This will be the owners' full time home, so they are investing a large amount of their retirement savings to make it worthy of the next 30 years of life, and a meaningful contribution to the neighborhood - an area that has benefited from many recent thoughtful remodels.

studio | BOSE
Rajah Bose
212 Lorenzo Ln.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
rajah@studiobose.com
studiobose.com
+1 (505) 310 3737

Proposed details:

The proposed remodel would include:

- a small new addition of heated space (348 SF) to the north west corner of the structure
- reworking some roof and parapet elements to accommodate ceiling height changes. We do not propose to encroach on our height limit of 16'-4", per our staff analysis.
- a complete exterior envelope package, including:
    - new stucco
    - new metal clad wood frame windows, see architectural elevations
    - new TPO or sim. Roof, colors to comply
    - new exterior wood stains
- See color swatches at end of document for reference

**A note on the existing brick coping:* we propose to keep all of the existing brick coping on the primary facades, and to continue it back on the east and west sides as far as possible before the areas of significant addition/remodel begin, where we propose to end the coping and continue with a standard Santa Fe-style stucco parapet detail.

**A note on the window design:* since the windows have been replaced ad-hoc and without a cohesive design approach, it is our goal to unify the exterior appearance of all of the windows, while also improving durability, energy efficiency, and readiness to last another few decades. Though there are larger glass openings on the north, hidden facade, the southern primary facade design fully embodies the design principles of the district and the streetscape. Because we would like to upgrade the window package on a primary facade, we will need to request the following outlined exceptions.

Exceptions requested:

1) *Exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(I) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards: The applicant requests an exception to (I) Windows, Doors, and Other Architectural Features for all facades of significant and landmark structures and for the primary facades of contributing structures : (a) Historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible. Historic windows that cannot be repaired or restored shall be duplicated in the size, style, and material of the original. Thermal double pane glass may be used. (b) No opening shall be widened or narrowed. (c) No new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence. (d) No existing opening shall be closed.*

1. We believe the proposed new window package not only prevents any damage to the district, but actually brings the house into better compliance with the district's design values, most specifically relating to the divided-lite windows. You will see in our proposed elevations that the eastern most window on the south facade, window unit "C" (see elevations), was at some point replaced with a picture window.

2. The hardship inflicted on the client by having to repair all of the existing windows rather than replace them with windows of today's construction & energy standards is multifold.

studio | BOSE
Rajah Bose
212 Lorenzo Ln.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
rajah@studiobose.com
studiobose.com
+1 (505) 310 3737

In the case of this particular house, the first hardship is a tandem issue of energy and finances. The thermal and air infiltration of new windows is substantially better than windows made between 1940-1980, which is the approximate range of units we're dealing with. The notion of repairing the disjointed set of windows on the south facade, just for them to ultimately cost the owner more through energy-loss, is an undue hardship that can be easily avoided. From the perspective of design congruence and the ultimate durability of the whole window system, it would also be silly to replace the rest of the windows, which are permitted to be changed, and not those of the southern facade. Anyone familiar with Santa Fe's climate and strong sun knows that metal clad windows are a standard here due to metal's ability to resist the sun and extreme dryness, especially on southern facades.

3. In terms of design options, the alternative to the proposed full window package would be to somehow repair or replace in-kind the windows that are existing - windows that wouldn't comply with the HPD standards to begin with, like window "C." Rather than play that game, we believe it's the most reasonable option to allow a full new window package, during which previously made design anomalies and compliance issues would be ironed-out in one fell swoop, whilst enhancing the beauty of the streetscape and enabling the owners to inhabit the district comfortably. This will ultimately contribute to the district's longevity (which suffers from many second-home-ers (empty houses), lack of young families, etc.) via their investment and full-time presence.

2) *Exception to 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards: (a) For all façades of significant, contributing and landmark structures , architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced. Replacement of the terracotta portal.*

1. We believe the metal roof and the terra cotta roof share a similar level of importance when it comes to authentically representing the history of NM. While Terra Cotta is a historic material in many parts of the world, it was always used as a superficial material in NM and CA to trigger a Mediterranean look and feel. Truthfully, metal roofs have a much longer history in our region, where they have been regularly used for hundreds of years. Especially studying the history of northern New Mexican architecture, you will find much more metal roofing than terra cotta tiles, probably due to metal's much enhanced durability-to-price ratio. Secondly, in terms of the district's character and the typical material palettes, one can find many instances of territorial brick coping on the parapets, paired with metal awnings over portals, etc. This palette is exactly what we suggest.

