

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oJxb2I-m3cY>

Original transcript by You Tube I.A. with some corrections provided by HPD

Historic Districts Review Board Hearing August 25, 2026

Starting at 24 minutes, 15 seconds

The first case is 2026 012764 HDRB at 1062 Camino Santa Acacio.

This is Senior Planner McCulley's case. Are you ready to proceed?

This presentation is actually going to incorporate both cases 2026 12764 and 12765 at 1062 Camino San Acacio for construction of a main residence and an accessory dwelling unit. They're both on the same property. So, I'm just going to do one presentation for both. 1062 Camino San Acacio is located on the south side of the road between Victoria Street and Camino Cerrito. The property was brought before the board on June 9th of, 2026, under case 26-012284. The board postponed the case for a redesign. The clarification was that a pitched roof would most likely require an exception, the corners of the residence be rounded, and that additional windows on the street-facing facade be added to the ADU accessory dwelling unit. There was some conversation regarding the trellis at the front of the yard wall, but it was not determined if the board would disapprove this item. The board also asked that staff recalculate the heights and pitches on a streetscape to confirm allowable height and whether a pitch exception was required. Staff recalculated the pitches in the truncated streetscape, finding 42% of the eligible buildings had pitched roofs and therefore a pitched roof on this property would require an exception. With this recalculation, the applicant chose to redesign the structure with a flat roof.

Recalculation of the maximum allowable height found that the height should not exceed 16 feet 4 in. The applicant continues to request four feet of extra height for the main residence due to the slope. So he's looking for 20' 3". The overall height of the structure has been lowered from the initial design by 6 in. The applicant has also made changes to the stucco color and texture. The accessory dwelling unit is designed at 14'4 in. The front yard wall is requested at the maximum allowable height of 4 feet. The trellis is requested to remain as part of the project at a height of 8 ft. Other changes to the design include the parapets, canale, solar panels, and windows. Respective drawings have been added to the packet documents per the request of the board.

Okay. So, I'm going to go over the main residence request first. The accessory dwelling unit second, and finally some renderings. Please note that a motion is required for each of the two cases. So two motions will be required. The applicant proposes new construction of a primary residential structure to construct a 3,441 sq ft primary residence to a height of 20' 3" in where the maximum allowable height is 16'4". The residence will consist of 2,213 square feet of heated space and 1,228 square feet of porches in a recent Santa Fe style. The site slopes 14 ft from the

lowest to the highest portion of the footprint. The applicant is requesting additional height due to slope per section 14-4.6F22F. Windows are planned to be simulated divided light on the publicly visible sides of the structure without divisions on the remaining portions. Windows and patio door exteriors will be aluminum clad wood in dark bronze anodized finish. While there are corner windows on the rear of the building, the publicly visible windows will meet the three-foot-from-the-corner requirement for Section 14-4.6 G22B. The roofs are flat except for the shed roof over the portal on the north elevation. The garage door will be a metal door in dark bronze color. The garage door is not publicly visible at the south end of the west elevation. They will be sticking in the elastic buckskin. Details on the portal roof overhang fascia will be made of steel and will rust over time to match the exposed roofs. An exception is requested to have metal elements. This is our north elevation without, and then with the other structures as we'll be seeing from this street. This is our east elevation, south elevation, and then the west elevation. Property does still has terraces with low yard walls and low retaining walls. The lowest walls are actually planned to be made out of metal. The taller ones are planned to be stuccoed yard walls. So no retaining wall is planned to be over six feet in height. They're actually insulated concrete forms which will be stuccoed over in the elastic adobe. And then there will be railings and exterior stairs for access up the terraces, and one six-foot-high lattilla fence at the driveway is planned.

So the staff actually finds that the exception criteria to section 14-4.6E42B have not been met and recommends denial for the use of metal for details on the portal's roof overhangs and canales, as well as the yard walls. The staff recommends approval of the other elements of the application as they comply with general design standards and the historic downtown and east side designs.

And now I'm going to go ahead and move over to the accessory dwelling unit unless you guys want to discuss them separately.

