City of Santa Fe
Historic Districts Review Board
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Case # 2025-11246-HDRB
Address – 532 Calle Corvo
Agent's Name – John A. Padilla, AIA
Owner/Applicant's Name – Susan McShane Salomone

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board ("Board") for hearing on February 10, 2026.

BACKGROUND

The single-family residence at 532 Calle Corvo has a contributing status to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. The house was built on a 0.16-acre lot in 1952 and totals 1,638 square feet of roofed area with a 362-square-foot detached garage. The residential structure and garage are designed in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style, as observed by the construction material, recessed doors and windows, flat roof and rounded parapets. The Calle Corvo streetscape consists of a mix of Spanish Pueblo Revival and Territorial architectural designed houses constructed from the 1930s to 1950s. They are generally built of adobe block, wooden vigas, wood frame and concrete masonry block with low stucco yard walls. Common architectural elements include but are not limited to rounded parapets, brick coping, bullnosed corners, wrought-iron elements, recessed picture and divided-lite windows. Most of the structures in the streetscape are one-story with occasional two-story structures. The house and garage at 532 Calle Corvo are consistent with the size and configuration of the other structures on this street.

In a hearing September 23, 2025, the Board upgraded the main residential structure, garage and south lot-line yard wall from non-contributing status to contributing. See Case # 2025-11108-HDRB. The Board designated the east elevations of the main residence and garage as the primary façades. The Board considered a Historic Cultural Property Inventory by Historian John Murphey which identified several modifications and alterations from 1958 to 1966, including a bedroom addition, covered portal, and laundry room. According to the HCPI, around 2015 the front façade was modestly reworked, with the original 1950s faux wrought-iron porch supports replaced with rustic, stained wood posts and beams in a retrofit Old Santa Fe Style. Murphey noted that the building has retained its form since 1966, and, for these reasons, he recommended it for contributing status. As for the garage, minimal changes have occurred.

At this hearing, the Applicant requests Board approval of the following items:

Main House:

1) Removal of the existing non-historic front door of the residence and replacement with a new wood door in the existing opening.
2) Removal of existing non-historic windows in the residence and replacement with exterior metal-clad wood windows in the existing openings with the exception to one window on

the primary facade which the applicant proposes to narrow the historic window opening, from 4'7" wide by 4'4" high, to 4'7" wide by 3'2" high. This requires an exception to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i), which prohibits the widening or narrowing of window openings on the primary façades of contributing structures. Color to be Hemlock Green by Sierra Pacific Windows.

3) Removal of the existing 193-square-foot covered patio from the master bedroom and bedroom # 2 on the west elevation.
4) Addition of a new family room, bedroom # 2 and portal on the west elevation for a total proposed area of 620 square feet, for a net addition to the historic footprint of 421 square feet. This addition is less than 50 percent of the main residence historic footprint.
5) Addition of a new 5-foot-tall concrete masonry stuccoed (CMU) yard wall with a 3-foot single-swing gate along the north property line from the new bedroom # 2 to the renovated existing garage's east façade.

Garage:

6) Renovation of the existing garage into a new bedroom within the historic footprint of 362 square feet of the garage.
7) Addition to the existing garage of a portal, entry area, closets and a bathroom for a total added area of 518 square feet. This exceeds 50 percent of the historic footprint of the garage and will be within 10 feet of the primary, east façade, requiring exceptions to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d), which:
    - Prohibits additions exceeding 50 percent of the historic footprint of a contributing structure;
    - Prohibits additions exceeding 50 percent of the existing dimension of the primary façade of a contributing structure; and
    - Prohibits additions to the side of the existing footprint of a contributing structure unless the addition is set back a minimum of 10 feet from the primary façade.
8) Removal of the non-historic, tilting garage door from the east façade, but preserving the existing opening, allowing the opening to read as a historic opening.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After conducting a public hearing and having heard from the Applicant and all interested persons, the Board hereby FINDS, as follows:

1. The Land Use Department Staff conducted a preliminary zoning review ("PZR") and determined that the application appears to meet the underlying zoning standards set forth in the Santa Fe City Code ("SFCC").
2. Historic Preservation Division Staff reviewed the application and related materials and information submitted by the Applicant for conformity with applicable SFCC requirements and provided the Board with a written report of its findings ("Staff Report"), which evaluates the factors relevant to the application.
3. Historic Preservation Division Staff Recommendation: Staff recommended a finding that the exception criteria to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) have not been met for the proposed alterations to the garage, but the Board may find that they have upon further testimony from the applicant. Otherwise, staff recommended approval of the exception

request for SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) to reduce a window opening on the primary façade, and the other proposed alterations that do not require an exception, as they comply with SFCC Section 14-5.2(D), General Design Standards for all Historic Districts, and 14-5.2(E), Downtown and Eastside Design Standards.

4. The project is subject to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C), Regulation of Significant and Contributing Structures.
5. The project is subject to the requirements and general design standards set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(D), General Design Standards.
6. The property is located in the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and is subject to the district design standards set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(E).
7. Under SFCC Sections 14-2.6(B)-(C), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(2)(a-d & f), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a-b), 14-5.2(C)(4), and 14-5.2(D), the Board has authority to review, approve, with or without conditions, or deny, all or some of the Applicant's proposed design to assure overall compliance with applicable design standards.

