



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
August 12, 2025, at 5:30 PM
Council Chambers, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue**

Meeting Minutes

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3pWCdknedI>

Call to Order

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

1. Roll Call

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present

Mr. John Bienvenu, Acting Chair
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid
Ms. Madelein Aguilar Medrano
Ms. Amanda Mather
Ms. Mary Ellen Degnan

Members Absent

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair (excused)
Mr. Scott Cherry (excused)

Others Present

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

Director Lamboy stated that item 9(h) 2025-010871-HDRB, 439 Camino del Monte Sol, has been postponed to August 26, 2025, and item 9(j) 2025-010895-HDRB, 1379 Cerro Gordo Road, has been withdrawn.

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

3. Approval of Minutes

a. July 8, 2025

Acting Chair Bienvenu requested that on page 12, in the third paragraph and the first line, delete "didn't" so that the sentence reads "Member Bienvenu stated that he believes that the board preferred not to design a new bridge;".

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

b. July 22, 2025

The minutes for July 22, 2025, were available in the packet but were not listed on the agenda. Therefore, they will be reviewed and voted on in the next hearing, on August 26, 2025.

4. Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

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

5. Matters from the Public

Elizabeth West provided a packet for the soldiers' monument to the members who were not present at the previous hearing, with an updated cover letter and additional information. She requested the Board to review the status of the monument at the next hearing. She stated that the historic district's code supports the process of the request from the HDRB. She noted three main items: one is the city register exists as the historic building status map; two, the soldier's monument on the Santa Fe Plaza has no historic status from the HDRB, and three, the HDRB has legal authority to designate historic status for the soldier's monument on the city register.

Stefanie Beninato expressed disappointment with the technical issues and no availability on Zoom. She was unsure if it was even available on YouTube. She felt the issues should have been addressed earlier since it had taken weeks. She also shared her lack of confidence in the staff based on the governing body appeal case. She stated that the Land Use Director misrepresented what an institution was by representing the Girl's Club as an institution. Institutions are clearly defined in the code as government buildings, educational buildings, museums, and hospitals, not clinics. So, Girls, Inc. does not fall into any of those categories. She stated that it becomes difficult to want to trust staff if

they don't even know what the law actually says and then misrepresent it to either the board or the council. She added that, in terms of the soldier's monument or the obelisk, there is a definition of "object" in the city code that says that monuments are not included. They define it as something small, which obviously the obelisk is not, but it's also nonconforming at this point. The code requires that a non-conforming item cannot be replaced or repaired. They can only be removed. She said these are two major issues that need to be considered before bringing this request from Miss West to the board for public discussion.

Richard Martinez mentioned that this board still does not have an architect sitting on the board. His understanding is that there have been two nominations sent to the mayor, which is what was believed to be the request. He felt the staff should not be part of the decision. These are positions appointed by the mayor, and they represent the wider community in Santa Fe. He pointed out that an architect means registered with the state, not someone who calls themselves an architect. He said it was important to remind the Board that there is no architect on the Board. Secondly, he offered to share photos of the obelisk and plaza prior to the destruction and even prior to the obelisk being located on the plaza. He stated that it is possible to have a plaza that's person-centered, not object-centered. Where a person can occupy the center of the plaza rather than having an object in the center of the plaza. He thought perhaps the obelisk no longer represents the community and who they are now.

6. Staff Communications

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

Director Lamboy stated that per section 14-5.2(M), state capitol outlay projects require the state to present a feedback case. The Museum of New Mexico is a division of the state. Therefore, the standards that apply in subsection M require that the state present the project to the board for feedback, and if there are any concerns regarding the design, then there would be a subcommittee that would be appointed by the board to work with the state. This is step one, and the applicant is present to provide an overview of the project and get feedback. If there are any major concerns we can set for with the next step. No materials were provided in the packet, just a rendering. Ms. Lamboy then introduced Mr. Philip Weddle for his presentation.

Philip Weddle, 6916 East Fifth Street, Scottsdale, Arizona, was sworn in. Mr. Weddle introduced the team on the project, including Michelle Roberts, Deputy Secretary for DCA, David Young, Executive Director for the Santa Fe Botanical Garden, and Kenneth Francis from Surrounding Studio, Principal Landscape Architect. He presented the concept for the Santa Fe Botanical Garden for the Gateway Pavilion and the Children's Discovery Garden on 1.2 acres on the southern edge of the Botanical Garden. The goal is to develop a passive and active experiential learning space for children. The gateway pavilion functions as a portal into the children's discovery garden and provides restroom facilities to support programs in that area.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked how much is visible from Camino Lejo.

Mr. Weddle stated that primarily, just the eastern elevation is visible from Camino Lejo. The north and south elevations are oriented towards the garden and towards the neighboring property, and then the west elevation is oriented towards the central garden.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if there were photos of the existing structures in the botanical garden that they were trying to harmonize with.

Mr. Weddle showed images and defined what each building was used for. This included the moss rock walls part of the orchard garden, Milner Plaza across the street from the botanical garden, Museum Hill, and stucco from the botanical garden on the rival gateway at the existing garden, the ramadas from the botanical garden orchard garden, and one from

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked Director Lamboy what the process was for the approvals for initial buildings.

Director Lamboy stated she would need to research the history of that process.

Michelle Geller Roberts, 12 Sierra Dawn, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Ms. Roberts stated that the statute was passed in 2021, and the buildings predate the statute, so the existing structures were not subject to HDRB approval.

Acting Chair Bienvenu felt that confused matters because this area has been in the district and under the review of the HDRB since 1983. He shared that while projects in this district typically get staff approvals, it would seem that the gardens would have gotten some form of approval for their existing structures.

Ms. Roberts shared that the land is partially state and partially city property, and until the 2001 statute, the state was not required to go through this process for approval for buildings on state property.

