



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board  
Tuesday, February 28, 2023, at 7:00PM  
Virtual Meeting

**Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Members present: Elaine Hill (Co-Chair), Chris Jech (Co-Chair), Mary Lou Fragomeni-Nuttall, and Carol Maywood.

City Staff present: Jodie Brown (PDSD) and Wyatt Berger (PDSD).

Guests present: Caelin Norgord, Lu Griego, Paul Reimer, Jill Heater, and Aaron Heater.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 7:11 PM.

**2. Approval of Minutes/LAR: October 25, 2022**

*This item was heard out of order.*

A motion to approve the October 25, 2022, minutes was made by Fragomeni-Nuttall and seconded by Co-Chair Hill. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

**3. Reviews**

**a. HPZ 22-079/T22CM06756, 5259 East Fort Lowell Road**

Construction of a new single-family home and retention of existing ruins on the site.  
Full Review/Vacant Parcel/Estimated time: 30 minutes

*This item was heard out of order.*

The project was presented by the applicants, Caelin Norgord and Lu Griego.

Board members had several questions and comments about the project.

Which trees are being removed from the site?

- The dead trees on the site in addition to the trees where the residence is proposed will be removed. The trees by the adobe ruins will also be removed.

Why are steel bollards proposed?

- Bollards are proposed to protect the ruins from vehicles impacting the adobe ruins.

Are the bollards proposed only during construction?

- The bollards or other similar materials are permanent.

Are you proposing gravel in the driveway?

- No, brown quarter minus is proposed.

Can you provide a detail of the quarter minus?

- Yes, a detail can be provided with the next submittal.

Can you explain the purpose of the swale around the adobe ruins?

- The swales are intended to keep stormwater away from the ruins.

Are you adding the swales against the ruin, or are you recessing an area around the ruins?

- We are proposing to recess an area around the ruins.

Have you had an expert tell you to recess around the ruins?

- No, we have not consulted with an expert.

Are there exterior sills or lintels on the windows?

- No exterior sills or lintels are proposed.

Would you consider a lintel or a sill?

- No, it is not practical to provide exterior lintels.

What color is proposed for the aluminum clad windows?

- Bronze aluminum is proposed for the cladding.

What are the materials for the proposed canales/scuppers?

- Red clay tubing is proposed for these architectural elements.

Can you clarify the windows next to the double entry doors?

- These are openings into the courtyard and are not windows.

Is there a detail of the front door into the residence?

- No, a detail was not provided with the plans.

Board members were concerned that the removal of the trees would impact the ruins, and recommended consulting with an adobe expert to understand the impact of the tree removal. A Native Plant Preservation Plan was previously requested and not provided. A

pony wall was suggested by the board to obstruct the garage door from the streetscape. Board members also expressed concern about the drainage patterns on the site. The applicant clarified that drainage is directed to the northern portion of the site away from the ruins.

The clerestory windows depicted on the front elevation should be removed. The board indicated that they are not an element that is found in the neighborhood. The floor plan still does not explicitly show the recessing of the proposed windows. Additionally, details of the windows previously requested still need to be provided. Co-Chair Hill clarified that windows in the Fort Lowell Historic Preservation Zone typically have multiple lites and are double hung. Many examples of details provided are of projects outside of the Fort Lowell Historic Preservation Zone. The details provided also do not describe what is being proposed for this specific project. Circular tubing was proposed for the canales and scuppers was proposed but not recommended by board members.

There was additional discussion about the size and placement of the proposed windows on the front elevation. A triple-glass front entry door as proposed is incompatible with the design guidelines. Inconsistencies were noted between the narrative and plans regarding the materials of the proposed courtyard entrance gate. Elevations of the front and rear courtyards also need to be provided. Staff was directed to determine the egress requirements for the proposed windows. There were other inconsistencies between the statement of proposal and the submitted plans.

