



**Regular Meeting of the Historic
Districts Review Board
March 24, 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=zIcKJFIPluA&index=22>

Call to Order

Chair Rios called the regular meeting of the Historic Districts Review Board to order at 5:44 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Roll call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present

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

Others Present

Ms. Heather Lamboy, Planning and Land Use Director
Mr. Gary Moquino, Historic Preservation Division Planner Manager
Mr. Frank Ruybalid, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Lani McCulley, Senior Planner
Ms. Mariah Kavanaugh, Planner Technician

Note: All items in the Board packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Board packet is available on Civic Clerk and can be requested from the Historic Preservation Division.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Moquino requested that case 2026-011886-HDRB at 521 Calle Corvo be moved to the beginning of the New Business section.

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

3. **Approval of Minutes**

- a. December 9, 2025
- b. January 13, 2026
- c. January 27, 2026
- d. February 10, 2026

Member Bienvenu moved to approve the four sets of 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**

There were no findings and conclusions to approve.

5. **Matters from the Public**

Elizabeth West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe, expressed hope that those who have enjoyed serving on the Board can continue to do so in some way after new members join.

Stefanie Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, Santa Fe, speaking via teleconference, expressed hope that the historian position on the Board would not take as long to fill as the architect position has.

6. **Staff Communications**

- a. **2026 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Awards:** The 2026 Santa Fe Heritage Preservation Awards ceremony is scheduled for May 21.
- b. **Architect Position on Board:** On March 25, 2026, the City Council will hold a vote on whether to appoint Joe Simmons to the Board's architect position.
- c. **Phase 2 of Land Development Code Update:** Phase 2 of the Land Development Code update will begin in mid-April 2026. The Historic District ordinance will be discussed early in the process, and Board participation is requested.

7. **Old Business**

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

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

Ms. Lamboy presented the case and the staff recommendation. Staff requested reconsideration of the Board decision to classify a portion of the building as significant and the other as contributing. Based on the Code, status designation may be significant, contributing, or non-contributing. There is no provision in the Code that permits portions of one building to have more than one status. Staff recommended that the structure be designated as contributing, with façades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 as primary.

Member Cherry inquired regarding the Board's previous decision. Ms. Lamboy responded that the Board designated the area highlighted in red on the slide as significant and the rest as contributing. Member Cherry noted that, in addition to the primary façades recommended by staff, he believes the Board also designated façades 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18 as primary, excluding the non-historic additions but including the shell of the structure. He inquired regarding the reason staff did not recommend designating façades 14, 15, and 16 as primary. Ms. Lamboy noted that the façades had been modified over time. The users of the building may also need to add more parking in those areas.

Member Bienvenu suggested that the Board assign a single status to the building but retain the same primary façade designations as previously.

John Padilla, the applicant, P.O. Box 2986, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He thanked the Board and staff for reconsidering the status designation and suggested that the primary façades be designated per the original staff report.

Public Comment:

Ms. West, 318 Sena Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. She suggested the building be designated as contributing.

Ms. Beninato, P.O. Box 1601, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she suggested that the primary façades be designated per the original motion.

Jordan Young, 652 Galisteo Street, Santa Fe, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she suggested that the Board consider the current and future uses and needs of the El Castillo Life Plan Community and the people it supports, and provide a designation that will allow it to conduct business without having to come before the Board if urgent repairs become necessary.

Member Biedscheid suggested that the Board uphold the staff recommendation regarding the primary façades, noting that the entire original east façade is obscured by infill and additions.

Board Action:

Member Cherry moved in case 2026-011792-HDRB at 924 Paseo de Peralta that the building be designated as contributing, with façades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18 as primary, excluding the 1980s alterations and infills on façades 16 and 18. Member Degnan seconded. The motion passed (4-1).

- b. **2026-011831-HDRB, 1489 Upper Canyon Road, Downtown & Eastside Historic District, Non-Contributing.** Christopher Purvis, agent for Susan Jancar, owner, requests approval for new construction of a 1,640-square-foot structure to a height of 14 feet eight inches, where the maximum allowable height is 18 feet nine inches, and for a four-foot-seven-inch-tall by 20-foot-long metal vehicular gate. An exception is requested to Section 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

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

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

Christopher Purvis, the applicant, 518 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the wall is five feet six inches from the inside, but the height on the outside appears to be four feet seven inches, as the ground is higher.

Member Bienvenu expressed a preference for gate option two and inquired whether the applicant would agree to provide some form of fenestration in the wood slats, such as diamonds cut between the slats. Mr. Purvis responded that he would. Member Bienvenu suggested that staff be allowed to approve the final gate design, noting that the wall appears to be appropriate.

