



# Agenda

DATE 4/26/18 TIME 4:15p  
PREPARED BY JM Culligan  
REVIEWED BY SS8888

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, May 15, 2018 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1<sup>st</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 15, 2018 at 6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

\*\*\*AMENDED\*\*\*

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Case #H-17-098A: Decide on Motions to rescind the Historic Districts Review Board decisions on April 24, 2018 to designate the historic status of contributing to the residential structures of 122 Camino Santiago, 125 Camino Santiago and 126 Camino Santiago in Plaza del Monte, in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

## G. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-17-098A, 101 – 123 and 125 - 126 Camino Santiago and 104 – 120 Camino Matias, Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for 22 contributing, non-contributing, and non-statused residential structures. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-17-098B, 122, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago, Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests demolition of the structures and associated yardwalls. (David Rasch)

## H. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check [http://www.santafenm.gov/historic\\_districts\\_review\\_board\\_hearing\\_packets](http://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board_hearing_packets) for more information regarding cases on this agenda. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.



# Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4/26/18 TIME 3:20 PM

SERVED BY M. C. Kelly

RECEIVED BY Melanie Byn

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, May 15, 2018 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 1<sup>st</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

## HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, May 15, 2018 at 6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

1. Case #H-17-098A: Consider Motions to rescind the Historic Districts Review Board decisions on April 24, 2018 to designate the historic status of contributing to the residential structures of 122 Camino Santiago; 125 Camino Santiago and 126 Camino Santiago in Plaza del Monte, in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

## G. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-17-098A. 101 – 123 and 125 - 126 Camino Santiago and 104 – 120 Camino Matias. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for 22 contributing, non-contributing, and non-stated residential structures. (David Rasch)
2. Case #H-17-098B. 122, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests demolition of the structures and associated yardwalls. (David Rasch)

## H. ADJOURNMENT

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 or check [http://www.santafenm.gov/historic\\_districts\\_review\\_board\\_hearing\\_packets](http://www.santafenm.gov/historic_districts_review_board_hearing_packets) for more information regarding cases on this agenda. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the Historic Preservation Division office at (505) 955-6605 five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
May 15, 2018

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
B. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	1
D. Business from the Floor	None	2
E. Communications	None	2
F. Matters from the Board		
1. <b><u>Case #H-17-098A: Decide on Motions</u></b>	Rescinded previous motions	2-6
Executive Session [Not on the Agenda]	Discussed in Closed Session	8-11
G. Action Items		
1. <b><u>Case #H-17-098A.</u></b> 101 – 123 and 125 - 126 Camino Santiago and 104 – 120 Camino Matias	Postponed with directions	12-13
2. <b><u>Case #H-17-098B.</u></b> 122, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago	Postponed	11-12
I. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:03 p.m.	13

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FE**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
**May 15, 2018**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair, on the above date at approximately 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Cecilia Rios, Chair  
Mr. Frank Katz, Vice Chair  
Ms. Meghan Bayer  
Ms. Jennifer Biedscheid  
Mr. Edmund Boniface  
Mr. William Powell  
Mr. Buddy Roybal

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Planner Supervisor  
Ms. Theresa Gheen, Assistant City Attorney  
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

**NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department and available on the City of Santa Fe web site.**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION: Member Roybal moved, seconded by Member Boniface, to approve the agenda as presented.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, Powell and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

#### **D. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR**

There were no matters from the Floor.

#### **E. COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no communications.

#### **F. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

1. **Case #H-17-098A: Decide on Motions to rescind the Historic Districts Review Board decisions on April 24, 2018 to designate the historic status of contributing to the residential structures of 122 Camino Santiago, 125 Camino Santiago and 126 Camino Santiago in Plaza del Monte, in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District.**

Member Katz noted his intent to make a motion to rescind three actions that had been passed on April 24 concerning 122, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. When the Applicant came forward with a Request to Demolish last fall, the Board had determined the need for a status evaluation of all the structures in Plaza del Monte. The Board took no action and the Applicant received a report from John Murphy on the buildings in Plaza del Monte.

When the matter resurfaced on April 24, due to time restraints he had suggested the Board deal with the five structures in question for demolition and consider the others later. He now thought that decision was wrong because the Plaza structures all relate to each other. That was the reason the Board wanted a report on all of the structures.

