

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

Case # 2025-10490-HDRB

Address – 815 E. Alameda St., Unit 8

Agent’s Name – William Kleinschmidt, Architect

Owner/Applicant’s Name – Nancy Abruzzo Holdings, LLC

THIS MATTER came before the Historic Districts Review Board (“Board”) for hearing on June 10, 2025.

BACKGROUND

The property at 815 E. Alameda St. is located across from the Santa Fe River Park, which is a recreational area with landscaping, picnic tables and a walking path, and has a lot of pedestrian traffic. The houses in the residential sector of Alameda Street range in style, with the most prominent styles being Spanish Pueblo Revival and Territorial. While there are two-story buildings, the majority are lower, single-story buildings with an average height on the streetscape of 12’5”. The street is lined with low yard walls with an average height of 54 inches (4’6”). The properties have a high density, with a zoning of R-21, which allows for up to 21 residences per acre. The yard walls are stuccoed concrete masonry units that are colored to match the corresponding building.

The 0.89-acre property that houses the Sangria Compound Condominiums is addressed as 815 and 817 E. Alameda St. The property is part of a phased Development Plan, which was amended most recently in 2025. Phase 3 is 0.38 acres, listed as 815 E. Alameda St., Unit 8. It is presently a vacant lot used as parking by the occupants of the other residences. Phases 1 and 2 are complete. This request is for Phase 3 of the development plan. The original structure on the property is a contributing two-story multifamily residence constructed in Territorial Revival style in 1949. That structure is now addressed as units 1A and 1B and is part of Phase 1 of the development plan.

The area of the lot designated for 815 E. Alameda St., Unit 8 was previously addressed as 817 E. Alameda St., Unit 8, as it was in Case # H-05-084-D. This case proposes the construction of the final building in the development plan. The HDRB approved the residence in March, 2006, however, the structure was not constructed at that time. All streetscape and courtyard walls and fences, hardscaping and exterior lighting were approved in previous Case # H-05-084-E. The yard walls were approved at 3-foot to 4-foot-high rear lot line walls, and coyote fences between 5 feet and 6 feet on May 9, 2006.

Due to the lapse of time since these approvals and changes in design, the Applicant is returning to the HDRB for approval of Phase 3. The Applicant proposes the following exterior alterations:

- 1) Construct a 2,204-square-foot, single-story residence to a height of 14’5” where the

maximum allowable height is 14'5". The residence is designed in a Spanish Pueblo Revival style with 3" to 4" bullnosed corners. Windows and doors will have rounded corners and will consist of wood units with metal cladding in either cream or light green with true divided lites. The residence will have skylights that will not be publicly visible. The residence will be stuccoed in synthetic stucco from La Habra, colored "Adobe" or "Viejo Suffolk". Exterior wood will be stained in semi-transparent medium-to-dark wood stains with clear sealer. An 882-square-foot portal with an exterior fireplace will be located on the south elevation.

- 2) Construct a yard wall to 6 feet high with an 8-foot-high gate enclosure where the allowable height is 4'6". An exception is requested to exceed the maximum allowable height. The fence will house two pedestrian gates, with one on the west and one on the south. The gates will be wood with frames in matte clear sealant or stained in medium-to-dark brown to match other wood details.
- 3) Install exterior lantern-type wall sconces in dark bronze or black under the portal, and simple cube-shaped downlight sconces in black on the exterior of the courtyard walls at each gate.
- 4) Install a 3-foot-high weathered steel planter along the exterior of the yard wall and building wall on the east side of the lot.

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. 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 had not been met for the 6-foot-high yard wall and gates, and recommended denial of this element. The Staff also recommended a finding that the 3-foot-high, publicly visible metal planter wall that extends across approximately half of the east façade does not comply with SFCC Section 14-5.2(E), Downtown and Eastside Historic Districts Standards, as metal does not simulate the appearance of adobe construction, and recommended denial of the metal planter. Otherwise, Staff recommended approval of the other elements of the application, as they comply with SFCC Sections 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 the requirements and general design standards set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(D), General Design Standards.
5. 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).