2. Terra cotta is unfortunately a very brittle material and susceptible to impact damage as well as freeze-thaw expansion damage. Terra cotta was never meant to be used on roofs where snow loads are expected, though it can endure lots of sunlight. Our terra cotta roof eave detailing is also often not done well, which has led to water damage below on the carrying wood structure. A metal roof would give us the chance to properly flash the assembly, as well as install metal gutters to keep water away from the entry and foundation of the house. It would be an undue hardship on the owner not to be able to

studio | BOSE
Rajah Bose
212 Lorenzo Ln.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
rajah@studiobose.com
studiobose.com
+1 (505) 310 3737

improve the building assembly in this way, especially considering the expense of roof and water damage in the future.


3. Needless to say, the only other option here is to leave the terra cotta roof as it is. While we understand the primary facade nature of the portal, the metal roof seems like a reasonable solution to improving the longevity of the house, maintaining and improving the character of the district, and ensuring the occupants are able to remain in the historic district, contributing to its longevity and quality as a neighborhood. Attempts to modify the terra cotta roof to perform better according to the grievances above also may not result in an architecturally pleasing outcome, which we believe the HPD would not appreciate, and why we suggest it be avoided.

COLOR SWATCHES:

- Stucco color: “**Suede**” by STO



- Door & Window cladding color: “**Dark Bronze**”



studio | BOSE
Rajah Bose
212 Lorenzo Ln.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
rajah@studiobose.com
studiobose.com
+1 (505) 310 3737

- Front door & Garage - paint to color match window cladding above
- Exposed wood stain color: “**Dark Walnut**,” “**Espresso**,” or Sim.



Thank you for your time and review. Please contact us if you have any questions, or if we can provide any additional material or detail.

Sincerely,


Rajah Bose

Principal Architect, studioBOSE

Attachments:

- Architectural drawings
- Photo exhibit of existing home
- HCPI document by historian John Murphey
- Previous Board Action Letter

studio | BOSE
Rajah Bose
212 Lorenzo Ln.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
rajah@studiobose.com
studiobose.com
+1 (505) 310 3737



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

EXISTING SITE PLAN

Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

G-1.0

Scale	1/8" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"



1 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"

0' 15' 30' 60' 120'

TRUE NORTH

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

G-1.1

Scale	1/8" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"



EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
"DESIGNATED PRIMARY FACADES" INDICATED BY ORANGE LINE

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

A-1.1

Scale	
Print Size:	24" X 36"



1 PROPOSED MAIN HOUSE FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

0' 1' 2' 4' 8' 16'

PROJECT NORTH

TRUE NORTH

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN


Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	LZZ

A-1.2


Scale	1/4" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"

EXTERIOR MATERIAL LEGEND

- WOOD/ PAINTED METAL
- STUCCO
- GLASS
- STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF



EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION



1 SOUTH ELEVATION (PRIMARY FACADES)
3/8" = 1'-0"

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION


Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

A-3.1

Scale	As indicated
Print Size:	24" X 36"



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION



1 PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION
3/8" = 1'-0"

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION


Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

A-3.2

Scale	3/8" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"



EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION



1 PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION
3/8" = 1'-0"

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION


Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

A-3.3

Scale	3/8" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"



EXISTING EAST ELEVATION



1 PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION
3/8" = 1'-0"

studio|BOSE
+1 (505) 310 3737
rajahbose@gmail.com
studiobose.com

CALLE CORVO REMODEL

521 & 521A CALLE CORVO
SANTA FE, NM 87501

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

No.	Revision	Date

PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION

Date	2-16-2026
Drawn By	RMB

A-3.4

Scale	3/8" = 1'-0"
Print Size:	24" X 36"

Pinnacle Casement & Awning

Features and Benefits

- The warmth and beauty of Clear Select Pine, Douglas Fir or Natural Alder; can be painted or stained
- Clad units offer a strong, durable extruded aluminum sash and frame for low maintenance; primed units offer the traditional appearance where the trim and exterior sash are cellular PVC
- Glass is replaceable in case of damage
- 2" thick sash adds beauty and increases insulating value
- Exterior tape glazing slows conduction of heat/cold through edge of glass; two beads of silicone ensure a water tight seal that creates three seals between glass and sash
- Single lever, sequential, multi-point lock for sleek look and easy operation



- Adjustable concealed hinge system ensures smooth operation



- 1-1/4" jamb creates unmatched strength and stability
- Silicone-injected frame corners create a stronger and more attractive joint

Sizes

Available in hundreds of standard and custom sizes

Glazing

- Windsor Glazing System provides 3/4" double pane insulated glass; Cardinal® LoE 366 glass standard; tinted, tempered, obscure and laminated glass available
- Glazed with tape and silicone sealant
- Custom and special glass types available
- Preserve protective film optional