Director Lamboy clarified that section 14-5.2(M) was adopted in 2009. Since this is in the Historic Review District, most cases are managed administratively, except statused properties or exception requests. An exception would be required for the materials and design of the project, which is why this is being presented.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that the HDRB is reluctant to permit weathered steel structures in the historic districts. Though there have been some exceptions, particularly in this district. But it is the concern of the board and staff, as Director Lamboy mentioned, that it would need an exception under our interpretation of the code. He also stated that the percentage of the stone base or foundation on the structures is compared to the stucco would be an exception in the district. He then asked where the applicant perceived themselves to be in the process set forth for capital outlay projects, specifically, if they were at the stage before commencing with the design phase, when the applicant or the state is to consult with the board, or after that.

Mr. Weddle felt that the applicant was at the stage before the design phase, and they would need to have a public meeting with the design proposal. Though they were uncertain if the Museum had already held any public engagement meetings.

Director Lamboy confirmed that both public engagement and HDRB hearings were still needed.

Member Degnan pointed out that the photo makes the stone, along with the stucco, appear to be orange in color and asked if that was accurate.

Mr. Weddle stated that the stones in question are indeed orange and are located at the property across the street.

Member Biedscheid asked if the case were coming before the board, what exceptions would be required. She felt there would be one for the material, specifically the steel, and one for the percentage of rock to stucco, but she questioned the design of the windows and whether there was a code exception for them.

Director Lamboy stated the windows themselves do not violate code, the two exceptions staff would identify are the roof form and the wall-dominated. She pointed out that there is more flexibility in the historic review district than in other districts. So, being wall-dominated, the overall appearance and context of Spanish Pueblo revival design are exceptions.

Member Biedscheid appreciated that the building is oriented the way it is because it minimizes the profile of the butterfly roof that is publicly visible from the east,

which is something that is not in keeping with the design standards. However, where the botanical garden's mission includes guidance for sustainable gardening and which is a feature that would be important to the mission of the building, she did not have an issue with it due to its orientation. She pointed out that it also screens the solar array.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that this was a very preliminary review, it's very difficult, and he didn't think that it is completely helpful to be looking or to give much in the way of feedback to designs that are being seen for the first time at the hearing. Especially without any context of visiting the site or having the information in the packet to review ahead of the hearing. He stated the structure would not fit most of the design standards for the district, although it is an attractive design in the right location, and it would need several exceptions to be approved. From his perspective, it should be scaled back to be at least somewhat more traditional in form, even though it's not completely visible from the street. This is because the ordinance is written for a reason, and it's important to enforce it as written. He asked the applicant to defer to staff to work on what the next steps would be under the ordinance and asked if a committee should be appointed to work with the applicant, as he thought it might be helpful with staff and a subcommittee of the board to engage with the museum to determine the best path forward, and then report back to the board.

Board members Mather and Degnan volunteered to work with staff and the applicant for new design approval.

Public Comment:

Jerry Richardson (address inaudible) was sworn in. Mr. Richardson is a long-standing member of the Board for the Botanical Garden. He stated the botanical garden, which has approved these plans, has worked with the state in this process for quite a while and while he understands the concerns, the whole region of Museum Hill should be considered because the gardens are right across Camino Lejo from the folk art museum which is a mid-century modern building designed by John Gaw Meem and it does not fit the design guidelines in the code, and Pueblo Revival would not fit any of the other buildings in the garden. The gardens are looking to have something that's architecturally cohesive and fairly well screened from the neighbors and the street, and the exceptions should be granted.

Stefanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was sworn in. Ms. Beninato recognized that there are other steel roofs in the botanical gardens, but found it ironic that a botanical garden uses steel as opposed to natural materials or roofing. While she understood it was longer lasting, it was still ironic. She stated this particular design seems much bigger than as described. So, visually, it has more of an impact and shows more

mass because the bathrooms are to the east, and the one window doesn't seem to fit the design. It feels like there needs to be either more windows, something, or maybe reverse it so that the mural is on the east side and the bathrooms are on the west side, which is on the interior facing into the garden as opposed to exterior.

- b. Attorney Ruybalid announced that the Governing Body at the appeal hearing for 2024-009478-HDRB for 614 Paseo de Peralta upheld the decision of the HDRB from the December 10, 2024, hearing. The appeal hearing was heard on July 30, 2025, and the Governing Body voted eight to one to uphold the HDRB's denial for approval of the non-conforming 5'8" coyote fence.

7. Old Business

- a. **2025-010698-HDRB, 222 Polaco St.,** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Gayla Bechtol, agent for Lee Kirch, owner, requests to install a coyote fence to a height of 6'-0" where the maximum allowable is 4'-7". Exception is requested to 14-5.2(D)(9)(a)(ii)(B).

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation, pointing out that this is the new design after the 6'0" high coyote was rejected by the HDRB, and this is now designed as a 4'7" high yard wall with a 5'0" high pedestrian gate of steel frame with wood panels and a vehicular gate at 4'7" in height. Staff recommended approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(I) Westside-Guadalupe Design Standards.

Acting Chair Bienvenu noted the design of the gate is not fenestrated and asked if staff had discussed this with the applicant.

Ms. Romero stated that due to the height of the gate, fenestration was not requested by the staff.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked what the proposed height was and if it was solid wood or planks for the gates.

Ms. Romero stated it is 5'0" for the pedestrian gate and 4'7" for the vehicle gate, and that she understood it to be a solid wood panel for the gates.

Gayla Bechtol, 320 Aztec Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She stated the gate is panelized, but she was unclear about what was meant by fenestration.

Acting Chair Bienvenu explained that there is a guideline that requests fenestration of some kind, not solid gates. He read into the record "a fenestration of gates shall always be encouraged." By that, the board has always understood that to mean some kind of

openings in the gate.

Ms. Bechtol stated that at 4'7" for the vehicle and 5' for the over 5' pedestrian gate, they can each be seen over.

Acting Chair Bienvenu explained that the word fenestration as used in the guidance was to have openings in the gate as opposed to a solid gate, and it doesn't really speak to whether that depends on the dimensions of the gate.

