



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, June 27, 2023, at 7:00PM
Hybrid Meeting

Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Members present: Elaine Hill (Co-Chair), Chris Jech (Co-Chair), Michael Bell (arrived at 7:06 PM), Mary Lou Fragomeni-Nuttall, Carol Maywood, and David Pietz.

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

Guests present: Briggs Clinco, Lu Griego, George Jacoby, Suzanne Jacoby, Caelin Norgord, Haydee Sanchez, and Alan Scott.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes/LAR – February 28, 2023, and March 9, 2023

A correction to Item 3b of the February 28, 2023, minutes was requested. The correction specified that there were concerns related to the obscuring of the south residence rather than the east residence.

A motion to approve the corrected February 28, 2023, minutes as well as the March 9, 2023, minutes was made by Fragomeni-Nuttall and seconded by Co-Chair Hill. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0 (Maywood and Pietz abstained from voting).

3. Reviews

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

Construction of a new single-family home and retention of existing adobe ruins of the Fort Lowell School (1913) on the site.

Full Review/Vacant Parcel

The project was presented by the applicant, Caelin Norgord.

Board members had several questions and comments about the proposal.

Are you proposing decomposed granite as the driveway material?

- No, a crushed-rock, quarter minus driveway material (dirt colored) is proposed.

The plans show a driveway on the east side of the ruins/ Will the existing west driveway be blocked off?

- Yes. There will be only one entry/exit on the east side. The applicant will vegetate to prevent use of the west driveway. Any vegetation within the right-of-way will not be removed.

Are there any stoops or walkways proposed to connect the driveway to any entrance? A circulation plan was requested by the Board in the previous review.

- Stoops or walkways are not proposed for this project. Additionally, staff clarified that there is no requirement from PDSD to provide on-site circulation for this specific project.

As it related to building height being stepped back and varied from the front elevation, what is the distance between the entrance to the front courtyard (the lowest height) and the entrance to the great room (the highest height)?

- The distance between the two doors is approximately 12'-6".

Is a perimeter wall proposed?

- No.

Is a pool planned?

- No.

Where will the mechanical equipment be located?

- The mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof and hidden by a parapet.

Will any mechanical equipment be located on the ground?

- No, all mechanical equipment is proposed on the roof.

Is there concern about the location of the proposed new driveway as it relates to the intersection at Beverly Avenue or the new adjacent driveway proposed at 5301 East Fort Lowell Road?

- No, staff clarified with the Department of Transportation and Mobility that there were no issues with the location of the proposed driveway.

Board members expressed concerns that were also brought up in previous reviews, including the need to narrow and vary the proportions of the windows proposed on the south elevation. Wider, uniform dimensions for bedroom exists are not needed along the south elevation as these rooms are shown as a dining room and study. There were concerns about the impact the location of the leach field has on adjacent properties;

concern that the site plan does not show site circulation that will preserve and protect the schoolhouse ruins; and that a complete landscape, grading, and draining plan were not submitted for review. Fort Lowell Design Guidelines address native landscape guidelines and the Board had previously requested a plan.

The Board further noted that the plans show an existing adobe wall to be the west property but, but in fact it is not the property line according to the applicant's surveyor and the neighbor (the wall is on the neighbor's property. As such, the setback is not correct on the site plan. The applicant stated he would adjust the location of the house. There were other concerns regarding the lack of preservation consideration of the existing adobe ruins, especially as related to the proposed driveway and visit parking next to the ruins. The Design Guidelines call for parking to be located in the rear yard. Staff clarified that the Department of Transportation and Mobility has no objection to the proposed driveway location.

There was confirmation that a pony wall will hide the garage door, and that solid doors will be used at the front gate and east side door.

Jech made a motion to approve the project with several conditions: to vary the proportions and widths of the south elevation windows; to clarify the location of the west property line and setbacks; to update the submitted landscape plan with drainage grading, and plantings; to show the location of the mechanical equipment, to consult with an adobe expert regarding the existing ruins, and to show vehicle and pedestrian circulation on the site plan. The motion was seconded by Fragomeni-Nuttall.

Co-Chair Hill requested an amendment to the original motion with an additional condition to remove any reference of a future perimeter wall on the site plan. Both Jech (motion maker) and Fragomeni-Nuttall (seconder) accepted the modified motion. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

4. Fort Lowell Historic Zone Inventory Discussion

The board will be assisted by the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation with an updated nomination of the Fort Lowell National Register District. Co-Chair Hill noted that the boundaries of the National Register District will be expanded to include the Fort Lowell Historic Preservation Zone.

5. Call to the Audience

None.

6. Staff Updates

Staff informed the board that a new website for the City of Tucson recently launched, and that the PDSD has a new Director. There were no updates regarding the Historical Commission separation.

7. Future Agenda Items—Information Only

New board membership.

8. Adjournment

Co-Chair Jech made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Fragomeni-Nuttall. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0. Co-Chair Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:04 PM.