Public Comment:

Ms. West, previously sworn in, noted that the gate design was a significant improvement.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, speaking via teleconference, agreed with Member Bienvenu's comments.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011831-HDRB at 1489 Upper Canyon Road that the application be approved, as submitted, based on the Board and staff's preference of gate option two, for which the exception criteria have been met, with the additional condition, as agreed to by the applicant, that the wooden portions of the gate be redesigned to add fenestration and appear more as wooden slats rather than metal, through separation or staining, with the design to be submitted for staff approval. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

8. New Business

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

Ms. Lamboy presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff found that the exception criteria for the following sections have not been met and recommended denial of these exception requests: 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(a) historic windows shall be repaired or restored wherever possible, 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c) no new opening shall be made where one presently does not exist unless historic documentation supports its prior existence, and 14-4.6(G)(4)(II)(a) architectural features, finishes, and details other than doors and windows. Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the 348-square-foot addition to a height of 14 feet five inches, re-stucco, re-roof, and other elements of the application that do not require an exception, as they comply with Sections 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(2) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Member Cherry inquired whether the picture window under the portal or the easternmost one on the south façade had been replaced and requested evidence that there had not previously been a picture window in that location. Ms. Lamboy responded that she believes it was the easternmost window, which was excluded in the Board's designation

of the façade as contributing due to its materials. She is unsure when it was replaced, but it is not an original window.

Member Bienvenu inquired whether the findings of fact have been entered and noted that the Board had expected additional information regarding the windows.

Chair Rios noted that there were houses in the area with picture windows.

Member Cherry noted that one of the picture windows has a pane and one does not, and there is no evidence that the opening had not previously contained a non-picture window.

Rajah Bose, the applicant, 212 Lorenzo Lane, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the paperwork for the case has changed hands numerous times, as former planner Paul Duran left the department before the first planned hearing. He did not seek a window assessment because he felt that, between the professional historian and the licensed architect, the conditions were clear. He requested that the Board approve the case as submitted or provide reasonable and clear conditions. He shared a presentation that provided more details, noting that the structure will be the owners' full-time home in their retirement and that the long-term energy demands and maintenance costs of the home should therefore be considered. He requested the reason Section 14-4.6(G)(4)(I)(c), regarding new openings, was applied to the case, as no new openings were proposed.

Mr. Bose provided more detail on the key considerations being discussed. He noted that the owners have given him authority to negotiate certain items and requested that the request to replace the terra cotta roof with standing seam metal be removed from the application, per staff's recommendation. He believes the openings on the primary façades are original, per the historic cultural properties inventory (HCPI); however, there is no indication of the type of window that originally occupied the easternmost opening on the south façade. The historian, John Murphey, believes the façade design was originally symmetric and that the picture window under the portal was original. He noted that Santa Fe has many examples of new, durable windows installed in historic buildings. He is not proposing a new opening on the westernmost window on the south façade, but rather to raise the sill by approximately eight inches to accommodate a kitchen sink. He requested that the Board consider the needs of the users of the home, as wood windows are not practical for Santa Fe's climate and are not energy efficient.

Member Biedscheid noted that an image of the easternmost picture window in the HCPI appears to show a remnant of a dividing structure. Mr. Bose responded that Mr. Murphey believes the original window was a pair of divided units, similar to that on the opposite side.

Member Bienvenu noted that the color scheme does not appear to fit in with the neighborhood and that, while the easternmost picture window appears odd, the one under the portal appears to be characteristic of the area. He noted that the existing windows are not of great quality, and he has no objection to replacing them. While the incorrect section may have been cited by staff, raising the kitchen windowsill would require an exception; he expressed approval of this, as it would appear more like a kitchen window characteristic of the area.

Member Cherry expressed disagreement with the applicant on the subject of windows, noting that older windows often last longer than modern windows provided that they are maintained properly and latex paint is not used. He noted that some of the windows appear to be true divided light windows and that modernization processes exist that can be applied to historical windows to mitigate air loss. He noted that there are options to maintain the kitchen window at its current size and still have a functional kitchen.

Public Comment:

Susan Lamden, 615 Calle Grillo, was sworn in. She identified herself as the owner of 528 and 530 Calle Corvo, also on the agenda, and noted that she has no objection to any of the proposed changes. However, she wished to set the record straight regarding the applicant's statement that the owners of the subject property were the only ones in the neighborhood to light farolitos on Christmas Eve; rather, many homes had farolitos.

Ms. West, previously sworn in, noted the difference between streetscapes and districts.

Ms. Young, previously sworn in, speaking via teleconference, expressed hope that it would become easier for homeowners to replace non-functioning windows, as affordability is important.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, suggested via teleconference that the Board follow the requirements for changing a window size and that the owners maintain the lighter detail on the windows rather than the proposed bronze.