We'll stop there and see if there are any questions.

Is there an exception request for the height? No, the extra four feet is due to slope.

Okay, it's not required. No, it's not required.

Well, it's not an exception per se, but it's still within the board's discretion whether to grant that.

Correct.

Okay. There's a diagram as a site section that shows a couple of heavy dashed lines that indicate a 16'4" height above the natural grade.

Not sure I understand which elevation you're referring to.

It's a section drawing, and it's called site section drawing number 113-1. Sorry. H3-1.

That's probably in the packet, not in the presentation. Okay.

So, what this diagram shows is it shows the natural grade as it exists, and then it shows the building set on that grade, and then it shows an offset line 16'4" above the natural grade.

Not having it in front of me, I can't visualize it in my head. Sorry.

Okay. Well, staff has not questioned that. So, I guess I just am to assume that then there is no because of this diagram that at no point is a piece of the structure higher than 16'4" above the existing natural grade. So there therefore there is no exception needed.

That is incorrect. The building is actually at 20 ft 3 in from natural grade on the north side.

I see natural grade at the front of the building. Right.

Okay. I'm still trying just to understand exactly how these heights work. Okay.

So the height is measured either from the existing grade or the finished grade, whichever is the lowest, and then it's measured up from there.

I see. Okay. Okay. That answers my question. Thank you. Yes member.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to clarify the house proposed elevation is 20T3, correct? On the north end of the building, 16'4" is allowed.

Yes. Thank you.

Did you also want to address the corners?

yes. So, I do note that in the case he's asking for sharper corners at a 1/4 to 3/4 inch corner. Staff would recommend that they be bullnosed at between 3 and 4 in.

That would be staff's recommendation as a condition of approval. Yes.

And do you know what the proposed corners are on the concrete retaining walls? I do not.

Well, would your recommendation be the same? Yes, it should be rounded as well. Thank you.

I also would note I'm sorry because we didn't discuss this in the field but windows should also be inset anywhere from one inch and a half to two inches one and one half to two inches. Is that what you said? Yes.

Okay. That's also a recommended condition of approval from staff. Very good. We can wait for the

Why Don't you go ahead and proceed with 2026-012765-HDRB at 1062 Camino San Acacio, and then we'll hear from the applicant.

Okay. All right. This is for the guest house.

So the applicant is requesting to construct a 733 sq ft accessory dwelling unit to a height of 144. The residence will be flat-roofed with parapets. Windows are aluminum-clad wood simulated divided lights. Window and patio door exteriors will be in dark bronze. There will be nine roof-mounted solar panels. Canales will be steel, which will rust over time, and stucco in elastomeric buckskin. So this is the north elevation without and with fencing.

There's the 4-foot right in the front there.

So west, south, and then this is kind of the southeast elevation. It's the inside of the L-shaped portion of the structure. And then the east. So, they're going to construct a 48-inch-high fence along Camino San Acacio. The fence will have masonry pilasters with a stone finish and a metal frame, and 3-in cedar slats. There's going to be a bonus at the exterior of the fence along San Acacio. It will be stuck out in elastic buckskin to match the residence. Install an 8-foot-tall, 36-inch-wide steel trellis attached to the back of the yard wall pilasters, and install a 4-foot-high crash enclosure at the street by the driveway on the northwest side of the property.

Staff is recommending approval of the proposed project, finding that the application complies with our general design standards and our downtown and east side design standards. Of course, again, with the condition that the windows at the corners of the building be bullnosed and the windows be inset. And we would also like to ask that the trellis be made of wood rather than steel.

Very good. So that would be an additional recommended condition of approval: that the trellis be made of wood. What about the well and also the corners?

Is this trash enclosure shown on the renderings? I recall that I thought that was made out of steel in the original proposal as well.

I believe it's Coyote Latillas, but okay.

I just didn't know if I saw it in the renderings. I don't see it in this rendering either. Well, we can ask.