Ms. Bechtol stated the plan for the gate is a solid wood panel on steel for longevity purposes.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated that it was hard to see elevation online, but now that she can see it on the monitor, she noted the gate is a solid panel three feet six inches wide with three panels and then an opening, and then three panels for a total width of seven feet. So, though it is not fenestrated, it is at least visually interesting. There is a break in the gate itself halfway, with a bar with a difference between the framing and the actual material in the gate, so she felt it had a sense of a break and that it should be approved.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010698-HDRB, at 222 Polaco Street, to approve the application as submitted and recommended by staff. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

8. New Business

- a. **2025-010763-HDRB, 515 Paseo de Peralta**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, significant, Rebecca Wood, agent for Georges & Tina Feghali, owners, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure, yard walls, and outbuildings.

Amanda Romero presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the residential structure be maintained as significant, the shed to be designated as significant, the garage to be designated as contributing with the south and east (G2 and G3) as primary and the north retaining wall, south retaining wall, and the upper southeast retaining wall to all be designated as contributing per section 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that there was a bit of confusion with the last hearing because there was the impression that this was a contributing building and needed to know if it was an upgrade to significant. It appears that, in fact, it already has a significant

designation, as just indicated. He also asked about the current status of the shed and garage.

Ms. Romero confirmed that the main residence is significant and the shed is not currently status, and the recommendation is significant for the reasons in the report. The garage is also unstatused and is recommended as contributing along with the retaining walls, and the recommendation for the walls is also contributing.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if the addition on the west elevation was non-historic.

Ms. Romero shared a façade map and pointed out that facade 16 was the 1970s addition.

Acting Chair Bienvenu appreciated the thorough report but pointed out that the packet included a report on the condition of the structures. He stated that it is not necessary for statusing because the Board does not consider the condition for status.

Director Lamboy concurred that the conditions should not be considered for status.

Member Biedscheid asked for clarification on which portion was the non-historic addition.

Rebecca Wood, 909 Rio Vistas, and the contractor at 924 Shoofly Street, were sworn in. Ms. Wood stated that the intent in working with the clients is to preserve the original structure while remodeling in a way that honors the original structure of the building. She felt this was an incredible opportunity, and they looked forward to working on this important historic endeavor.

Acting Chair Bienvenu confirmed that the hearing was being recorded for viewing.

George Feghali, owner, was sworn in. Mr. Feghali explained that he and his wife have lived in the area for some time and truly admire this home and its spectacular view from Paseo de Peralta. He said they are looking forward to making this their new home. They chose the district because of the way it appears, and they are looking to preserve the appearance of the home.

Ms. Wood shared photos for context and history of the site and explained that the request was to determine the historical significance of these separate structures and determine how to best celebrate the significance of the original brick house. After her summary of the property, she reiterated that the primary goal of the project will be to restore and celebrate the unique original brick house. The additions and outbuildings added later may be old, but their character is so distinct that they detract from the historic integrity of the original house. And in several cases, they are too degraded to occupy safely. Based on this research and analysis, they propose that the original brick house be designated significant and the distinct outbuildings and additions be designated non-contributing.

Brandon Gable, 10002 Calle Largo, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He introduced himself as the son of the prior owner. He stated his grandmother owned the property in the 1930s, and it has been owned by his family until recently. He was amazed at the research on the property. He said that the decision to sell to the Feghalis was due to the overwhelming deferred maintenance, and he felt that they would be good stewards of the property. He felt the addition could have been added during the 1950s housing crisis post-war, but he was not sure; it was built of cinder block to enlarge unit one. He said the outbuildings are not in good condition, and the shed has not been used for some time. The garages are not well-built, and water does not drain well.

Ms. Wood stated that they felt the south wall was contributing, if not significantly, but the others were non-contributing due to their low height and lack of public visibility.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated this is a beautiful building, and it definitely should be considered significant. The other structures, including the additions that may have been used as part of the building, are distinct. They are historic, and while people keep saying that they weren't part of the original, they are all historic, especially if the small one by the shed was put on in maybe the 1950s. While they may not be significant, they are historic. The main house should be designated as significant; the additions on the back of the house are a different stucco, and it's very distinct. It has that red line around it in the photograph that should be contributing, and the shed should be non-contributing. The rock walls should all be contributing; whether they're low or high, they're a part of the property, and they should be preserved.

Acting Chair Bienvenu reminded the board that they will be designating status for the main residence, shed, garage, and three retaining walls.

Member Aguilar Medrano questioned the staff whether a part of a building can be contributing if it is designated as significant.

Ms. Romero explained that it can be designated as significant and exclude sections or features.

Director Lamboy requested that the board make four motions to make the actions clear for the applicant.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010763-HDRB at 515 Paseo de Peralta to retain the significant status of the main residence, excluding the northwest addition (facades 16, 1, and 2) and excluding the garage addition on the northeast elevation (facades 4, 5, and 6). Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010763-HDRB at 515 Paseo de Peralta to designate the shed as non-contributing, noting it does not meet a high level of integrity. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with Members Biedscheid, Degnan, and Mather voting for and Member Aguilar Medrano against.

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010763-HDRB at 515 Paseo de Peralta to designate the garage as non-contributing because the building lacks integrity. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010763-HDRB at 515 Paseo de Peralta to designate the south retaining wall, including the entry steps, as contributing and the other retaining walls as non-contributing since they are part of the landscaping. Member Degnan seconded.

Member Biedscheid asked if the wall could be significant.

Director Lamboy stated that usually the walls are listed as contributing, but if the board would like, they can designate them significant.

Member Biedscheid amended the motion to designate the south retaining wall, including the entry steps, as significant.

The amendment was accepted.

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

- c. **2025-010764-HDRB, 438 Apodaca Hill, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, non- contributing.** Jeffrey Seres, agent for Chuck Williams and Lee Lewin, owners, requests to construct a 260 sq. ft. free-standing carport to a height of 11'-6", where the maximum allowable is 13'-9".

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

Member Aguilar Medrano asked if the carport on the site would match the existing shed color.

Ms. Romero stated they would be similar but not identical.

Member Augilar Medrano asked if the date of construction was known for the shed.

Ms. Romero said it was unknown.