Member Katz said they do need to look at the Plaza as a whole and one way to do that is to rescind the motion. In addition, he had concerns about the eligibility because the code states, "*approximately 50 years*". There has been some dispute as to whether the structures are close to 50 years and what the City Attorney's position is on the meaning of the code.

Member Katz continued now there is additional information in a February 1969 photograph making it clear some structures were not constructed then and are not 49 years old.

Finally, his concern is that if the Board gives contributing status to buildings that do not qualify in the code, there will be an appeal, and this would go to City Council and the Board's credibility will be in question.

He thought Plaza del Monte a valuable place many would want to preserve, and he wants should this go forward, what is sent by the Board to City Council to be as strong as possible.

**MOTION: Member Katz moved to rescind the three motions/votes made to upgrade the status of 122, 125 and 126 Camino Santiago to contributing structures. Member Roybal seconded the motion.**

Member Powell noted this might need to be brought up with the Applicant. The Board had been informed at the last hearing the aerial photograph was the only aerial, but he had concerns. He looked up the Applicant's building which was constructed in 1968. Building 125 was also a 1968 construction date and if based on age the County Assessor's date would be accurate.

Chair Rios reminded the Board the definition of contributing is based not only on age, but if structures are approximately 50 years or older if the structures establish and maintain the character of the historic district.

Member Powell asked if appropriate to pass around an independent survey.

City Attorney Gheen counseled it is outside the role of quasi-judicial board members to do an independent investigation of facts and she would counsel they not do that.

Member Katz suggested getting the information into evidence by asking Staff the question.

Member Powell pointed out it is a one-sided conversation when the Applicant hires someone, and the Board was not always able to get all of the information and when they can find information they cannot present it. He asked who was looking at the counterpoint and doing research on the other side. Staff does not have the time the Board is not allowed, and the public does not have the resources or time.

He said they are taking things presented at face value by the Applicant. He asked Staff if they had looked at the County Assessor's website regarding the date of the buildings.

Mr. Rasch suggested if the Board did not have sufficient information to take action they should postpone requesting that action.

Member Powell moved to postpone the request until the Board has complete information.

Chair Rios noted that a motion was already on the floor. The Board is discussing the motion to rescind and she asked if there was further discussion.

Ms. Gheen explained that while there is a motion to rescind on the table, a motion to postpone cannot be considered.

Chair Rios explained she had corrected that and member Katz was aware.

Member Biedscheid questioned the logic for the motion to be limited to three structures when the action was taken on five structures and if the logic is to consider all of the structures (26), then why they would not rescind the entire action.

Member Katz accepted that as a friendly amendment.

The stenographer addressed the motion noting that the motion did not pass in regard to 124 and the garages behind the 126 structure..

Chair Rios interpreted what Member Biedscheid was saying was that all of the structures should be considered. She reviewed the actions taken on the five: 122 was classified, after discussion, as contributing and 124 was not contributing, 125 Camino Santiago was contributing and the house for 126 is contributing but the garage is non-contributing. She suggested if they were going to rescind they should rescind all of the structures.

The City Attorney provided direction to the Board. The Board would simply need a majority of the quorum to approve a motion to rescind if notice had been given and it had been noticed for the three motions that decided the contributing status for the three structures.

She continued there had been no notice, in other words in this case, the remaining two structures were found non-contributing - then the majority of the entire board or two thirds of the Board quorum, whichever is less, would be required for approval of the motion to rescind.

For this case, if the majority of the Board were to approve the motion to rescind all of the motions for all five structures, that would suffice.

Member Powell said he could not understand what the Board had done for two hours if they were going to rescind this and why they are showing up if that is the case.

Member Katz asked why the Board would have asked for a survey of all of the houses if they were not going to discuss the entire community.

He responded to a comment that was inaudible that it was unfortunately his suggestion and the focus was on the five structures, but they did not discuss the entire project and they should have.

Member Powell said we had a large caseload that night and in addition to this, there is a special session they are here now to do. He was unsure why there was a need to revisit this, especially in the light of recent things. He suggested if they plan to re-discuss this, then all of the facts should be brought to the Board.

Member Biedscheid suggested if the goal was to consider these in context to the larger compound, they could go through their agenda and consider the status of the five following that discussion.

