



**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 setbacks 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(l) 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
Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

5/12/26
Date