So, these are the renderings. I just want to go ahead and share those. This is the property rendering with a kind of aerial perspective. And then the northwest corner of the lot, the northwest, yes, northeast corner of the lot. There are some gray structures in the background of each of these. They are to indicate the location of neighboring structures. Some of them fly. They're not really actually flying. And then our west elevation rendering. The east elevation.

And just to summarize again, we are recommending approval with a few conditions, except for the denial of the metal elements.

Okay. Thank you. Do board members have questions for staff? Member Jerry, was there an exception request made for the metal elements on the main house? Yes, it was part of the main house.

Okay. So this is the case, but on the guest house it's proposed, but it would require an exception, and there is no exception request. How's that?

The u metal element on this house is on the guest house; it is just the canale.

The trellis was asked for as steel, but we did not ask for an exception. I missed that it was steel. So we would recommend it be a wood trellis

or an exception request be made by the applicant.

Right. If he requests an exception, he will have to come back. The case would have to be postponed. Okay.

Yes. Members, I have a couple of questions. Following up on the metal, as I read the plans, the metal elements are columns and beams that are structural elements. Am I reading that correctly?

They're the portal elements. Yes. Okay.

Where in our code does it not allow that? It would be Section 14-4.6 E42B.

Am I correct in that the code refers to those as decorative elements?

It's a support beam for the can for the portal. I wouldn't call that decorative.

Okay. So, our code is specific. It requires support beams to be made out of wood.

I don't know that it's written specifically that way.

What is the exception request for?

Okay.

Sorry. Were you talking to me? I was waiting for Frank.

Right. I thought I was too. I thought maybe Attorney Ruybalid was looking up the provision in the code.

This is subsection 2 under G under 14-4.6.

It reads: with rare exceptions, buildings are one story, etc etc. Roofs are never carried out beyond the line of the walls except to cover an enclosed portal or porch formed by setting a portion back a portion of the wall or form an exterior portal. The outer edge of the roof is supported by wooden columns. Okay.

I think the other provision of the code that's normally cited for this proposition is that recent Santa Fe-style attempts to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retention of a similarity of materials.

Well, there's always inherent in codes like that. There's also a stipulation that a new structure shall make a distinction between itself and the historic structures around. No. Yes, it is. Yeah.

Not here. But there are additions. That is suggested.

It's also not for freestanding new buildings. It's also part of the National Park Service guidelines that new structures be designed as a building of our time and not try to copy historic buildings to such a degree that they have created a false history. So I, as an architect, believe that it really is appropriate for new structures to identify themselves as being something that is built. We walk through the, especially the east side, and it's very difficult to tell the difference between a building that was built in 1926 or 1926 versus a building that's built in 2026. I think that it's important that new buildings be new buildings and that historic buildings be historic buildings, and that we try not to dilute the character and the quality of the true historic buildings that way. And so, therefore, I believe that steel posts and steel beams are appropriate when used judiciously.

I have those on my house in a historic district in the Guadalupe district. And I don't think that it's something that detracts. So that's just my opinion about that. Then my next question has to deal with where the requirement to have a radius corner comes in with the new Santa Fe style? I know that this board has a preference for that, but I don't see that written in the code. And again, a sharp corner or a 90-degree corner is something that could make a distinction between itself and an adobe building nearby.

Chair Bienvenu and Member Simmons. With respect to your first question on the new buildings being distinguished from older buildings, what that specifically reads is that, under building additions, and this is under subsection E14-4.6 design, building additions that meet the standards of section 14-4.6G2, 6G2 downtown east side historic district shall continue to meet those standards in addition to the standards outlined in this section. Building additions shall have similar materials, architectural treatments and styles, features and details as the existing structure but shall be distinguishable from and not attempt to duplicate the existing structure. So it does indicate that the original design should have a bearing on the new design. It's just that it shouldn't duplicate the old structure so that the distinguish with respect to the bull-nosed corners. There isn't anything specific about bull-nosed corners in our code, but what is important, especially with the downtown and east side historic district, there's no new Santa Fe style.