Member Katz thought it better to have all of the structures in front of the Board and there are issues on time and it would reflect their credibility with the Governing Body.

Member Powell disagreed. They are a preservation board and they make tough decisions and if City Council makes a different decision that would be on them. The HDRB has done their job and they should not try to second-guess what the Council may or may not do.

Member Katz replied he was not second-guessing and as a lawyer who was the City's Attorney for four years and understands the code – 48 years is not *approximately* 50 years. If members are not satisfied with the information they have, they should get more, and they need to have the best facts they can get. He found the aerial photograph from February 1969 to be strong evidence.

Member Powell questioned if it was the first or second photograph.

Member Katz noted it was the second one because the DOT told the Applicant that the first photo that cut off the western portion was all they had. But it turned out they had more. That is additional information and why he would like to look at it.

Member Biedscheid indicated she was still not clear on the 50-year interpretation and needs to understand if the dates for 122 and 125 are as verified in the HCPI report or questionable. Secondly, if they are dated 1970/1971 then are the dates not within approximately 50 years?

Mr. Rasch clarified the ordinance clearly states, "approximately 50 years old". The Land Use Staff realized they need standard and a gloss. He asked the City Attorney to make an interpretation on the meaning of "approximately 50 years" and the City Attorney determined the applicable gloss to be 49.5 years. Staff accepted that and has been operating with that since.

He indicated Ms. Gheen made a good point the last time when she said this is the information they are giving and it could be used however the Board sees fit. But 49.5 years has been the practice of the Staff.

Chair Rios pointed out the Board's charge is to uphold the ordinance, but members may have different interpretations. She suggested because of the number of cases on the agenda, they proceed with the motion because it would provide opportunity to see if something was missed or should be included.

She called for the vote of the motion to rescind all five cases.

Member Biedscheid indicated there was no question about 126 and she was unsure why they would rescind that.

Chair Rios clarified again, it is not only the age used to determine contributing. Structure 122 is 47 years; 124 is 50 years; 125 is 48 years; 126 is 50 years and the garages are 1977 or less than fifty.

Member Katz clarified the motion is for the demolition of the other two cases. The Board did not successfully pass a motion regarding the status of 122 and the garages but passed the motion to allow the demolition.

Member Katz clarified his motion to rescind the three cases where status was given; 122, 125 and 126 and the two structures agreed would be demolished - 124 and the garages.

Member Biedscheid recalled giving status to those first and that was the reason they moved forward with demolition. They had to give the others status as contributing because they required an exception.



Chair Rios read from her notes: 122 is contributing; 124 is not contributing; 125 and 126 are contributing but 126 garages are not contributing.

Member Katz said the motion that passed was to keep it noncontributing.

Member Biedscheid said they were two separate actions - designated as noncontributing and subsequently allowed to be demolished.

Member Katz confirmed his motion was to rescind all five (status and demolition) and discuss those with the other cases.

**VOTE: The motion passed by a majority (4-2) show of hands in favor. Member Bayer and Member Powell voted against.**

Chair Rios noted there were now 27 cases before them and each should be given due process. She asked how the Board wanted to proceed.

Ms. Gheen asked to clarify the motion.

Member Katz replied the motion included all of the stages and the demolition of all five structures.

He suggested taking evidence on all of the structures and then have public comments and at that time he would make a motion to hold the Board deliberations in a closed session as a judicial process as permitted by the Open Meetings Act (OMA).

Chair Rios questioned whether it is permissible to meet in a closed session and recalled in her tenure on the Board there had never been a closed session. She asked Legal for confirmation.

Ms. Gheen explained that the Land Use Department, in conjunction with the City Attorney's office, had determined the City code does not favor closed deliberations such as the Board was considering.

Ms. Gheen counseled against having closed deliberations. She continued that even if the OMA allowed such deliberation, the Code says the public should be able to listen to the deliberations and that was her reason to counsel the Board against closed deliberations.

Member Katz asked where that was stated in the code and why Land Use had weighed in on a legal question.

Ms. Gheen responded that the Land Use Department has jurisdiction to interpret the code. In addition, the City Attorney is in alignment with that reasoning, but she would not go into the matter to preserve attorney-client privilege.

Chair Rios recalled that ordinances encourage public comment and deliberations that include the public.

