



Barrio Historico Historic Zone Advisory Board  
Monday, January 15, 2024, at 4:00PM  
Virtual Meeting

## Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report

### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Members present: Grace Schau (acting chair), Phillip Neher (arrived at 4:07PM), and Mitch Mackowiak. A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 4:05PM.

Guests present: Jodie Brown (PDSO), Paolo De Lorenzo, Bobbie Jo Buel Carter, Greg Veitch

### 2. Approval of LAR/Minutes – July 10, 2023

A motion to approve the minutes and Legal Action Report of July 10, 2023, was made by Schau and seconded by Neher. The motion was approved with a vote of 3-0.

### 3. Call to the Audience

None.

### 4. Reviews

#### a. 627 S 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, SD-1123-00134

Construction of 138 SF first floor addition to single family home  
Full Review/Non-Contributing Resource

Greg Veitch presented the project.

The board members reviewed the information and had several questions/comments.

- Is there a shade roof behind the wall?
  - Yes, it will remain.
- What is the roof on the main house?
  - Metal, the new roof won't match because it will be really low ceiling. We are proposing a parapet condition.
- What is the roof type?
  - TPO with a parapet or higher slope and matching the existing roof.
- How would it flash against the existing roof—you would have to remove some stucco; it would be very tight.
  - The deck framing would have to change. We could decrease the size of framing members. We would have to investigate it.
- If you did a parapet roof it should cover any connections, flashing, etc.
  - Yes
- Any thoughts on contrasting on design?
  - No, since it is such a small addition it should be consistent.
- Why not make it higher by removing balcony to walk on the roof?
  - It was a cost issue.
- You won't see this change that much. Not sure it is feasible to build based on the current info. Drawings seem off from what is actually on site.

- Framed construction?
  - Rasta
- Are you proposing to use aluminum frame windows?
  - Yes
- How should we treat that when the current design guidelines state wood?
  - Could say that it won't set a precedent
  - The main house is the primary reference, and it has aluminum windows
- Will you use scuppers?
  - Yes, internal roof drains do not make sense
- Will you be removing the cistern?
  - We will be relocating it
- Will the stucco wall match the existing?
  - Yes
- Will the utilities be located inside the courtyard?
  - Yes

A motion was made by Neher to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions, there is a solution for the roof with parapet that reaches the beam, the cistern is relocated to the original location, the scupper matches the original design, the utilities will be hidden from view, the windows will match the existing even though it is not consistent with the design guidelines and it will not set a precedent. The motion was seconded by Mackowiak. The motion was approved with a vote of 3-0.

**5. Election of Officers**

This item was trailed to the next meeting.

**6. Vote on Meeting Format—Hybrid, In-Person, Virtual**

This item was trailed to the next meeting.

**7. BHHZAB Design Guidelines Discussion**

No update

**8. Staff Updates—Information Only**

Historic staff provided an update on the commission split.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08PM.