Exterior Trim

- Clad windows available with WM 180 brickmould, Williamsburg, or 3-1/2" flat casing; 3/8", 1-1/4", 2-1/4" subsills
- Primed windows available with WM 180 brickmould, WM 180 brickmould with flange, Williamsburg, 3-1/2" flat, 4-1/2" backband, 5-1/2" flat or plantation casing; 2" bull nose sill nose, casement subsill or 2" casement subsill
- All prime window trims, subsills and sill nose are cellular PVC

Grilles

Windsor Divided Lite (WDL) = simulated divided lite

- 7/8" and 1-1/4" Perimeter Grille (NOT available on radius casements)
- 7/8" and 1-1/4" Stick Grille
- 3/4" and 1" Profiled Inner Grille
- 13/16" Flat Inner Grille
- 7/8" and 1-1/4" Ogee WDL
- 5/8", 7/8", 1-1/4" and 2" Tall and Short Putty WDL
- 5/8", 7/8", 1-1/4" and 2" Tall and Short Contemporary WDL
- 2" Simulated Check Rail
- Standard and custom grille patterns available

Finishes

- Interior – Available in Clear Select Pine, Douglas Fir or Natural Alder
  - Primed: white or black
  - Painted: white, black or gray
  - Stained: 9 color options
- Exterior – Clad windows feature heavy-duty extruded aluminum cladding on sash and frame; primed windows offer an assortment of traditional cellular PVC trim options

Clad Colors

All clad colors painted in-house with the highly durable AAMA 2604 standard finish, or upgrade to AAMA 2605 for the most challenging of environments

- 24 Standard Clad Colors available in 2604 and 2605 finish
- 20 Feature Clad Colors available in 2604 and 2605 finish (Custom color matching is also available)
- 7 Matte Clad Colors available in the 2604 finish only

Hardware

Encore folding nesting crank and cover by Truth® available in champagne, white, bronze and black; optional finishes in faux bronze, oil rubbed bronze, satin nickel and bright brass

Performance Ratings

For current performance ratings, visit our website at windsorwindows.com and click on "Professional Information" in the menu bar



TERRA COTTA

COLONIAL RED

REGAL RED *

BURGUNDY *

PATINA GREEN

HEMLOCK GREEN *

HARTFORD GREEN *

EVERGREEN

SLATE BLUE

REGAL BLUE *

SOLAR WHITE

REGAL WHITE

STONE WHITE

SURREY BEIGE

TLG MOONSTONE™ *

TLG CHARCOAL GRAY *

TLG MEDIUM BRONZE *

TLG DARK BRONZE *

TLG BLACK *

CORELINE TEXTURED LOW-GLOSS (TLG) PVDF COLORS









Sheffield Metals International
A MAZZELLA COMPANY

* Available at a slight price premium * Metallic premium * Weathered premium

Oil canning is an aesthetic issue and is an inherent part of light gauge cold formed metal products. By using coil that has been processed properly, designing for thermal movement, following stringent specifications for installation and proper handling most oil canning can be minimized. Oil canning is not grounds for coil/panel rejection.

COOL R® ENERGY EFFICIENT ROOFING METAL

NTM New Tech Machinery A MAZZELLA COMPANY

AIA Continuing Education Provider

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS Coil Coatings

Sherwin-Williams® is a trademark of SWIMC LLC.

MCA METAL CONSTRUCTION ASSOCIATION

Find us in MasterSpec® Powered by Deltek Specpoint®

RIB | SpecLink

SILVER *

COPPER *

CHAMPAGNE *

ACRYLIC-COATED GALVALUME®

See our colors on your roof or wall with our Color Visualizer!

Take a picture of your property and find the perfect color! Scan the QR code above to get started.