Reduction of Window Opening on Primary, East Façade:

8. Under SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i), no window opening on the primary façade of a contributing structure shall be widened or narrowed.
9. The Applicant proposes to reduce the size of a historic window opening on the primary façade from 4'7" wide by 4'4" high to 4'7" wide by 3'2" high. The Staff determined that an exception to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) would be required for approval of this item (# 2, reduction of window fenestration), and the Applicant requested the exception.
10. To obtain an exception, the Applicant was required to conclusively demonstrate that the three exception criteria set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b) have been met.
11. Based on the information set forth in the Staff Report, and the exhibits, evidence and testimony presented at the hearing, the Board finds that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all exception criteria have been met:
    a. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(i), the Board finds that granting the exception would damage the character of the district because the proposed reduction of the historic window opening would adversely impact the highly visible, street-facing façade of the structure and compromise its contributing status contrary to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(b);
    b. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(ii), the Board finds that the exception is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public welfare because there is no demonstrated hardship to the occupants of the house from the window opening in its present configuration; and
    c. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(iii), the Board finds that granting the exception would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts because there is no persuasive evidence that the habitability of the structure is impaired by the present window configuration.
12. The Board finds the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all the exception criteria have been met for reduction of the window opening on the east, primary façade.

Garage Addition Exceeding 50 Percent of Footprint and Primary Façade:

13. Under SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d), an addition to a contributing structure shall not

exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the existing footprint, nor shall it exceed 50 percent of the existing dimension of the primary façade.

14. The Applicant proposes to construct a 518-square-foot addition to the 362-square-foot garage, a contributing structure. The addition would exceed 50 percent of the square footage of the existing footprint and exceed 50 percent of the existing dimension of the primary, east façade. The Staff determined that exceptions to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(5)(a)(i) would be required for approval of this element (# 7) of the application, and the Applicant requested the exceptions.
15. To obtain an exception, the Applicant was required to conclusively demonstrate that the three exception criteria set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b) have been met.
16. Based on the information set forth in the Staff Report and exhibits, and the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing, the Board finds that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all exception criteria have been met:
    a. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(i), the Board finds that granting the exception would damage the character of the district because the proposed 518-square-foot addition more than doubles the size of the garage and changes the character of the building, threatening its contributing status, contrary to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(b);
    b. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(ii), the Board finds that the exception is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public welfare because there is no persuasive evidence that the garage in its existing configuration creates a hardship to the property owner;
    c. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(iii), the Board finds that granting the exception would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts because there is no evidence that the same purposes could not be served by a smaller or less prominent addition.
17. The Board finds that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all of the exception criteria have been met for creating an addition to the garage that exceeds 50 percent of its existing, historic footprint or that exceeds 50 percent of the existing dimension of the primary façade.

Garage Addition Within 10 Feet of Primary Façade:

18. Under SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d), additions are not permitted to the side of the existing footprint of a contributing structure unless the addition is set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary façade.
19. The Applicant proposes to construct a 518-square-foot addition to the garage, which would attach to the south elevation at a point less than 10 feet from the primary, east façade. The Staff determined that an exception to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d) would be required for approval of this element (# 7) of the application, and the Applicant requested the exception.
20. To obtain an exception, the Applicant was required to conclusively demonstrate that the three exception criteria set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b) have been met.
21. Based on the information set forth in the Staff Report, and the exhibits, evidence and testimony presented at the hearing, the Board finds that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all exception criteria have been met:

a. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(i), the Board finds that granting the exception would damage the character of the district because the proposed design more than doubles the dimension of the east, primary elevation, it would be the most prominent massing, and it would threaten the contributing status of the garage, contrary to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(1)(b);
b. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(ii), the Board finds that the exception is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public welfare because there is no persuasive evidence that the property owner suffers a hardship from the existing configuration of the garage or would suffer a hardship from an addition set back 10 feet or more from the primary façade of the garage;
c. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(b)(iii), the Board finds that granting the exception would not strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the City by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the Historic Districts because there is no persuasive evidence that the habitability of the structure would be impaired by an addition that attaches to the garage 10 feet or more from the primary façade.

22. The Board finds that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all of the exception criteria have been met for placement of an addition to the garage that is set back less than 10 feet from the east, primary façade.

23. The information contained in the Staff Report and exhibits, and the testimony and evidence submitted at the hearing, establishes that all applicable requirements for Board review as herein described have been met.
24. The information contained in the Staff Report and exhibits, and the testimony and evidence submitted at the hearing, establishes that all applicable design criteria have been met for the project elements approved by the Board (#s 1, 3-6 and 8).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Under the circumstances and given the evidence and testimony submitted during the hearing, the Board acted upon the application as follows:

1. The Board has the authority to review and approve the application.
2. The Board approves project elements # 1, 3-6 and 8 as set forth in the application, as recommended by Staff.
3. The Board denies Items # 2 and 7 as set forth in the application.
4. The Board denies the exceptions requested in the application.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 27th DAY of OCTOBER, 2026, BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

_____ _____
Cecilia Rios, Chair Date

FILED:

_____ _____

Geralyn Cardenas
City Clerk

Date

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____

Frank Ruybalid
Assistant City Attorney

_____

Date