Jeff Seres, 122 Lorenzo Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Mr. Seres had no comments but was available for questions.

Public Comment:

There were no public comments offered.

Board Action:

Member Degnan moved in case 2025-010764-HDRB, at 438 Apodaca Hill, to approve the application as submitted. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- c. **2025-010493-HDRB, 626 Canyon Rd.**, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, contributing, Richard Martinez, agent for Santa Elena Properties LLC, owner, requests to construct a 290 sq. ft. addition to a height of 12'-0" where the maximum allowable is 14'-9", reconfigure the existing pergola to 175.5 sq. ft. to a height of 9'-9".

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

Ms. Romero pointed out to the Board that the west elevation in the packet is mislabeled and is actually the east elevation.

Richard Martinez, P.O. Box 925, Santa Fe, was sworn in. The owner could not be here tonight, so read a typed message from Ross Boyd, owner, into the record: *"I would like to begin by sharing how excited we are about the opportunity to be a part of the Canyon Road community. We have made new friends on every side of the house. Whether it's Estefan Rios, who owns the Desert Moss Vintage Store behind us, and who looks after our house when we're gone, or Stu Dixon at the Canyon Cafe across the street. We enjoy being able to take walks in the peaceful courtyard or sit on the front patio on Canyon Road, just to name a few things. While we recognize the importance of preserving the exterior integrity of the house as much as possible, and its unique history. Brooke has made friends with Mr. B's heirs, who have recently visited the house. We have lots of family friends who love to come visit. They all have small children. So, with Richard's help, this bathroom and living room addition will really help us when entertaining family and friends. As it currently stands, we have a second bathroom only for guests and one guest room, and it does get crowded with the parents and children being on top of one another for showering, etc. Having stated the above, Brooke and I kindly ask for the historic board's cooperation so we can continue to enjoy what we feel is one of the most unique and special places anywhere for many years to come."*

Historic Districts Review Board

August 12, 2025

Page 12 of 28

Mr. Martinez offered that the plan is to construct a 290 sq. ft. addition to enlarge the living room, adding a bathroom and a closet to one of the guest rooms. The additions will be in the courtyard away from Canyon Road and are not publicly visible. They also plan to rehang the existing front door with the hinges so it will open into the pergola off the kitchen. He added that there is a post in an awkward location, so there is a need to redesign the pergola.

Public Comment:

There were no public comments offered.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2025-010493-HDRB, at 626 Canyon Road, to approve the application as submitted. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- d. **2025-010693-HDRB, 516 & 516 1/2 Alto St., Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, contributing, Mark Naktin, agent for Steve Dayton, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure and garage.**

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the main residential structure be maintained as contributing and the north elevation be designated as primary identified in the Proposed Façade Diagram as numbers one and two and the stand-alone garage retain it's contributing status with the east elevation designated as primary identified in the Proposed Façade Diagram as number 1, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

****It is noted that the staff report shows the case number as 2025-010869-HDRB, where the agenda shows 2025-010693-HDRB.**

Member Biedscheid asked if the carport was part of façade one.

Mr. Duran stated the carport is not recommended as part of façade one.

Marc Naktin, 1523 Taos Street, was sworn in. Mr. Naktin agreed with the staff's recommendation regarding the primaries but pointed out that there have been significant alterations since the 1990s.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated she was happy that no one was recommending downgrading the property; however, the east façade should be

considered for a primary façade because it is more character-defining than either of the two north facades.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010693-HDRB at 516 and 516 ½ Alto Street to retain the main residence as contributing with the north (facades 1 and 2) as primary and designate the garage as contributing with the east facade designated as primary, excluding the carport, noting the garage doors are character-defining. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded with a friendly amendment that on the primary residence, the non-historic windows and doors be excluded. The amendment was accepted. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- e. **2025-010695-HDRB, 549 ½ Agua Fria St.,** Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Non-contributing, Robert Kreger, agent for Cathrine Wynne, owner, requests a historic status review with primary facade(s) designation, if applicable, for a residential structure.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the structure be upgraded to contributing and designate the south elevation as the primary façade, identified as number one on the Proposed Façade Diagram, exclusive of non-historic windows, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

** It is noted that the staff report shows case number as 2025-010870-HDRB for the status, and both cases 2025-010695-HDRB and 2025-010945-HDRB as the remodel.

It was noticed that the agenda and the staff report had different case numbers for both this case and the previous case.

Attorney Ruybalid stated that the number being incorrect does not affect whether the address and description of work were the same.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked which case number should be used.

Attorney Ruybalid stated it was the staff's choice.

Mr. Duran stated he would prefer the number on the staff report be used.

Robert Kreger, 3068 Plaza Blanca, was sworn in. Mr. Kreger stated that he and the clients agreed with the staff report.

Catherine, Wynne, (inaudible), was sworn in. Ms. Wynne agreed with the staff report, and she has enjoyed learning about the building.

Public Comment:

There were no public comments offered.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010695-HDRB, at 549 ½ Agua Fria to designate the residence as contributing with the south as the primary, excluding the non-historic windows, and designate the non-historic yard walls as non-contributing. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- f. **2025-010839-HDRB, 433 Calle La Paz, Downtown & Eastside Historic District,** contributing, Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for John C. Gregory and Pamela S Austin Revocable Trusts, owners, requests primary façade designation of the main residence, a historic status review with primary façade designation, if applicable, for a casita and a garage structure.

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the main residential structure be maintained as contributing with the north façade (R1), which retains the original and design designated as the primary facade, the garage be designated as contributing with the west (G4) as the primary façade and the guest house and yard walls be designated as non-contributing due to their age per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked staff to address the west facade of the primary residence, as it was indicated that the south and the east were mentioned as not being primary in the past, which implies that both the north and the west have been considered primary. Secondly, that west elevation was noted by the HCPI as the oldest portion of the house, and it's quite visible from the street. It's by far the most visible portion of the house from the street, and it seems to retain at least one, if not two, historic windows. He asked if there was any reason why the west was not recommended to be primary as well, or would staff agree that that could also be considered primary?

