VIGIL, XAVIER I.

From: BUSTAMANTE, PAUL C.
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2026 4:47 PM
To: VIGIL, XAVIER I.
Subject: Fw: public comment re pools, scrivener errors and permit erroneously issued w/o due process and creating public safety issue

Just in case these didn't make it in the portal.

Thanks!

Paul C. Bustamante
City Councilor, District 2
Office: (505) 955-6816
Cell: (505) 637-2615
Email: pcbustamante@santafenm.gov

From: STEFANIE BENINATO <stebeni@zianet.com>
Sent: Monday, November 9, 2026 4:02 PM
To: Mayors Office <mayor@santafenm.gov>; BARRETT, ELIZABETH A. <eabarrett@santafenm.gov>; BUSTAMANTE, PAUL C. <pcbustamante@santafenm.gov>; FAULKNER, PILAR FH. <pfhfaulkner@santafenm.gov>; CASTRO, ALMA G. <agcastro@santafenm.gov>; GARCIA, LEE A. <lagarcia@santafenm.gov>; aachavez@santafenm.gov <aachavez@santafenm.gov>; CHAVEZ, AMANDA C. <acchavez@santafenm.gov>; CASSUTT, JAMIE A. <jcassutt@santafenm.gov>; FEGHALI, PATRICIA C. <pcfeghali@santafenm.gov>
Subject: public comment re pools, scrivener errors and permit erroneously issued w/o due process and creating public safety issue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Public Comments 10 Nov 2026
I hope the governing body will approve the work necessary to reopen Salvador Perez pool and put the project on a fast track. It has been closed for over 8 months now.
I am concerned about the ordinance to correct scrivener's errors to the very long land use bill that was passed in the past nine months. Is it really just correcting typo errors or are there small or sly substantive changes? Who from the governing body has read the entire bill and compared it to the one just passed. Some of he changes to the land use code in that bill were mistakes including allowing developers to forego onsite parking requirements in the BCD and the formula for increased density—particularly the one concerning an R-1 zoned piece of land.
Why has it taken the land use dept over a month to provide a copy of my neighbor's permit application for a fence that blocks the sight line I created in my wall for safety reasons. I have waited **One Month to get**

a IPRA response re permit. Why is the LUD stonewalling? Why is the city attorney still trying to decide what to do--if the neighbor left out a significant fact or misrepresented on the permit (reason for needing fence) then the city can legitimately revoke the permit…

And how can you have a time for an appeal run when a person has no notification or way to be notified as in the city's issuance of a permit that can sit in its office for days if not weeks?

The city can easily revoke the neighbor's permit and require her to remove the fencing if she did not reveal the material fact that she was denied a permit for a fence that extended to the sidewalk in 2020-21 and had to set back 15 ft or she falsely alleges I destroyed my wall (I complied with the permit for removal of a small part of the wall 13 ft x approx. 34 inches)

It is also a public safety issue because anyone using my driveway or hers cannot see pedestrians or get a clear view of traffic…How come it is taking the city so long to "resolve this issue"??