There's a recent Santa Fe style. And what it reads as recent Santa Fe style intends to achieve harmony with historic buildings by retaining the similarity of materials, color, proportion, and general detail. The dominating effect is to be that of adobe construction prescribed as follows. And it gives a bunch of information on what constitutes adobe construction. And it has been the opinion of several board members, with which I agree with is that a sharp corner is not consistent with adobe construction. Adobe construction typically has bull-nosed or rounded corners.

We have innumerable structures in the historic districts, both the east side and other historic districts, that do have sharp corners. It was also a motif, if you will, that John Gaw Meem himself did. We have just one on this site: a territorial style building that has sharp corners. It has a rusted metal cornice on top of the brick, unfortunately. So I don't believe that rounded

corners are I believe that rounded corners are a specific detail, not a general detail. I think the general detail is the sort of the gestalt of the neighborhood. And I think that that's really what our charge is: to evaluate the differences between a new structure and historic structures as well as I lost my train of thought.

Go ahead, Member Bienvenu, and Member I'm sorry, Chair Bienvenu and Member Simmons- it's important to consider case law that concerns code enforcement. There's a case called City of Santa Fe versus Gamble Stockmo, Inc., and the holding of that is that it is no defense to a prosecution for violating an ordinance that others have been permitted to violate it without prosecution or punishment. That is, the fact that there are some buildings in all of the historic districts that we're not sure exactly how they were built that are not consistent with the code should not be considered a precedent to violate the code when approving or disapproving of other designs that have those same non-conforming elements.

I'm not suggesting that it's a violation of the code. I'm just suggesting that the code is not so specific that it would preclude doing a square corner.

Director Lamboy. Thank you, Chair Bienvenu. Member Simmons. This is a good conversation that we can have when it comes to the update of the code, but I will just sort of provide a little history lesson on as to how the code has been interpreted by the H board. So there are two styles allowed in the Downtown Eastside Historic District. The one being old Santa Fe style and the other one being recent Santa Fe style, which tends to. The purpose for reason is to emulate old Santa Fe style. So, in old Santa Fe style, there is a criterion that states that exterior walls are not less than 8 in. thick to emulate adobe construction and that geometrically straight façade lines are avoided. And so the board has traditionally, and certainly we can have dialogue, and you can vote however you would like to in this particular case, but those geometrically straight base lines, which include the lack of a bullnose, as that is typically found on historic buildings, have been applied in the case of recent Santa Fe style to be consistent with the overall character of old Santa Fe style.

Thank you for that.

Nothing further. Okay. So, I think we're ready to hear from the applicant at this point unless you have anything further to add.

Okay. Applicant, may you please step forward? Be sworn in.

Hi.

Please state raise your right hand and state your name and address for the record. Gabriel Brown, 7604 Old San Trail, San

Thank you, Gabriel. Do you solemnly declare and affirm that the testimony you have in reference to this item is the truth, the whole truth, and do this under the penalty of perjury?

I do. Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Brown.

Thank you for working with the board on your project. It's good to see you back.

I see. If you're going to activate the Elmo, please inform the members of the board. Thank you.

Please let us know what you have to add to the staff's presentation.

Thank you. I was last in front of you two and a half months ago. I'm going to read my presentation so I can make sure not to miss any details. Since that time, the staff has done a new height and pitch calculation based on several different streetscape definitions. The result of that investigation was with clear design constraints were delivered to me on July 30th. Less than a week before the deadline for submittals for this meeting. In that time, I revised the design to reflect the revised height and pitch calculations and reflect some of the feedback I received at the June meeting. I've made the casita a flat-roof structure and made the portal bedroom and living room masses shorter at the front of the residence the home shorter than it was in the previous design. Staff's report suggests that I have made the building six inches lower, but I think that expresses but I don't think that clearly expresses the changes I've made. Whereas before I was requesting the street-facing living room mass to be at height at the height limit, including the 4T of additional height allowed at the discretion of the board. Now I'm only asking for 23 in of height at the discretion of the board, living less than half 11 in of height at the front bedroom mass, and I'm asking I am asking for 47 in of the 48 in, which is at the discretion of the board, but only at the guest bedroom, which is at the very back of the building, not publicly visible, and is excavated deeply into the hillside.