Member Katz replied the public is not included in operations. The Board of County Commissioners went into closed executive session for deliberation on the truck stop and had no problems doing that. City Council can go into executive session and the Board is doing the same things being done by City Council.

He said the Board was not making a recommendation to City Council, they are determining the property rights of the owner and that person is entitled to due process and what a quasi-judicial hearing is about. That is the difference between a legislative and a quasi-judicial and allows them to go into closed session.

Ms. Gheen stated as the Assistant City Attorney representing the City, she disagreed with Member Katz's interpretation. She counseled the Board not to have a closed deliberation.

Chair Rios said the Applicant had suggested that five of the 27 cases in the summary be Contributing. She asked the Board their thoughts on listening to those five cases.

Ms. Gheen replied to raise the Board's awareness, the five motions for the two cases for status and demolition did pass but no action can be taken until notice is given for the five properties and the five properties in the motion to rescind cannot be decided on new evidence.

The Board might decide without hearing new evidence but if they want to hear new evidence it must be properly noticed with at least 15 days' notice.

Member Katz suggested crossing the bridge when they get to it and if they need more evidence they can then postpone and get the evidence and determine the questions they want to ask.

Chair Rios asked Ms. Gheen if it is appropriate for the public to speak at this time.

Ms. Gheen clarified that the Board was considering how to hear the evidence regarding the cases.

Chair Rios replied it would be those five cases *and* everything else, but she was not clear whether they would hear one case at a time, or how they would go about this.

She indicated Member Katz had stated his opinion, but she had not heard from other members.

Member Biedscheid stated she was in favor to rescind and preferred hearing all of the cases together and making a decision in the same hearing without postponing any part. She thought actions should not be taken on the others without knowing if new evidence was needed and to be in a position where they have voted on everything but the five and then that had to be postponed.

Member Roybal pointed out some properties like Lot 105 should be looked at first that do not meet criteria. He asked if those could be put in blocks.

Chair Rios suggested they first review all of the cases suggested by the Applicant as contributing, then cases that are older and the cases in question of being less than 50 years. Or they could just go down the line 102, 103, etc.

Member Powell questioned if they were still considering a closed deliberation and if so, they should be discussing this at that time.

**MOTION: Member Katz moved to go into a closed deliberation of the evidence after the cases have been discussed. Member Powell seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by majority (5-1) voting in favor of the motion and Member Roybal voting against.**

Chair Rios asked if the City Attorney wanted to comment.

Ms. Gheen replied she is not on the Board and does not decide for them, she simply provides legal counsel.

Mr. Karl Sommer asked for the opportunity to comment. He stated his understanding was that the Board would not decide the application this evening because it was not properly noticed. But they were going to deliberate on something the Applicant had not even asked for.

He said the Applicant did not ask for any status reviews on the 22 cases the Board would be hearing. The request was for action on five structures the Board acted on that they will not be acting on tonight. He was concerned about the Board planning to act on an application that had not been made.

Secondly, the Board is going to deliberate a case that the Applicant has not filed, and the Board rescinded a case that they would not act on that night.

Mr. Sommer expressed concern that that is not a fair process and exceeds the Board's authority to legally undertake that process. The rescission is based on considering the five cases on new evidence that would not be heard because it was not noticed properly. And the Board would take evidence that deals with the entire compound and not decide what the Applicant asked but deliberate 22 cases the Applicant has not asked for.

Mr. Sommer said that is fundamentally unfair to the Applicant and violates his right to a fair hearing. He objected to that process.

Member Katz said his understanding is that the Applicant did not ask for the status review, the Board did and that is acceptable. The Board is hearing the Board's request for a status review of all of the structures.

He added that he did not know if the additional evidence would be needed or not and if they do need that, they would postpone those.

Chair Rios agreed. The Applicant or the Board could request a status review as well as Staff.

Mr. Sommer responded that the Board is entitled to ask for a status review on buildings that can affect the application. They are not allowed to ask for a status review on a building the Applicant does not intend to do anything with. The Board does not have that authority.

Member Powell asked to confirm a recent request by the Board to look at a status review to determine status for something they had no application on. He said the Board does have that authority.