6. Under SFCC Sections 14-2.6(B-C), 14-5.2(A)(1), 14-5.2(C)(3)(a-b) and 14-5.2(C)(4), 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.

Yard Wall Height:

7. The Applicant proposes to construct a yard wall to 6 feet high with 8-foot-high gate enclosures where the allowable yard wall height is 4'6". See Item # 2 of the application.
8. Under SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(ii)(C), yard walls and fences shall be limited to a height that does not exceed the average of the height of other yard walls and fences in the streetscape, which is 4'6".
9. Staff determined that an exception to SFCC Section 14-5.2(D)(9)(c)(ii)(C) would be required for approval of Item # 2 in the application, and the Applicant requested an exception.
10. To obtain an exception, the Applicant was required to conclusively demonstrate that the six exception criteria set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c) have been met.
11. Based on the information set forth in the Staff Report and exhibits, and the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing, the Board agrees with Staff's determination that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all exception criteria have been met for construction of a yard wall higher than 4'6":
 - a. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(i), the Board finds that granting the exception would damage the character of the streetscape because it is not proportional to other yard walls on the streetscape, and this location is prominent in the Historic District;
 - b. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(ii), the Board finds that the exception is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public welfare;
 - c. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(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 has been no showing that the habitability of the new structure will be impaired by a yard wall that complies with the height standard;
 - d. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(iv), the Board finds that there are no special conditions or circumstances that are peculiar to the land or structure involved that are not applicable to other lands or structures in the streetscape; and
 - e. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(vi), the Board finds that granting the exception would not provide the least negative impact with respect to the purposes set forth in SFCC Section 14-5.2(A)(1) because the height of the yard wall is not consistent with the compound or the streetscape and will have a negative impact in this otherwise open area.
12. The Board finds that the Applicant has failed to conclusively demonstrate that all of the exception criteria have been met with respect to Item # 2 of the application.

Weathered Steel Planter:

13. The Applicant proposes to place a 3-foot-high weathered steel planter along the exterior

- of the yard and building walls on the east side of the lot. See Item # 4 of the application.
14. Under SFCC Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(e), Old Santa Fe Style buildings are made of adobe with mud plaster finish, and construction with masonry blocks, bricks or other materials with which the adobe effect can be simulated is permissible.
 15. Staff determined that an exception to SFCC Section 14-5.2(E)(1)(c) would be required for approval of Item # 4 in the application, as an architectural element of weathered steel is inconsistent with adobe/masonry construction. The Applicant requested an exception.
 16. 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.
 17. Based on the information set forth in the Staff Report and exhibits, and the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing, the Board agrees with Staff's finding that the Applicant has not conclusively demonstrated that all exception criteria have been met for the placement of a 3-foot-high weathered steel planter along the yard and building walls on the east side:
 - a. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(i), the Board finds that granting the exception would damage the character of the streetscape because exposed steel on a highly visible façade is inconsistent with the design standards for the Downtown and Eastside Historic District;
 - b. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(ii), the Board finds that the exception is not required to prevent a hardship to the Applicant or an injury to the public welfare, since a planter can be made of material which is consistent with the Historic Districts Code;
 - c. Pursuant to SFCC Section 14-5.2(C)(5)(c)(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 has been no showing that the habitability of the new structure will be impaired by a planter of some material other than steel.
 18. The Board finds that the Applicant has failed to conclusively demonstrate that all of the exception criteria have been met with respect to Item # 4 of the application.
 19. 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 for application Items # 1 and 3.
 20. 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 with response to application Items # 1 and 3, as described below.

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 Items # 1 and 3 as set forth in the application, as recommended by Staff.
3. The Board denies Items # 2 and 4 of the application, as recommended by Staff.
4. The Board denies the exceptions for Items # 2 and 4 requested in the application.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON THIS 28th DAY of April, 2026, BY THE HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE.

Cecilia Rios, Chair

Date

FILED:

Geraldyn Cardenas
City Clerk

Date

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Frank Ruybalid
Assistant City Attorney

Date