Board Member Simmons had expressed several specific questions and design criteria in that previous meeting. I thank him for that feedback. I've made changes to the design that I hope addressed these concerns. Member Simmons did not perceive a design dialogue between the three buildings correctly, and I asked that the three buildings tie together in a better way. I made all three buildings the same color as the existing shed color array.

I think the flat roof casita reflects the flat roof design of the shed. I've added a brick coping detail on the main house or tall balcony and a similar coping detail along the coy fence elements and the plasters in the fence. I've added a banco Member. Simmons expressed a concern that the intent of the rule, which requires that glazed openings be set back 3 ft from outside corners, was not being followed. Again, I respect that comment and believe he was sort of correct. While I think the code is being followed, I have offered a design alternative which I'll show you on the iPad in a minute. Which is more respectful of Member Simmons' interpretation of the intent. I don't prefer the alternative, but I'll show it to you, and I would accept that if that were the wish of the board. Member Simmons expressed concern that the front of the casita, especially, was not very friendly toward the street, as he put it. I think what he meant is that there was little fenestration. I've added a pair of windows in that facade, which I think helped a great deal along that line. I also added a portal, a banco on the street intended to offer my neighbors a place to sit.

One of the blessings of Camino San Acacio is that it's, I think, one of the most widely used pedestrian streets in the historic district. There are always people and their dogs walking along that street. I mean, live there and work there. I enjoy seeing that. So we're offering a bench there, and we want to do a little dog bowl since there are dogs.

Member Simmon expressed support of the steel detailing, and I appreciate that. I want to get back to the code and what it says specifically. I think about that, but I want to go through the board. Member Biedscheid also gave me a very specific list of concerns or things that were concerning to her, and she had questions. The first was height and pitch, which obviously have led to some significant changes.

Member Biedscheid expressed concern about the amount of glazing on the building and the mixture of divided and undivided lights. Heard that concern. But I have carefully followed the code and provided divided lights where they're required and left undivided lights where those are allowed. Member Biedscheid expressed concern about the angles in the floor plan. I understand that concern and agree that sharp angles are not typical of our local styles. I hope she and other members of the board can see in the 3D model that the resulting design expression is of a simple stepped pueblo style; masking doesn't express the kind of dynamism that you see in the floor plan because those elements are not height. And so, while I do think the floor plan shows a kind of twisting or several angles, I don't think that is represented in the final three-dimensional design. Member Biedscheid expressed concern about the steel facial elements over the doors. I did not change this aspect of the design as currently proposed. But I do point out that these aspects of the design do not violate the code and are not publicly visible.

Members of the public expressed concern about the height-to-width proportion of the tall columns. Maybe they were sort of tall and skinny, which is not part of our local design conversation. I've eliminated the tall columns and lowered the portal significantly which reduced the width of the proportion of width to height on the columns.

The concern was expressed about the floating nature of the portal railing wall. Again, from a member of the public, I took that to heart and modified the design so that the portal railing wall returns to the building on one side and returns significantly on the other side, which is more typical of masonry construction where the strength of the masonry comes from its corners.

I have requested an exception for the use of steel for some decorative exterior elements on the building. The board need not approve or disapprove the metal of the metal elements as if they were all one design choice. So the consistency of using steel on all these details contributes to a simple expression of structural intent and simplified palette of materials, and I think both of those are keystones to the style that we are trying to emulate. One of the things I want to point out is that at the beginning of the code, and I'm sorry I didn't bring a copy of the code with me, but in the opening paragraphs where it describes historic districts, one of the sentences that it puts forward is that every building is a record of the time in which it was built. And that's a two-sided sword, as I think Member Simmons was trying to point out: historic buildings need to be

thoughtfully and carefully protected for their historic value, and new buildings also need to represent their time. And that means a modification of the techniques and the materials that are being used. and because we can because we have those available to us, and those are expressions of this day and time, which I think is also appropriate, and I would put the steel elements solidly in that category. I then want to address each of the steel elements separately again because this is not one design choice but a series of design choices.