A motion was made by Co-Chair Hill to continue the project and requested the following: consultation with an adobe expert about the proposed swales and removal of trees around the adobe ruins; details of the colors and recessing of the windows; elevations of the front and rear courtyards; details of both the proposed front gate and front glass door; pictures demonstrating what is explicitly proposed rather than what could be proposed; pictures aligning with examples of contributing structures within the Fort Lowell Historic Preservation Zone, and if other examples are used, such examples are called out as not within the Zone; remove all examples of buildings across the street from the application; details of the scuppers and of the driveway; show a pony wall that obstructs the view of the garage door; eliminate the clerestory windows; and the size and height of the windows off grade. The motion was seconded by Jech. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

**b. SD-0223-00027/TC-RES-1222-01675, 5360 East Fort Lowell Road**

Construction of a new perimeter wall and landscaping remodel.

Full Review/Contributing Resource/Estimated time: 30 minutes

*This item was heard out of order.*

The project was presented by the applicant, Paul Reimer.

Board members had several questions and comments about the project.

Do the proposed front gates have handles?

- No handles nor rivets are proposed. Rope rap and a steel bar will be proposed.

Has engineering structurally reviewed the proposed opening in the existing wall?

- Not yet, but engineering review is anticipated.

Have you ever considered constructing a carport?

- Yes, but carports were thought to be avoided within the Historic Preservation Zone.

Is part of the proposed wall acting as a pool enclosure?

- Yes, a section of the wall is intended to be part of the pool enclosure and will meet code requirements.

Is there a fence along the east side of the property?

- Yes, there is an existing ocotillo fence.

Does the ocotillo fence come to the north side of the property?

- No, it only meets up to the existing wood fence perpendicular to the easternmost residence on the property.

Do we have comments for the landscape plan?

- No.

Are you willing to accept Bell's landscape comments into consideration?

- Yes, we will accept those written comments.

Board members expressed concern that the photographic examples provided are not within the Development Zone. There were additional concerns about the placement of the proposed wall in front of the existing wood fence, the obscuring of the east residence, and of wall height and a lack of variation. Co-Chair Hill suggested that the proposed wall be either pushed back ten feet, be lowered to four feet in height, or provide openings in the wall if it is to be six feet in height. Board members further recommended the proposed wall be varied in both height and location.

Fragomeni-Nuttall made a motion to approve the case with several conditions to provide more variations in the height and location of the proposed wall, to approve the gate as presented, and to allow the location of the wall to be constructed in front of the existing wood fence as depicted on the site plan. The motion was seconded by Maywood.

Co-Chair Hill amended the motion to approve the case with several conditions to keep the existing fence at its current location, to have the wall be four feet in height or constructed with openings, and to vary the height of the location of the proposed wall along the east property line. The motion failed to be seconded.

Fragomeni-Nuttall made a new motion to approve the case with additional conditions to provide more variation in both wall height and wall location along the west property line rather than east, to approve the proposed gate as presented, to allow the wall to be constructed in front of the existing wood fence, and to ensure the proposed pony wall also varies in height. The motion was seconded by Maywood. The motion passed with a vote of 3-1.

After the motion was passed, staff clarified to the applicant that the board will be making a recommendation to the Plans Review Subcommittee, and that it is strongly encouraged to discuss the proposed landscaping with Bell.

**4. Fort Lowell Historic Zone Inventory Discussion**

The discussion was rescheduled for the next regular meeting date.

**5. Call to the Audience**

None.

**6. Staff Updates**

Staff informed the board members that a volunteer from the board is needed to conduct a minor historic review for a solar project. Staff will continue to contact the City Clerk's Office to confirm the nomination of David Pietz to the board. Wyatt Berger will continue to attend future meetings and provide future agendas.

**7. Future Agenda Items—Information Only**

Staff will reach out to board members if a special meeting for HPZ 22-079 is requested by the applicant.

**8. Adjournment**

Fragomeni-Nuttall made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Hill. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0. Co-Chair Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:52 PM.