



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, October 3, 2023, at 7:00PM
Hybrid Special Meeting

Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

City Staff present: Wyatt Berger (PDSD), Koren Manning (PDSD), and Michael Taku (PDSD).

Guests present: Brian Atwood, John Burr, Greg Clark, Demion Clinco, Irene Fernandez, Jill Heater, Rose Holstad, Paul Reimer, Colleen Sackheim, and Barry Spicer.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM.

2. Reviews

a. Revote of SD-0523-00055/TC-RES-0423-04339, 5301 East Fort Lowell Road

Rehabilitation of an existing single-family residence and site improvements.
Full Review/Contributing Historic to HPZ/Estimated time: 30 minutes.

The board did not revoke on the approval of the project, but rather asked for revised plans complying with all the conditions set forth within the motion to approve the project. Fragomeni-Nuttall explained to the property owner that the Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS) requested revised site and drainage plans and noted that inconsistencies were found in the application for the proposed exterior changes and repairs. Bell also clarified that a more complete set of plans showing the relationship between the project and 5259 East Fort Lowell Road should be presented again to the FLHZAB. Co-Chair Jech concluded that the project should be continued for review.

A motion was made by Fragomeni-Nuttall to continue the project for a time when the property owner is prepared to submit a revised plan set and application addressing all FLHZAB conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Bell. The motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

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

Construction of a new perimeter wall and landscape remodel.
Full Review/Contributing Historic to HPZ/Estimated time: 30 minutes.

Co-Chair Hill provided a summary of the FLHZAB and the PRS reviews of the project. The PRS had asked during its second review of the project for a revised plan. The PRS remanded the revised plan to the FLHZAB for another review, however the architect delivered a third plan so the review was continued to this meeting for review of the third plan.

The project was presented by the architect, Paul Reimer. Board members had several questions and comments relating to the proposal.

What is the height of the fence pickets?

- The height of the proposed fence pickets is about 5'-4".

Can you clarify the distance requirement for the horizontal steel channels of the fence?

- The horizontal steel channels are required to be 45" apart if outside of the fence. There is no distance requirement for the horizontal channels if located inside of the fence.

How far is the fence behind the three-foot wall?

- The fence is situated two inches behind the wall in some areas. Portions of the fence are also located on top of the wall.

Is the three-foot wall along the west lot line existing?

- No. There is an existing ocotillo fence that will be replaced by the proposed wall and fencing.

What color are you planning for the wall?

- A tannish, sandy colored wall is proposed.

What is the height of the front wall?

- Much of the front wall will be four feet in height, with the gate and the wall surrounding the gate proposed to be six feet in height.

Why is the gate so wide?

- The gate is six feet wide to provide primary access to the property.

How far apart are the vertical bars on the front wall?

- Two inches apart.

Is there a fence proposed on the south and east lot lines?

- Fencing is proposed only along the east lot line. There are no changes proposed along the south lot line.

What are the materials for the proposed east side fence?

- Iron materials like the fencing materials shown for the north and west lot lines.

Board members indicated there is no precedent for a metal fence on top of a solid wall within the Preservation Zone. The meandering nature of the proposed changes on the west lot line is not distinctly shown on the revised plans. A darker color was recommended by Bell to blend the wall into the proposed landscaping. Clinco asked Deputy Director Manning why the partly constructed pool was not reviewed by the FLHZAB. Staff stated that pool permits are not reviewed by Historic Zone Advisory Boards. Clinco indicated that the *UDC* requires review of all structures above and below ground, and that the FLHZAB had reviewed pools in the past. Burr stated that the Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board has reviewed pools in the past. Manning indicated she would follow-up on this question.

Board members also critiqued the six-foot height of the front wall and gate. There were still concerns relating to the height of the front gate and wall surrounding the gate as there is no precedent of the FLHZAB approving construction of a front wall or fence six feet in height. As the Fort Lowell Design Guidelines state that the rural character of the Preservation Zone be maintained, rustivating the steel fence can enhance this concept. Co-Chair Hill indicated that the density of vertical metal pickets and bars proposed to be two inches apart on top of the front wall is too much. The architect indicated that reducing the amount of metal may benefit the homeowner by decreasing costs. However, the revised plans and renderings were deemed by a board member to be creative solutions to previous concerns relating to wall height in response to the pool requirement.

Co-Chair Hill discussed making a motion to approve the project with several conditions: that the front wall be no higher than four feet, except surrounding the proposed gate; that the easternmost portion of the front fence be metal only; that the wall along the west lot line be meandering and “lumpy” in character; that the property maintain a natural rural quality after construction, that there is intention to retain the existing ocotillo fencing at the northwest corner; that the color of the proposed perimeter wall be determined during a courtesy review; that the metal fencing rusticate; that the six-foot height of the gate be accepted; that portions of the front wall approaching the gate may exceed four feet in height as long as the overall height at the gate does not exceed an average of four feet with consideration for the large gate opening that allows visibility of the rear property; that all references to future work are removed from the submitted plans; and that the locations of the motor vehicle parking be removed from the submitted plans.

Co-Chair Jech made a motion to approve the project with the following conditions: that the front wall does not exceed four feet in height except surrounding the front gate; that the fence proposed along the east lot line is metal as shown on the submitted plans; that the fence along the west lot line is a mixture of both masonry and metal materials; that the masonry sections of the west perimeter wall are meandering, "lumpy," and vary between three and five feet in height, and not to exceed five feet in height; that the southern portion of the west perimeter wall is five feet in height with metal paneling in-between the wall sections; that the owner retain a rural quality of the property; that the color of the proposed perimeter walls are reviewed during construction as a courtesy review; that the proposed metal fencing rusticate; that the distance between the fence pickets will vary between two and four inches; that the front gate is six feet in height and is not intended to set precedence for other properties within the Preservation Zone; that the overall project will be organic; that the opening within the gate maintain visual access to the rear of the property; that all references to future work are removed from the submitted plans; that the locations of the motor vehicle parking be removed from the submitted plans; and that the proposed landscaping is not within the purview of this specific review. The motion was seconded by Pietz. The motion passed with a vote of 5-1.

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.