The recent Santa Fe style suggests a similarity of materials to the old Santa Fe style. So what Mr. Ruybalid read was the old Santa Fe style; the portion of the code which references the old Santa Fe style, and the recent Santa Fe style suggests that it should have a similarity of materials to the old Santa Fe style. In terms of materials within the old Santa Fe style portion of the code only two I can only find two references to materials: wooden columns, which is exactly what Mr. Ruybalid read, and wooden lintels. There are no other references to material or materiality in the old Santa Fe style portion of the description of materials that I can find. So the code here is making a clear statement that portal columns on recent Santa Fe style buildings should be similar to wooden columns. And I would suggest that, by using the form and the rhythm and the pattern and the proportion of typical wooden columns that you would find on historic buildings, I am in fact creating something similar, which is the requirement of the code.

I also point out that there are two historic homes in the streetscape of this building, both of which are photographed in your packet, which have steel portal columns. I don't expect that those were approved under any sort of exception criteria, or that these are old traditional homes that are still occupied by the original families that built them. One of them is contributing.

I suspect the other one would be deemed contributing if it were brought before the board. Now, I don't think it would be brought before the board. So, if you require that the columns be wooden, I think there's one sort of stretched interpretation of the code which might suggest that that is a requirement. I don't see any authority in the code to require that the beams be wooden. And I think setting a steel beam over a wooden column is odd. I see no mention of requirements for wooden canales. Certainly is no mention of that. You know, the only mention of canales is that they're typical of the style. Sheet metal canales are not uncommon in the historic district. And certainly sheet metal column channels predate the kind of hybrid wooden and sheet metal columns that we that are typical that we buy from lumber stores these days. And in fact, often what you see is more sheet metal than wood. There are two areas where roof fascia over exterior doors is proposed in steel. Again, Member Biedsheid brought these up as a concern.

This is a roof fascia. Code is silent as to the material applied to fascia on roof overhangs. There's simply no mention at all of what material that should be. But for practical purposes, metal is almost always universally used, at least at the flashing of any roof fascia and on a roof overhang. Finally, walls and fences visible from the street may be built of lots of materials, including wrought iron. This is not iron; that's just steel, but I think that code was written today; I think it would be considered.

That's really the presentation I wanted to make. I just want to show two things. One relative to height, one relative to the corner detail that I have prepared here. So, excuse me while I step away.

There are some extra lines in this rendering. I apologize for those. But this is simply a way that I can turn on and off, kind of a solid corner versus the thinner corner that was originally proposed that does meet the three-foot requirements. One of the things about this corner again, it's not visibly it's not visible from the street. So if

If I go through the Street View, it's only when you see this in the bird's eye views that you that you see that that corner is thin. So I would argue that the impact is minimal to the exterior and to the style, and it's maximal to the interior. And then I have one more.

Member Simmons asks about the relationship of the natural terrain or the existing terrain to the top of the building, and the answer is that where the sight section is cut, which is through the bedroom, we never exceed 16'4" above existing natural terrain for the site sections. We do exceed it, and so this image shows what we would see of the building if we took the entire three-dimensional existing terrain and lifted it 16'4" above its existing elevation. So you can see that we are at that corner. were about 15" above the 16'4" limitation, and that a portion of the roof does exceed a portion of the portal hitched roof does exceed the 16'4" limitation. Bit of and if I had if I had created a smooth ground instead of a terrain model, which is stepped, it would conceal a little bit more, but essentially the building is just a just less than a foot and a half above at any point on the building above an envelope which is 16'4 " above natural.

That's my presentation. Thank you very much for your patience in listening to it. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Thank you for your presentation. Board members, do you have questions for the applicant?
Member Cherry.

Hello, Mr. Brown.

So I just had a couple of questions for clarification, and then I wanted to share a few thoughts. So I heard it was presented as elastomeric stucco, but you've got an El Rey Stucco chart, which is a cementitious stucco. Can you just clarify? Is it because El Rye is not making Stucco anymore?