Ms. McCulley stated that the 2001 case did not actually mention either the north or the west facades at all. So, there was no indication which was considered primary or if both were, and in discussing it on site with Mr. Martinez, we both agreed that it's very possible that both were intended to be primary, but we were unsure.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked why staff wouldn't recommend the west, the very prominent west facade that's the oldest portion of the house, and seems to have been considered primary in the past to retain it or to be designated formally tonight as also primary.

Ms. McCulley stated it was an attempt to limit the number of primary facades.

Richard Martinez, previously sworn in, agreed with the recommendations of the staff and felt the reason staff only recommended the north elevation, not the west elevation, is because John Murphy in the historic report stated that the primary house is designated as a contributing structure and the most important facade is the front north facing elevation which been the least affected by additions and clearly communicates the building's original and historic character. Character-defining features of this facade include its original horizontal massing, window openings that contain older two-over-one wood sash windows, and the brick cornice, or perhaps because that is where the front door is, and it is character-defining the house, and that's the reason why John Murphy recommended only that facade as being the primary facade for the main house.

Mr. Martinez stated that there are non-contributing elements of that facade that should not be included in the designation of the primary. This included the portal in front of the house, which is a different style from the house and was possibly added later. The wood columns and the beams on the portal have been painted, and the paint possibly hides damage to the wooden elements there. He said he may want to replace those because restoration may not be possible. He said he noticed that the recommended elevations for the primary facade did not include this portal. So, he wanted to make sure that the portal is not included in that primary facade designation. Also, the window that is next to the door is non-historic according to the window report from Ra Patterson, is it is not. The plan may be to open this window up to being larger to match the historic windows on the facade, so since it is not historic, it should be excluded as well, because it is a blemish on the beautiful facade. He said it's too bad that the primary facade designation precludes the idea of expanding the portal to be symmetrical with the house, since the portal is only two-thirds of the length of the house behind it. He also pointed out that the facade that is recommended as primary by the staff includes a small eastern portion, which is an addition for a bathroom, which does not have the same details as the main portion of the facade. If that is designated as primary, he will not be able to do any addition or work within ten feet of that facade. That would affect a portal or other changes for the back area of the house, off the kitchen. So, he wanted this to be excluded from the primary as well. He agreed with the staff recommendation for the yard walls and the guest house.

Director Lamboy pointed out that while at the site visit earlier in the day, there is a window replacement on the south elevation closest to Calle La Paz that is recent, which was not approved, and the window approved in 2001 had a different mutton pattern than what has been replaced. There is still disturbed stucco around the window. The problem with illegal window replacement is that there are also building code standards that apply and have to do with fire rating. Because this property is not five feet stepped back from the property line. She shared this to alert Mr. Martinez that this issue will come up when a building permit is being sought. She also stated that the applicant should not talk about what is being planned as a basis for designating primary facades, but rather whether the finishes or features are historic.

Mr. Martinez stated he understood about the window replacement, though it was done before the current owner.

Member Degnan asked if the comments about the recommended primary facade and Mr. Martinez's professional approaches to addressing, for example, the portal that is not expanding across the front of the building, if changes like that alter the facade that the board is investigating.

Director Lamboy stated that it would alter the primary façade significantly if there was no proof that there was a portal there that was much longer.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated he understood the comments from the applicants' representative to be directed at excluding certain features because they were not character-defining or non-historic from the facade designations. He also stated that it seems there was a request to exclude a lot for the only facade that's recommended as primary. This is why the importance of the west street-facing façade, on page eight of Mr. Murphy's report, states that the west elevation holds the oldest portion of the house, and it looks like some historic windows that would not be protected if it were not a primary façade. It seems to be extremely important to protect both facades.

Mr. Martinez stated that his recommendation for exclusions does not mention any of what the historian mentions as the character-defining elements of that facade, like the coping, windows, door, or things like that.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated was happy that Director Lamboy brought up talking about what remodel items are desired because, as a professional architect who has appeared in front of this board numerous times, Mr. Martinez should know that he shouldn't be talking about what he wants to do. She supported the idea not only of having both the garage and the main houses contributing to the facades recommended as primary, but also included the street-facing façade that is said to be the oldest part with original windows. She felt it was important that it was publicly visible and important to be preserved. She did not feel it should include the portal, but felt the board could be very clear that it is excluding the portal as part of that primary facade.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010839-HDRB, at 433 Calle La Paz to retain the main residence as contributing with the north façade as primary excluding the portal which appears to be new based on the HCPI that refers to non-weathered wood and a new flooring and decking, excluding the side lite which per the HCPI is likely to not be original, and excluding the eastern addition with no brick coping, and to designate the garage as contributing with the west as primary, and the casita and yard walls as non-

contributing. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- g. 2025-010840-HDRB, 815 E. Alameda St. Unit 8, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, William Kleinschmidt, agent for Nancy Abruzzo Holdings LLC, owner, proposes to construct yard walls with pedestrian gates to the maximum allowable height of 4'-6".**

Lani McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the application as it complies with 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

Member Biedscheid questioned if, when staff writes an administrative approval for a 4'0" high or less wall, there is a required break in that length.

Director Lamboy stated that it is a zoning standard in terms of the breaks and the changes that apply throughout the city, regardless of height.

Member Biedscheid asked with respect to the coyote circular fence it went behind the tree or in front of the tree, along the street.

Ms. McCulley stated that it is behind the tree, so that the tree is on the side of the street.

Member Aguilar Medrano asked if the steel planters from the previous application were redesigned and part of this application.

Ms. McCulley stated the planters were denied at the last hearing, and the applicants have chosen not to build them.

William Kleinschmidt, 1919 5th Street, Suite D, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He had nothing further to add but was available for questions.

Member Biedscheid questioned whether the pedestrian gate was planned as a wood plank gate or a coyote fence gate.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated that it was planned to be a wooden plank gate.

Member Biedscheid confirmed that there is a mix of elements, including stucco, coyote fencing, and a wood plank gate.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated she was correct, and the coyote fence that goes around the fruit tree already exists, but three elements are incorrect.