SIERRA TAN

SANDSTONE

ASH GRAY

DOVE GRAY

SLATE GRAY

CHARCOAL GRAY

BURNISHED SLATE

MEDIUM BRONZE

MANSARD BROWN

DARK BRONZE

MATTE BLACK

VINTAGE® *

PRE-WEATHERED GALVALUME® *

COR-TEN AZP RAW® *

STOCK AVAILABILITY MATRIX	LEED V4.1	ISR	EMI	3 YR. SRI	SRI	GALVALUME				ALUMINUM				
						22 GA.	24 GA.	24 GA.	24 GA.	.032 NOM.	.032 NOM.	.040 NOM.	.050 NOM.	.063 NOM.
						48.375"	40.375"	44.375"	48.375"	40.500"	48.000"	48.000"	48.000"	48.000"
Acrylic Coated Galvalume®	L	0.67	0.14	N/A	56	●	●		●					
Ash Gray		0.32	0.83	31	31		●		●	●	●	●		
Burgundy		0.31	0.86	29	32		●		●					
Burnished Slate		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
Champagne Metallic		0.32	0.83	31	31		●		●					
Charcoal Gray		0.25	0.83	22	22	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		
Colonial Red		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●	●	●			
Copper Metallic	L	0.35	0.75	32	32		●		●	●	●			
Cor-Ten AZP® Raw		0.32	0.89	N/A	34		●		●					
Dark Bronze		0.25	0.83	22	22	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Dove Gray	L	0.35	0.83	35	35	●	●		●	●	●	●		
Evergreen		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●	●	●	●		
Hartford Green		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●		●	●	●	
Hemlock Green		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
Mansard Brown		0.25	0.83	22	22	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	
Matte Black		0.25	0.83	22	22	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Medium Bronze		0.25	0.83	22	22	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Patina Green		0.32	0.83	31	31		●		●					
Pre-weathered Galvalume®		0.24	0.83	19	21		●		●	●	●			
Regal Blue		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
Regal Red	L	0.35	0.83	35	35		●		●					
Regal White	L	0.65	0.83	77	77	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Sandstone	L	0.35	0.83	35	35		●		●	●	●	●		
Sierra Tan		0.31	0.87	28	31		●		●	●	●	●		
Silver Metallic	L	0.54	0.77	55	60		●		●	●	●	●	●	
Slate Blue		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●	●				
Slate Gray	L	0.35	0.83	35	35	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Solar White	L	0.65	0.83	77	77		●		●	●	●	●	●	●
Stone White	L	0.55	0.83	59	63		●		●	●	●	●		
Surrey Beige	L	0.35	0.75	32	32		●		●	●	●			
Terra Cotta	L	0.35	0.83	35	35		●		●	●	●	●		
TLG Black		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
TLG Charcoal Gray		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
TLG Dark Bronze		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
TLG Medium Bronze		0.25	0.83	22	22		●		●					
TLG Moonstone		0.32	0.83	31	31		●		●					
Vintage®		0.30	0.70	N/A	22		●		●					
Custom Colors						▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

NOTES

- All of Sheffield's CoolR® metal is painted with a .20 mil primer and .70 - .90 mil Top Coat of 70% PVDF resin-based coating. The reverse side has a .20 primer and .30 - .40 backer coating.
- Cor-Ten AZP Raw®, metallic, and textured products are directional.
- For low slope roofing to meet LEED V4.1 requirements, the initial SRI must be ≥ 82 OR the 3-year SRI must be ≥ 64. For steep slope roofing to meet LEED V4.1 requirements, the initial SRI for 75% of the roof must be ≥ 39 OR the 3-year SRI must be ≥ 32.
- Low slope is defined as ≤ 2:12. Steep slope is defined as > 2:12.
- Materials should be stored in a cool, dry place. Materials with PVC film on project sites should be used immediately or stored in a climate-controlled setting. PVC film must be removed prior to installation.
- **Anything not noted in the Availability Matrix can be painted, regardless of width, substrate, or thickness; however, it would be subject to a minimum paint run and would need to meet standard custom order criteria.**

KEY

● = Stocked Item
● = Available from Atlanta location only
▲ = Available on Custom Order Basis
L = LEED V4.1 Compliant
ISR = Initial Solar Reflectance
EM = Emissivity
SRI = Solar Reflectance Index

Colors shown are matched as accurately as possible, but may vary slightly from the finished product. These rich and vibrant colors are produced with PVDF resins, which provide superior color retention and allow Sheffield Metals to offer non-prorated coating warranties for most applications. Touch-up should only be done with a Sheffield Metals color-matched PVDF air-dry paint pen.

Galvalume® is a registered trademark of BIEC International Inc. Coating warranty varies for CoolR® Moonstone, Matte Black, Copper, Champagne, Silver, and Pre-Weathered Galvalume. Please contact your representative for more information. Steelscape's Vintage carries a 20-year Finish Warranty. Vintage is a dynamic finish that changes with the light where batch-to-batch and directional variations can occur. For more information, please visit steelscape.com/vintage.

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - OVERALL

521 CALLE CORVO




EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO




EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING EAST ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO




EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 CALLE CORVO



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION - MAIN HOUSE

521 A CALLE CORVO



EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION - ADU

521 A CALLE CORVO



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION - ADU

521 A CALLE CORVO



EXISTING WEST ELEVATION - ADU

521 A CALLE CORVO



EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - ADU

521 A CALLE CORVO



EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION - ADU