Ruth Williamson, owner of 521 Calle Corvo, was sworn in. Speaking via teleconference, she noted the importance of protecting historic neighborhoods. She noted that she and her husband purchased the home over one year ago because of its proximity to family, and she would like to plant a garden and have the kitchen window face the street so that she can interact with the neighborhood.

The Board clarified that the cementitious stucco for the walls should be as close to the current color as possible, with the acknowledgement that the original color may not be available, and that the color should be approved by staff. Mr. Bose agreed with this suggestion.

Member Cherry requested clarification of the staff recommendation. Ms. Lamboy responded that the staff recommendation was to leave the kitchen window's size as it is, but that the Board should decide whether to approve the proposed window changes.

Member Aguilar Medrano suggested that the new windows mimic the light patterns of the existing ones more closely, as the proposed light pattern appears contemporary.

Member Biedscheid noted that the south façade contains three different light patterns and suggested the applicant be allowed to make them more uniform.

Member Cherry suggested that the code be applied more consistently regarding windows. Ms. Lamboy responded that window assessments are requested but not required by code.

Chair Rios suggested that the primary façade remain similar to its original design, as the new design changes the home's character.

Board Action:

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011886-HDRB at 521 Calle Corvo to approve the application, noting that the exception request for the terracotta portal has been removed with the applicant's agreement to retain it, and noting that the criteria for the other two exceptions have been met as follows: the complete window replacement is approved based on additional testimony given regarding the poor condition of the existing windows, the fact that they are not true divided light windows, and the HCPI referring to the easternmost picture window on the south façade as modern; and the raising of the kitchen windowsill is approved based on testimony describing the practical use of the indoor space and the balance of architectural symmetry on the outside; with conditions that the picture window under the portal be replaced with another picture window, that the trim be white, and that the stucco be cementitious in the existing color. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion failed (2-3).

Member Biedscheid moved in case 2026-011886-HDRB at 521 Calle Corvo to approve the application, noting that the exception request for the terracotta portal has been removed with the applicant's agreement to retain it, and noting that the criteria for the other two exceptions have been met as follows: the complete window replacement is approved based on additional testimony given regarding the poor condition of the existing windows, the fact that they are not true divided light windows, and the HCPI referring to the easternmost picture window on the south façade as modern; and the raising of the kitchen windowsill is approved based on testimony describing the practical use of the indoor space and the balance of architectural symmetry on the outside; with conditions that the picture window under the portal be replaced in kind, that the trim be white, and that the stucco be cementitious in the existing color; window replacement is allowed provided that the light patterns of the existing windows are maintained; and raising of the

kitchen windowsill is approved provided that the light pattern simulate that of the easternmost window. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion failed (2-3).

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011886-HDRB at 521 Calle Corvo to approve the application, noting that the exception request for the terracotta portal has been removed with the applicant's agreement to retain it, and noting that the exception criteria for the complete window replacement has been met based on additional testimony given regarding the poor condition of the existing windows, the fact that they are not true divided light windows, and the HCPI referring to the easternmost picture window on the south façade as modern; with conditions that the picture window under the portal be replaced in kind, that the trim be white, and that the stucco be cementitious in the existing color; window replacement is allowed provided that the light patterns of the existing windows are maintained; the kitchen windowsill must remain at its current height. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed (4-1).

- b. **2026-012025-HDRB, 507 and 509 Coronado Road, Downtown & Eastside Historic District.** Steve McCormick, agent for Julia Dancy, owner, requests status review and primary façade designation (if applicable).

Mr. Moquino presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended that the historic status of the structure be upgraded to contributing with the south elevation (R1, R2, R3), including the portal with the pony walls, and excluding the non-historic windows, doors, and carport, as the primary façade, with the casita, yard wall, and pergola as non-contributing per Section 14-04.06(C) Designation of Significant, Contributing or Noncontributing Status Within Historic Districts.

Steve McCormick, the applicant, 318 West Gomez Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He agreed with the staff recommendation and noted that the carport is not historic.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

Board Action:

Member Aguilar Medrano moved in case 2026-012025-HDRB at 507 and 509 Coronado Road to upgrade the status of the main building to contributing, with the south elevation, including the portal and pony wall, excluding the non-historic windows, doors, and carport, as the primary façade, and to designate the yard wall, casita, and pergola as non-contributing, per the staff recommendation. Member Bienvenu seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

- c. **2026-011825-HDRB, 619 West Alameda Street, Westside-Guadalupe Historic District, Contributing.** Dura Build Construction, agent for Max Scott, owner, proposes to install a bond beam, repair historic windows, re-roof the existing residence, and construct three-foot, four-inch-high yard walls. An exception is requested to Section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure.

Ms. McCulley presented the case and staff recommendation. Staff recommended approval of the exception to Section 14-4.6(E)(2)(IV)(b) to raise the height of a contributing structure, recommended approval of the items that do not require an exception, and found that the application complies with Sections 14-4.6(E) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-4.6(G)(5) Westside-Guadalupe Historic District Design Standards.