Mr. Rasch read the code, section 14-5.2 C-2 - Designation of Significant Contributing or Non-contributing Status within Historic Districts - 2b: *"The Board is authorized to change the status of the structure to designate a status or a structure with no status designated. A change in status or the designation of a status should be based on an evaluation of data provided through survey or other relevant sources of information and the definitions of significant contributing and noncontributing."*

He continued reading 2c - Initiation of Review of Status Designation: *The Board may review the status designation response to the following: i.) an application for construction or demolition in this section, ii.) a request by the property owner, or iii.) by the City.*

Mr. Rasch stated it appeared the Board does have the right to ask for a status review whether the owner does or not.

Chair Rios confirmed that whether the applicant indicated they would touch certain buildings, the Board at the authority to request a status review, including those indicated by the Applicant that they would not do anything with.

Mr. Sommer noted the Board has a right to initiate their own status review, but that is not what they did. In response to the filed application the Board has said they will not consider the application until a study is done on the entire property.

That provision of the ordinance states the Board could initiate a status review and the City of Santa Fe will pay for that, but that has not happened. That is the section Mr. Rasch just quoted.

This is beyond the Board's authority and the Board cannot go around town asking people to do studies on property because the Board wants that. When the Board is asked to do something on property they can request a status review, but that is not what happened in this case. That is not within the authority of the provision quoted by Mr. Rasch.

And now the Board is not dealing with the properties asked for by the Applicant – that has been rescinded. The process has become unreasonably expensive, time-consuming and unfair to the Applicant. Here they are a year or so after the application and nothing has been done.

Chair Rios explained the Board can move forward with those cases this evening if there is no new evidence presented.

Mr. Sommer pointed out that the cases had been rescinded and the Board is not taking new information and cannot act on the cases because they have not been noticed.

He asked to lodge his objection to the Board and said the process the Board is following has done a great disservice to both the Board and the Applicant.

Ms. Gheen was asked by Chair Rios to comment on Mr. Sommer's remarks. She explained Robert's Rules of Order allows the motion to rescind which takes away the prior action and puts the Board into the position before the action was taken. That means that hearing the evidence has been closed and the Board can take new action.

She could not understand Mr. Sommer's remarks about how this would violate the OMA.

Mr. Sommer replied there has not been notice for a meeting to take action on the Application filed by the Applicant tonight. The Board apparently will take action on 22 cases that the Applicant has not asked anything for and has held up their Application, which is specific to what the Applicant wants to do.

This has not been properly noticed.

Ms. Gheen pointed out the action to rescind has been properly noticed. The agenda states for Action Item #2 the demolition regarding the three structures would be considered for action. She did not see a problem.

The Board has the authority to make a new motion on those cases because the motion to rescind was approved. She clarified that the Board could not base their decision for the five properties on *new* evidence.

**MOTION: Member Katz moved to go into closed session deliberations to discuss the five structures; 122, 124, 125, 126 and the garages behind 126 of Camino Santiago. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by majority (4-2) roll call vote with Members Bayer, Katz, Biedscheid and Powell voting in favor and Member Roybal and Member Boniface voting against.**

Mr. Roybal asked to voice his concern. He said Chair Rios stated in her 28 years that this had never happened, and the Board is making case history and he was not feeling good about that.

Mr. Sommer spoke but was inaudible.

Member Katz replied 10-15-1 H3 is for deliberations in a quasi-judicial proceeding.

Ms. Gheen said as the Assistant City Attorney she would again state that she is counseling the Board *not* to go into deliberations because the Land Use Department and the City Attorney's Office found the City Code provides for the public to listen to the deliberations of the Board.

Member Katz remarked that is simply untrue; unless Ms. Gheen wanted to quote where code provides that. It does not.

Ms. Gheen quoted from section 14-2.8 D: *Regular meetings shall be held at least once a month unless there are no agenda items and at such other times as the chair may determine. Except as otherwise provided by the Constitution of New Mexico, the Open Meetings Act, or city ordinance all meetings shall be public meetings; all persons so desiring shall be allowed to attend and listen to the deliberations and proceedings; and public comment at the meetings shall be encouraged.*

Member Katz stated except as provided by the Constitution for the due process clause and the Open Meetings Act which allows for closed sessions in deliberations in quasi-judicial matters.

Chair Rios said to Ms. Gheen that she had stated her opinion.