They changed their name to La Habra. So what's the stucco?

So, you weren't here for the previous meeting where I got approval. So there are three structures on the property. The shed is a historic building that we're, if it's contributing, we're maintaining. We're going to be wrestling that. We still can get the help. I got buckskin. We can still get the buckskin stucco, which we will do in cementitious, matching the existing texture on, pardon me, on the shed. We will be using the same color but in an elastic finish with an elastic material and a sand finish on the other structures. So, we're using the same color, but it will be, in the last American drive it or stow or something. Yeah.

Gotcha. Okay.

So, and the, tell me again the corner radius that you're proposing, as Member Simmons was discussing. I prefer a sharper corner.

I came before this board in June intensely proud of the building that we did across the street with the in in what's really a northern New Mexico-style building. It seemed to me like I was unique in my affection for that building among the people in the room at the time. But, in some ways, that's what I was trying to duplicate at least at the casita here and in some ways all over the structure. That building has a clay plaster finish. It has fairly sharp corners. I would say 3/4 of an inch to/ inch. It is an it is a it is an 1880s adobe double adobe structure. It was built in the 1880s. We replastered it, with permission of the board, with a 3/4 inch radius at that point. I prefer those tighter radii. This is not the hill I'm going to die on.

Okay. Well, I guess one of the reasons I ask that is, and I know this isn't sort of for this meeting to discuss code interpretation, but we are interpreting the code for your project, so I do think it's relevant. I've seen and worked on a lot of buildings in this town, and I've seen a lot of different radius corners from a lot of different eras, and I do think that the code is subject to interpretation.

So my personal opinion is, it's not a big deal if it's a sharper corner.

And I think the argument that it makes it distinct to this time is valid.

The other thing I wanted to say is I would commend you for it seems like, you know, I wasn't at the other board meeting where this was heard, but it

seems like you took this feedback to heart. You went back, and you did a significant amount of redesign to accommodate the direction of the board.

So, I wanted to commend you for that. I think that's admirable.

I guess the other thing I'd say in relation to your project, which also sort of dabbles into code interpretation, is the use of steel. I would feel very similar to it regarding the bullnose. I see lots of buildings that it was used on historically and non-historically.

Of course, like any other material, it can be used very poorly.

One question I had regarding the steel that you're proposing is the color and texture, and because there's a lot that can go on with steel. Is it painted? Is it rusted? Is it a flat finish? Is it a gloss finish? Just the proposal was a natural to rust.

So it would,, it would be black when it was installed, but we would not be sealing it or painting it, so it would rust.

So what you do is, are you wanting it to rust? Sure.

Okay. I'm just curious because that's the intent is that it be rusty.

Okay. So is it going to get a treatment, like a ferric treatment or some kind of?

I didn't plan to patina it to rust. I was just going to let it rust.

Gotcha. But it's almost all, you know, it's almost all quite exposed and without a sealer of any kind.

It's like a dark blue hot-rolled steel that's just going to rust on its own.

Gotcha. Okay. , yeah. I think that's all I have to say about it without going on and on.

Any other comments from the board, questions?

Members, just a quick comment here. I do also want to commend you on the changes that you've made. I think you've really taken it to heart. I think you've made some improvements to the design. So, thanks.

Yeah. Is there anyone in the room who would like to speak on this project?

I see no one. Is there anyone on Zoom?

Yes, Miss Beninato would like to speak. Miss Beninato, you can unmute, and please state your name and address for the record. Be sworn.

Stephanie Beninato, PO Box 1601, Santa Fe.

Stephanie, do you solemnly declare and affirm that the testimony you have in reference to this item shall be the truth, the whole truth, and do this under the penalty of perjury?

I do. Thank you.