Member Beidscheid asked if the applicant had given consideration to having the pedestrian gate match the existing coyote fence because there are a lot of elements along Alameda, and the compound already has several colors and styles, so it is not very cohesive, and this may add to the disparity of elements on the street. It seems two elements, the coyote fence, and stucco, should be considered rather than the third element of the planks.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated that they had not considered that, but if it is an issue, it should be noted that the coyote fence is hidden behind the trunk of the tree, so the predominant elements that will be visible are the stucco and the gate.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated she had similar thoughts about the materials and their overall design of the wall since this is a compound. Right now, the wall is bookended by more territorial-inspired squared-off corners with a brick coping, and then the inside of the wall goes towards a more curved radius similar to what this house would be. As the walls are now, they are trying to reflect the houses that stand behind them. But looking at this as a streetscape and the fact that it's a compound, this wall really should read as one uniform entrance into the compound. There's an opportunity to improve that and make that happen. For example, one thought would be that on either side of the proposed gate, the two pilasters with brick coping should match the rest of the wall by extending the brick coping along the whole front of the wall as it appears on either end. The light fixtures should be consistent because there are already light fixtures on one end of the wall. Having two different fixtures just highlights that these are different residences rather than one unified compound containing different units. The wall is currently broken up into a couple of different colors, and it should be made into one cohesive color with this renovation.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated that, going back to the original development plan for the Sangria Compound in the early 2000s, it was intended to have distinct looks. So that's why there is the Territorial style on the two sides and then a more Pueblo Revival style in the center part of it. The applicant is trying to adhere to that original approved development plan, having the wall match the house, which is going to be Pueblo Revival, not Territorial. The property owner likes the idea of having a different look in front of each of the structures, and that is their reasoning for doing the design this way.

Member Biedscheid stated she appreciated Member Aguilar Madrano's comments. She agreed with that assessment, and it does change the streetscape, although she understood what the applicant was saying about matching the houses behind it, but for a compound and for this particular stretch, which is fairly close to another compound, it distracts more than it adds to the feeling of a consistent streetscape.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated she was very disappointed to see that the apple tree is getting removed, which is an older tree, and it is a pretty significant apple tree with a trunk, you know, of about a foot in diameter. While it is being replaced, it is going to get replaced

with a tree that's probably an inch and a half in diameter. She wished that there was a way, and perhaps the applicant would still be open to it, to save that apple tree by redesigning the home. Along East Alameda, the area already has such an open feeling compared to other parts of Alameda, and removing the apple tree is going to exacerbate that.

Mr. Kleinschmidt stated that the apple tree will be replaced with a baby fruit tree that will grow, and there was discussion around decreasing the footprint of the house, but it was decided against, and the applicant would prefer to replace the tree.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated that she would prefer if this board had purview over trees because they are historic and contribute significantly to the east side. She pointed out that it will take many, many decades for a tree to get back to the size of the one that's there now. So, if there's any chance the applicant would reconsider, I think it would be greatly beneficial to the streetscape.

Director Lamboy added that the city does have an ordinance relating to significant trees, and for significant trees in the city, the requirement is that for each inch of caliber lost, there must be a replacement. The tree would be evaluated, and the applicant may be required to plant more than one to replace it, based on that calculation.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, was sworn in. She was pleased that the applicant returned with a new design and that the board was working with the applicant on the design. She said she is proud to be a part of a town where this is possible. Regarding the tree, she stated that it would be nice if the applicant could find a creative solution to save the mature tree.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated that she appreciated that the applicant came back and made significant changes, and the comment about the gate being similar to the coyote fencing rather than an excess of material types. She agreed with Member Aguilar Madrano's suggestions and comments to make it more uniform because while the intention of the owner and the architect is understood, there are different considerations in terms of a streetscape and in a compound. She also felt that there may be more than one replacement tree required, which could encourage the design to save the mature tree.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2025-010840-HDRB, at 815 East Alameda Street Unit 8 to approve the 4'6" height of the wall with the condition that the full segment of wall from one entrance drive to the next have a single consistent stucco color, the light fixtures be consistent whether that be installing new lights along the entire length or matching the existing fixtures, that the pattern of pilasters with brick coping is repeated and used as a way to define points such as the pedestrian gate, that the brick coping be

Historic Districts Review Board

August 12, 2025

Page 20 of 28

used along the full extent of the wall to match either end that already exists there, and that the radius be consistent on the stucco and that the pedestrian gates be constructed with latillas to match the stucco fence rather than panels and revised plans be submitted to staff for approval. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- h. 2025-010872-HDRB, 836 Don Cubero Ave., Don Gaspar Area Historic District, Contributing, Daniel Strongwater, agent for Anthony Cao, owner, requests status review with primary façade designation(s) if applicable.**

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended the historic status of the main structure and detached guesthouse be maintained as contributing to the east facades, designated as primary, as indicated as number one on the Proposed Façade Diagram, and the yard wall be designated as contributing, per 14-5.2(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Daniel Strongwater (Inaudible) was sworn in. Mr. Strongwater stated that it should have been obvious on the field trip that a major renovation happened in the early 2000s, and it went through the historic process, so there is some documentation on the structure, but there is not a lot from the current owners. Hopefully, there is sufficient information to decide. A major portion of the house, the front of the house on the east facade, does remain largely intact. The guest house in the back is proposed as the primary façade; however, it has had full window and door replacement on that façade during the early 2000s renovation. They are plate windows and doors with no light divisions in them. The facade appears substantially revised, though the shape and dimensions remained the same, so it is questionable if that façade is worthy of a primary facade designation. Also, the portal over the door has been rebuilt.

Public Comment:

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, stated that she felt that what's now the guest unit was probably a garage to begin with. It's very common in that area to have the garage set back like that, and the fact that it's at a zero lot line sort of indicates that that would be the historic pattern. The façade could still be designated as a primary, excluding the non-historic windows and doors, since the openings are historic. The façade, where, south possibly, there are a couple of windows and a curve at the bottom of the windows that's concrete or stucco, is a very historic detail that's contributing to many homes. The way the window is designed with those sills should be considered for primary as well to preserve that feature because that really is a character-defining feature of these kinds of houses.

