



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board
Monday, July 22, 2024, at 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting

Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Members present: Mary Lou Fragomeni (Co-Chair), David Pietz (Co-Chair), Briggs Clinco (arrived at 5:31 PM), and Margo Sackheim.

City Staff present: Wyatt Berger (PDSD), Daniel Bursuck (PDSD), and Koren Manning (PDSD).

Guests present: Jannie Cox, Dan Hill, Elaine Hill, and Brent Jones.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes/LAR – February 27, March 25, and April 22, 2024

A motion to approve the February 27, 2024, minutes was made by Co-Chair Pietz and seconded by Sackheim. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

A motion to approve the March 25, 2024, minutes was made by Sackheim and seconded by Co-Chair Pietz. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

A motion to approve the April 22, 2024, minutes was made by Sackheim and seconded by Co-Chair Pietz. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

3. Reviews

a. SD-0624-00059/T22CM00519, 5401 East Presidio Road

The applicant presented the project to the board. Board members had several questions and comments about the project.

How far will the existing rear wall be moved?

- The wall will be moved around thirteen feet to the northeast to accommodate for additional back yard space.

Will the new addition be taller than the existing residence?

- No, the proposed ceiling and parapet will match the existing building.

What is the fenestration treatment for the addition?

- Dual casement windows are primarily proposed on the addition.

Is a new door proposed for this project?

- Yes, a new door matching the existing doors is proposed.

Is there any mechanical equipment within the proposal?

- Yes, a new and larger mechanical system is proposed on the roof. The mechanical equipment will not be visible from adjacent properties.

Will any vegetation be removed?

- No, all existing vegetation will remain.

Will the proposal alter any existing drainage patterns?

- No, drainage will not be impacted by the addition.

Double-hung windows, with the vertical dimension greater than the horizontal, are more appropriate. Why are double-hung windows not proposed?

- The proposed windows are intended to satisfy egress and building code requirements. The proposed windows also better match the existing fenestration treatment of the residence.

What are the current window treatments?

- The existing windows are wood-treated inside and metal-clad on the exterior.

Is the proposed east elevation window operable?

- Yes, an operable casement window is proposed.

Is the proposed window the only window within the project scope?

- The proposed double doors are replacing an existing window. Additionally, a casement window treatment is proposed on the west elevation, and a double-hung window is proposed on the east elevation.

Board members were primarily concerned about the proposed windows. While Clinco acknowledged that the new windows match the existing fenestration, the proposed windows do not meet the criteria of the Design Guidelines. Board members overall suggested providing double-hung windows with a vertical dimension greater than the horizontal. Additionally, the proposed windows on the west elevation were suggested to be separated to emphasize the vertical dimensions.

Clinco made a motion to approve the project as presented with the following condition: that the proposed new windows be separated and double-hung, with the vertical dimension greater than the horizontal. The motion was seconded by Co-Chair Pietz. The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

4. Design Guidelines and Technical Standards Manual Update Discussion

Elaine Hill summarized the proposed updates and changes to the Design Guidelines and Technical Standards Manual. After the presentation, staff identified several updates that conflict with the provisions of the *Unified Development Code (UDC)*. Deputy Director Manning indicated based on initial review by staff the following changes to the Design Guidelines and Technical Standards Manual appear to require amendments to the *UDC*: to require Full HPZ Review for new walls and fences; to change the definition of “Development Zone”; to limit the height of new construction by calculating the “typical height within the Development Zone”; to exclude the “Post Trader’s Store/Las Saetas” from any applicable Development Zone; and to require FLHZAB approval of Development Zone comparisons.

There was additional discussion relating to how the new ADU regulations (House Bill 2720) will impact the Historic review process. Deputy Director Manning indicated that a Full HPZ Review will continue to be required for ADUs. There was also discussion about the general timeframe for the Design Guidelines and Technical Standards Manual updates. Staff indicated that this process may take six months or longer to complete.

Deputy Director Manning concluded the discussion by stating staff will provide the board written comments and responses to the proposed updates and changes prior to the next scheduled meeting.

5. Call to the Audience

None.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 PM.