I have a few. I mean, I understand that the architect has made a lot of changes, looking at what the board members made comments about. But I am very disturbed by the idea that somehow the historic parks regulation should play into what is being done here. It is not a new Santa Fe style, but a recent Santa Fe style. And I think, as pointed out by Mr. Ruybalid, it is supposed to look like adobe, but made from other more modern materials. And so rounded corners, recessed windows- these are things that again are important in preserving that style. And having a building with very sharp corners just sticks out and says, "I just got built yesterday." It's not compatible with the district, and it's not compatible necessarily with the neighborhood. I find it to be a very large building. I mean, of course, if you have a lot of coverage, you can do it, but again, it just seems to overwhelm maybe the neighborhood. And I also am wondering what that sort of looks like: a box, a fairly large box. It's not the banco, but it's there by the coyote fencing. And I really wonder what that is. It's a step up. Is it a step up from the street, like a patio? Because again, it seems like a lot of hard surfaces are still on that property, and to me, although you know it really feels like an apartment building rather than a house, and I don't think metal structures, metal supports, are decorative; they are structural, and I don't think the portal, particularly at the street level or right at the street, should be allowed. I think that should be in traditional material. I

definitely think the rounded corners and recessed windows are important in terms of having it emulate Adobe construction. Otherwise, why bother? Why even have this ordinance? Why, you know, again, you as the board are required to follow the ordinance, and that's what it requires: that it looks like adobe construction, not looking modern, and there's plenty in there to tell people it is not in a historic building. Thank you.

Thank you. Is there anyone else online? No. Chair Bienvenu.

Oh, someone from the room wishes to speak. I'll swing back to you. Please.

Please raise your right hand and state your name and address for the record.

My name's Elizabeth West, at 318 Sena Street.

Thank you, Elizabeth. Do you so solemnly declare and affirm that the testimony you have in reference to this item is the truth, the whole truth, and do this under the penalties of perjury?

Yes, I do.

Thank you. She has been sworn in as vice chair.

You may proceed. I wanted to say something really nice about what the architect did in paying attention to. I was one of the people who mentioned the thickness of supports because they reflect the strength that is required when an adobe house is being built, and that's part of the history that goes behind. So I appreciate the stronger supports that were added in. However, I'm very glad that Miss Beninato brought up a few comments. I was completely surprised by the great big box. I didn't know what that was. I'm not very good at reading these kinds of, these particular sorts of renderings. That's my problem. But there's one of them that looked like a banco, and the other looked like a, I don't know, the top of a basement dwelling. I couldn't figure it out. So that's I apologize for not understanding that. It just looked very rectilinear. I thought it was so much fun. You could play with it and move it around. That is pretty cool. But I really appreciate Miss Beninato's comments and the subtlety; the relative subtlety of the corners, depending on a bullnose to some degree, does make a difference. It's subtle, but obviously it's very important for the modern aspect or a contemporary aspect to be sharp. However, in the Santa Fe style, even recent Santa Fe style, there's got to be that subtle difference. And I think the eye sees it, and the brain doesn't quite understand what's going on, but it's very effective. I want to underline much of what Miss Beninato said. Thank you.

Thank you very much. Any further discussion on behalf of the board?

I will entertain a **motion**, Member Cherry.

In case 2026 012764 HDRB at 1062 Camino San Acacio. I would move to approve the application as proposed, noting that the exception criteria have been met. Or sorry, I'm going to have to reverse here to make sure I get my words right. The use of it's for the use of metal. All

right. for the use of the metal in the portal. And then I would request that some treatment be made to those metal components to accelerate the rusting. And that would be it.

Is there a second? Second. Any further discussion on the motion?

I'll have a roll call vote. Member Degnan. No. Member Cherry? Yes.

Member Simmons? Yes. The motion has passed. Thank you.

Next case. Do I have a **motion**?

I mean, yeah, I can make a motion on that one as well.

In case 2026 012765, 1062 Camino San Acasio. I would make a motion to accept the application as proposed. And there are no exceptions here, but I would note that I would accept the use of steel for the trellis in the front, with the same request that some treatment be used on the steel to accelerate the patina.

Is there a second? Second. Any discussion? Oko, please.

Member Degnan. No. Member Cherry. Yes. Member Simmons. Yes. The motion has passed.

Ending at 1:24:22