Mr. Strongwater offered to share more photos if the board needed them.

Member Biedscheid asked if the windowsills were represented on the recommended primary façade as well as the one that was pointed out.

Mr. Duran stated they are also on the east façade and extend across the main house.

Mr. Strongwater stated the south facades were considered secondary.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2025-010872-HDRB, at 836 Don Cubero Avenue to adopt the staff's recommendation to retain the main residence and guest house as contributing and designate the east of the main residence as primary and the east façade of the guest house, excluding the non-historic elements, including the window, door, and portal as the primary façade, and the yard walls as contributing as recommend by staff. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- i. **2025-010873-HDRB, 219 & 219 A Washington Ave., Downtown & 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 23'-8". 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.

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that all the exception criteria had 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.

Member Biedscheid asked what the impact of these changes would have on the existing 219 and 215 buildings, which are both contributing.

Mr. Duran stated that looking at the streetscape, the west-facing facades or primary façades show the significance of the structures and, more so, the significant structure to the north of 219 Washington, which is a very prominent structure in Territorial style. The applicant is proposing at 219 on the west façade is to step it back to the east to avoid overwhelming the western façade while maintaining what was previously approved and setting everything to the rear. These are pretty large structures and they can overwhelm the area, but the applicant is doing the best they can to build on this property by stepping it to the rear of or to the east, where it has the minimal impact on that streetscape.

Robert Evans, Ojo Caliente, was sworn in. Mr. Evans had nothing to share but was available for questions.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked what the radius of the corners would be and if they would match the existing building.

Mr. Evans confirmed that the radius of the corners would match the existing building. He said that he is trying to match everything, including the wood and its color, on the front portal.

Member Aguilar Medrano stated that what was striking her as odd on the right side of the photo is the pattern of the windows; there is a large gap between them that doesn't really seem to be consistent with the patterning of the existing windows. She asked if the applicant could speak to the pattern and windows in general because on the south elevation, each floor has two windows, but they are not aligned. She wondered why the windows were in this type of configuration and what was behind the large gap in the rendering.

Mr. Evans explained that the gap on the second floor was a wall that separates units, and right in the middle are the bathrooms on that side.

Member Biedscheid stated that the proposed south elevation for units four and five had similar odd window placement and door placement as they were off-center, and asked if that was due to the interior.

Mr. Evans stated it was for the interior layout of the rooms.

Member Biedscheid stated that the Board has purview of the exterior, and the design seems to be around the interior. The off-center does not make sense because there is no apparent reason from the exterior for those not to be centered, or mimicking the placement of the windows on the adjacent contributing structures, which have a lot of windows, and this design is sparse. The general design seems especially uninspired, like a block wall next to the 215 and 219, which have a lot of character. The small size of the little building adds to the streetscape, and the reason we designated it as contributing was that it was just a very diminutive building; the additions that will connect to the building and the one behind it, although not visible, will have an effect. There is a lot of sky above this and next to 215, which is a two-story building, and it always appears very small. All of these changes just do not work; they jeopardize the status of the neighboring buildings. It is appreciated that things were moved to the rear, but if those were one-story buildings, it would be much more appealing.

Mr. Evans stated that the intention was to do a hip roof on 219A, but it would not meet the requirements B and Z for putting a hip roof for the architectural points system. The idea was to match that building with a hip roof.

Director Lamboy stated that the architectural point system applies in the rest of the city, but not in the historic districts; the historic districts review board determination applies. So, the point system would not apply in this particular case.

Mr. Evans stated it was part of the preliminary zoning review.

Director Lamboy stated she would verify what was on the form because it would not apply here.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth West stated that while she resides in the Don Gaspar Area District, she walks in this area. She stated that this is an addition to the streetscape that is quite dramatically big in feeling and it sounds as if the applicant was trying to make an effort to figure out what's going on but relating to her earlier comment about give and take, there are aspect of the project that are appealing, but this cute little item will be changed but other buildings in the area should be sought for inspiration and incorporated into this design. She stated she is in favor of building for the streetscape and then figuring out where the rooms go and how they configure in the structure.

Ms. Stefanie Beninato, previously sworn in, agreed that this would dramatically change the streetscape, and she did not hear any discussion about the hardship that was forcing this design, or how it would not negatively affect the public or negatively impact the streetscape. We already have a fairly big development going on right there in that area. It is going down that walkway. It was extremely controversial. It took many meetings for the board to approve it. I'm not sure why you need more than 50% add-on to 219. I don't hear any discussion about that. I think that too is a second story, and then you have this very square building that's 219A, that's totally generic and really unappealing and doesn't really fit in with downtown at all. And to keep referring to 215, 215 is a historic building. It is not a new building. And so, it's not even supposed to be considered in sort of the height calculations, all kinds of things. And yes, it would be nice to sort of reflect some of those details, but it doesn't make it okay to have a big building next door. Again, we don't see the fire supposed to be a fireplace. Is it a gas fireplace? Where's the venting? You don't see that in that diagram. I don't know why you have to be an extra 8 in above. Can't you make the basement lower, step down to the first floor, and then you can lower the second floor and be at the same height level, so you don't need an exception? I mean, there are a lot of alternative designs here that have not been considered. Um, and it seems like both staff and the owner think that, well, we have a right to develop, so we should be able to develop to the maximum, but this is a historic zone, and it's important to fit into the streetscape, especially in downtown, especially on Washington Avenue.

Mr. Evans stated that due to the layout between the property and the neighboring property at "Market Steer", this new taller building cannot be seen from the streetscape.

Director Lamboy stated that there was a planning and zoning review that was done on April 28th, and there was no mention of points on the form. Those architectural points don't apply in the case of historic districts precisely because we have standards relating to compatible construction. There would be no reason, potentially, other than the fact of a hipped roof, other than the fact that it might exceed the permitted height for the ordinance.