Ms. Gheen corrected Chair Rios – she had stated the opinion of the Land Use Department and the City Attorney's Office that is aligned with code.

Chair Rios agreed. She said Ms. Gheen also stated earlier that the Board could make decisions different than what Legal had advised.

Ms. Gheen replied she only provides legal counsel. The Board can make their own decisions.

Mr. Sommer asked Chair Rios to keep a record of those in the deliberation because generally Staff was not allowed except for the City Attorney.

[Ms. Gheen did not go into the closed session with the Board.]

The Board members went into closed session at 6:54 p.m.

The Board members began returning to Chambers at 7:50 p.m.

Chair Rios reconvened the open meeting at 7:54 pm. Ms. Chair Rios announced the discussion was limited to the following five cases requested for demolition: 122, 124, 125, 126 including the garages at 126 Camino Santiago.

**MOTION: Member Biedscheid moved to reconvene open session. Member Katz seconded the motion that passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **G. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Case #H-17-098A. 101 – 123 and 125 - 126 Camino Santiago and 104 – 120 Camino Matias. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests historic status reviews with primary elevation(s) designation, if applicable, for 22 contributing, non-contributing, and non-statused residential structures. (David Rasch)**

**2. Case #H-17-098B. 122, 125, and 126 Camino Santiago. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Lloyd and Associates, agent for Plaza del Monte LLC, owners, requests demolition of the structures and associated yardwalls. (David Rasch)**

**MOTION: Member Powell moved to postpone Case #H-17-098B and request further information that includes the County Assessor's results on the four properties, including the dates. Member Biedscheid seconded the motion and added a friendly amendment to include the 1988 Appraisers Report summarized in the addendum to the HCPI forms and an iPhone image referenced in the April 24 hearing, as well as a copy of the full Appraisers Report.**

She found the dates significantly different and wanted the basis for the 1988 appraisal dates.

**Member Bayer requested a friendly amendment regarding the special assessor information about the dates of construction to invite someone from the County Assessor's office to provide testimony because of the discrepancies of the data and the report. In addition, someone from the Menaul Historical Library that has archives related to the buildings should be invited.**

She thought Staff would be appropriate to extend an invitation to the County and the Menaul Library representatives to attend the meeting.

**Member Powell accepted the friendly amendments.**

Chair Rios asked if the postponement had been made to a date certain.

Mr. Rasch was uncertain how quickly he could get the evidence from the Library and the County Assessor.

Chair Rios confirmed the motion was to postpone Case #H-17-098B until the information being requested from the County Assessor's office on the date of construction, the 1988 Appraiser's Report and the information from the Menaul Library could be obtained.

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous (6-0) voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, Powell and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

Member Katz added in regard to the other buildings and in light of Mr. Sommer's comments, he believes it was the Board who requested the information.

**MOTION: Member Katz moved to postpone H-17-098A to a date to be determined regarding the status of the other buildings. Member Katz seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous voice vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, Powell and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

Chair Rios thanked everyone for attending and they would see them again when they receive the information and in reference to the 22 cases the date was indefinite.

Mr. Lloyd asked about a date for this postponement to be heard. However, many people were speaking, making it impossible to hear anything.

Ms. Betty Kersting thought the Santa Fe First Presbyterian Church would have more archives than the Menaul Historical Library.

Ms. Gheen suggested a motion to amend the prior action.

**MOTION: Member Biedscheid moved to approve amending the previous motion made on Case #H-17-098A. Member Boniface seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, Powell and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

**MOTION: Member Biedscheid moved that the request for a representative from the Menaul Historical Library be extended to include a representative from the Santa Fe First Presbyterian Church archive and that representatives be invited to provide testimony at the next hearing. Member Katz seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion passed by unanimous vote with Members Bayer, Biedscheid, Boniface, Katz, Powell and Roybal voting in favor and none voting against.**

Chair Rios asked about those who would attend the preservation awards on Thursday.

Member Katz thought he would be present but did not know when he would arrive. Member Boniface would be presenting the Manderfield and Sara Melton Awards.

#### **H. ADJOURNMENT**

**Member Katz moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Roybal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

**The Meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:03 p.m.**

Approved by:

  
Cecilia Rios, Chair

Submitted by:

  
Carl G. Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.