Chair Rios expressed approval of the applicant's desire to repair the existing windows even though they are in poor condition.

Max Scott, the owner of 619 West Alameda Street, was sworn in. He noted that he has worked on historic properties before and expressed excitement to work on the subject property. His goal is to bring health and safety items up to code while preserving the original style.

Public Comment:

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted via teleconference that the new windows appear to be double-paned, which would not be replacement in kind.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011825-HDRB at 619 West Alameda Street that findings be entered that the exception criteria have been met for the reasons outlined in the staff report, and that the project conforms with the code in all other respects; and that the case be approved as submitted. Member Biedscheid seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

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

and windows, shall be repaired rather than replaced for the wrought iron posts.

Mr. Moquino 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)(1)(a) for the replacement of the wrought iron columns with wood columns. Otherwise, the staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application, which do not require an exception, as they comply with Sections 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards for all Historic Districts and 14-5.2(E) Downtown and Eastside Historic District Design Standards.

Chair Rios inquired whether the applicant was also requesting a gate. Mr. Moquino responded that he was. Chair Rios inquired how far back the gate would sit, its material, and its height. Ms. Lamboy responded that the gate would be approximately four car lengths from the street.

Ju Tan, the applicant, 1219 Cerro Gordo Road, Santa Fe, was sworn in. He noted that the gate is proposed to be steel-frame, wood-clad, and 54 inches high.

Chair Rios inquired whether the applicant was proposing to replace the steel lattices with beams or vigas. Mr. Tan responded that he was proposing six-inch-by-six-inch wooden posts. Many of the lattices are structurally unsound, and at least one is no longer connected to the building. The entire portal structure will need to be refurbished, and some elements will be replaced in kind. Chair Rios inquired how many lattices there are. Mr. Tan responded that there are eight.

Member Biedscheid inquired whether it was possible to retain or replace the metal lattices in kind. Mr. Tan responded that they will need to be removed for repairs, and he is worried they will be damaged. Also, the immediate neighbors have wooden posts, and wooden posts will be used under the new portal in the back.

Chair Rios inquired whether the metal lattices were original to the house. Mr. Tan responded that he believes they were.

Mr. Bienvenu noted that the metal lattices were designated as part of the primary façade and would therefore need to be replaced in kind; otherwise, an exception would be required. He inquired whether the applicant would be willing to add some form of fenestration on the gate. Mr. Tan responded that he would.

Member Aguilar Medrano inquired whether the existing stucco is cementitious or synthetic. Mr. Tan responded that it is cementitious, and cementitious stucco is proposed for the entire house.

Mr. Tan noted that an exception was also requested for the steps, as he would like to remove one of the two sets of concrete steps due to safety and space issues. Ms. Lamboy responded that this would not require an exception.

Public Comment:

Ms. West, previously sworn in, noted that the home incorporates a mix of styles, which makes it interesting. The lattices are part of this.

Chair Rios inquired regarding the proposed blue shade. Mr. Tan responded that it would be used around the doors and windows and on the wooden elements of the portal; however, the blue shade shown on the slide is inaccurate.

Ms. Lamden, the owner, previously sworn in, noted that portions of the terracotta on the portal are also failing structurally. She believes that the metal lattice was common in hardware stores at the time it was used on the home; however, her concerns are more structural than design-related. She noted that she paid extra because she thought an exception was needed for the stairs.

Mr. Tan noted that it may be possible to incorporate structural solutions for the portal while retaining the lattices, such as by placing wooden beams behind them.

Ms. Beninato, previously sworn in, noted via teleconference that the lattice made the home unique and inquired whether the back portal railing is metal or wood.

Member Bienvenu inquired whether the exception request for the removal of historic materials had been withdrawn. Mr. Tan responded that it had, and the metal lattice will be retained.

Board Action:

Member Bienvenu moved in case 2026-011997-HDRB at 528 and 530 Calle Corvo to approve the application as submitted, noting that the applicant has agreed to withdraw the request for replacement of the wrought iron posts and instead will retain them, with the additional conditions that the wooden vehicular gate design include fenestration, to be submitted to staff for approval, that the stucco be cementitious, and that staff approve the proposed shade of blue. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The motion passed with the Board voting unanimously (5-0).

9. Discussion Items

Mr. Moquino inquired whether the Board would be present in person at the April 7, 2026, informational meeting. The Board members indicated that they would.

10. Matters from the Board

There were no matters from the Board.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting date is April 14, 2026.

12. Adjournment

Member Degnan moved to adjourn. Member Aguilar Medrano seconded. The vote passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Lori Goshert of Minutes Solutions Inc.

Cecilia Rios

Cecilia Rios, Historic District Review Board Chair

7-28-2026

Date