Member Aguilar Medrano asked if story poles were provided for the field trip.

Mr. Duran stated he did not ask for story poles.

Acting Chair Bienvenu stated that story poles should be required for all height exceptions.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2025-010873-HDRB, at 219 and 219A Washington Avenue, to postpone the case to a date certain of September 23, 2025, so that the applicant can take into consideration comments from the board, including the roof type, roof profile, windows, height, and massing, and install story poles as recommended by the Board. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

- j. **2025-010874-HDRB, 423 ½ A W. San Francisco St., Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Contributing, Walter Klump, agent for Ellen Yarrell, owner, requests approval for the proposed remodel, including replacement of all doors and windows, infilling one door, widening one window, and other exterior alterations. Exceptions are requested to 14- 5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) historic windows shall be restored wherever possible, and 14- 5.2(D)(5)(a)(iii) no existing opening shall be closed.**

Paul Duran presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project and found that all the exception criteria had 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.

Walter Klump, 501 Rio Grande Avenue, was sworn in. He stated that the owner, Ellen Yarro, sends her apologies because she had intended to be present, but she had an emergency to attend to. He said he had a few comments regarding the presentation. First, the color blue is much lighter than in the photo, which seemed very saturated. There are samples of the blue trims with the sand stucco finish on several buildings in the district. He said the infill door is already half-filled in, while no permit has ever been issued on the property. The interior of this door is drywalled, so if you open the door, you would see the drywall. The property was purchased in a state of disrepair, so they intend to restore some of the historic integrity of the building. He added that the stucco that staff recommended

keeping is a textured brocade from the late twentieth century, and we hired John Murphy as a historic consultant for the project. He states, "*Dear Ellen and Walter, I'm concerned about the staff recommendation to retain the brocade style stucco finish. The existing stucco exhibits a textured brocade or Spanish lace pattern created with a skip technique. This is a late 20th-century decorative treatment common in Santa Fe, only from the mid-1960s onward, and has no precedent in 19th-century plastered adobe buildings. Its appearance is more closely associated with STM or Bellam track houses built on the south side in that period. Historic adobe surfaces similar to the 423A house were finished with a hand-troweled smooth or subtly floated coat, often lime-based, producing a planer surface that kept the building's form and proportions visually prominent. The current textured finish is historically inappropriate. It introduces a visual busyness foreign to the building's period and obscures the craftsmanship of the original walls. A more appropriate approach would be to restucco using a traditional cementitious plaster such as LRA 2030 sanded stucco applied in a smooth or lightly floated finish to approximate the appearance of a 19th-century adobe plaster coat. This would restore a historically compatible surface while maintaining the protective function of the stucco.*" Therefore, the proposal is for a smooth texture for the stucco.

Mr. Duran stated that Mr. Murphy eloquently shares his assessment. However, given the status designation of the structure, the current state of the structure, and the stucco and architectural style that was implemented during the time it was stuccoed, staff recommends that the owner retain the stucco style.

Director Lamboy stated that the photo in the 1981 HCPI shows this pattern of stucco. There must be proof of the previous existence of smooth stucco.

Acting Chair Bienvenu asked if smooth stucco was part of the application and if the staff was recommending its approval.

Mr. Duran stated that the smooth stucco is part of the request; however, per the staff recommendation in the staff report, "*staff recommends that the proposed stucco be installed utilizing the same rough texture of the existing stucco to retain the historic character of the building.*"

Acting Chair Bienvenu clarified that staff is recommending approval on condition that the proposed stucco be installed utilizing the same rough texture as the existing stucco.

Director Lamboy stated that one other item in the HCPI, under photo 16, page 38, is a photograph of many layers of stucco, which is a hint at what was there previously. Underneath there is a rough texture as photo many layers of stucco there is a rough texture there as well.

Mr. Krump stated that while the smooth stucco is preferred if it needs to be textured to more the case forward they would be willing to do textured stucco.

Member Aguilar Medrano commended the applicant on their packet; it was very thorough, and they did a great job of calling out the details like finishes in addition to well-executed drawings.

Member Biedscheid asked for confirmation that the east elevation is not visible from the street.

Mr. Krump confirmed it was not visible.

Member Biedscheid stated that it appeared that almost all of the windows were not historic aluminum clad windows and then questioned what appeared to be pipes on the south elevation and on the secondary masing.

Mr. Krump stated that she was correct, the existing windows are not historic, and the piping vents on the west elevation exist. He confirmed that the pipes on the south elevation also exist, but were missing on the existing drawing.

Member Biedscheid pointed out that the tallest part of the building has a prominent cap at the parapet and asked if the applicant was keeping that. And with respect to the color, she confirmed that the color would be lighter.

Mr. Klump confirmed the color is a little lighter than the existing one.

Member Biedscheid asked if the color was protected.

Mr. Duran was unsure and asked if Director Lamboy might be able to assist.

Director Lamboy stated that looking over the photographs in the HCPI, there is a picture from the 1990s that has a lighter blue on the exterior door that accesses the kitchen, and in the 1980s, they are white, so the color is not historic, and either would be an acceptable choice.

Member Biedscheid stated that a couple of photographs of the windows have a grate or a trellis in front of them and asked if it was attached to the building and if it was to remain or be removed.

Mr. Krump stated that it was not historic.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth West, previously sworn in, confirmed that what was online and what was on the screen, the colors were saturated differently. There is a wall with two windows, not sure of the elevation, then similar windows or doors that look very static and odd. She

asked if these were planned to be retained. She then asked if there was any leeway when doing rough stucco because some come out nice and others do not.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2025-010874-HDRB, at 423 ½ West San Francisco Street, to approve the application, finding that all of the exception criteria have been met with the conditions that the stucco texture match the rough texture that currently exists per staff recommendation, unless the applicant can prove that smooth stucco existed historically and submit that documentation to staff for approval. Member Mather seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (4-0).

9. Discussion Items

There were no discussion items.

10. Matters from the Board


There were no matters from the Board.

11. Next Meeting

August 26, 2025

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10 pm.



Lani McCulley, Transcription



Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

Date