



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board  
Tuesday, August 22, 2023, at 7:00PM  
Hybrid Meeting

**Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report**

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

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

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

Guests present: Briggs Clinco, George Jacoby, Suzanne Jacoby, Sharon Ludwig, and Alan Scott.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 7:07 PM.

**2. Approval of Minutes/LAR – June 27, 2023**

A correction to Item 2 of the June 27, 2023, minutes was requested. The correction specified that Maywood experienced technical difficulties during the motion and did not abstain from voting on Item 2.

A motion to approve the corrected June 27, 2023, minutes was made by Maywood and seconded by Bell. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

**3. Reviews**

**a. 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

Co-Chair Hill provided a brief presentation on the history of the property, which was the Teacher's House for the Fort Lowell School, constructed in about 1913. The property has been vacant for over 15 years. The project was presented by the applicant, Sharon Ludwig.

Board members had several questions and comments about the project.

Can you clarify why the property is considered an “interior property?”

- The parcel is considered an “interior property” in relation to its Development Zone.

Was the original building constructed with adobe?

- Yes, adobe was the original construction material, with many layers of stucco added over time.

Will the one-kote stucco system be applied to the proposed shed?

- Yes, the shed will be stuccoed to match the residence.

What are the original roofing materials?

- The roof is composed of ¾-inch tongue in groove wood with a rolled asphalt finish and four layers of shingles.

Are you required to asbestos test the shingles?

- Staff has not confirmed whether asbestos testing is required for this project.

Are you creating a new roofing frame and removing the tongue in groove sheathing?

- The removal of the tongue in groove sheathing depends on what the roofing companies believe is most appropriate.

Does the structural integrity of the roof need to be inspected?

- The framing plan of the roof was provided to the PDSD and approved by the Residential Building Section in July.

Would you consider integrating a porch onto the front elevation?

- No objections to providing a front porch to the residence, but a porch is not planned. A front patio with low adobe walls is proposed.

Are you open to shingles rather than metal roofing?

- Yes.

Will the proposed adobe courtyard wall affect site drainage?

- The courtyard wall may divert drainage away from the front door.

Is the front door proposed in its original location?

- Yes.

Is there an interior lintel on the front door?

- Yes, there an existing interior faux-wood lintel on the front door. The lintel will not be exposed.

Are there lintels on the windows?

- Yes. The lintels will not be exposed.

What is the red arrow pointing to on the front elevation?

- The red arrow indicates a faux-wood window supported by a concrete lintel that will cover the existing intrusive door to the bedroom.

Have you considered proposing wood windows?

- No, only the existing steel casement windows are proposed.

Is the photograph of the front elevation casement window an example of what is proposed?

- The photograph is of the front steel existing casement window.

Is the cellar accessible from the exterior?

- Yes, the existing cellar is accessible from both the interior and exterior of the residence.

How are the proposed cellar doors opened?

- Handles are proposed to grant access to the cellar.

What is proposed on the elevation above the cellar doors?

- An existing steel casement window is shown above the cellar doors on the rear elevation.

Is the existing rear elevation casement window similar in proportion and framing to the front elevation casement windows?

- The rear elevation has similar proportions but does not include any lites.

Do you intend to remove any adobe walls to provide access to the shed?

- No, there is already an existing door that grants access to the shed.

Will the existing roof be extended to cover the proposed rear shed, or is a separate roof proposed for the shed?

- A new roof for the shed will tie into the fascia of the shed roof on the rear of the residence and will also be sheathed with shingles.

Does the steel casement window on the east elevation match the front elevation casement window?

- Yes.

Is the proposed bathroom window operable?

- No, the window is only intended to provide natural lighting into the bathroom.

Are concrete lintels proposed for the west elevation windows?

- Yes.

Are these concrete lintels visible?

- No, these lintels are currently covered by stucco.

Will decomposed granite be proposed for the driveway?

- No, something more like dirt-colored crushed gravel quarter-minus is proposed.

Is the end of the driveway a turnaround point?

- The end of the driveway can be a turnaround point in addition to parking. Parking is proposed in the rear of the property.

Is the mechanical equipment visible from the street?

- No, the proposed heat pump is located on the roof at the rear of the house and will not be visible from the street.

Board members expressed concerns that the Development Zone provided is incorrect. The correct Development Zone should include the block of the Historic Zone to the east and across Fort Lowell but should not include the entire reach to Craycroft Road including the Military structures. The framing plan submitted to and approved by PDSD was requested by board members. Staff was requested by board members to provide all review comments and all plans submitted to the PDSD. There was also a discussion about the proposed metal roof. Based on the Design Guidelines, the existing shingle sheathing is more appropriate than a metal roofing system. Additionally, drainage patterns on the site were of concern and were not addressed in the project submittal.

It was determined by board members that the proposed front elevation niche and lintel were inappropriate for the 1913 bungalow. A window of historic proportion or a faux window visible from the exterior was proposed as an alternative to the niche and lintel. There were other concerns about the stucco treatment. The board indicated that rounded edges are more appropriate for the project, and that only the damaged stucco and not all of the old stucco on the mud adobe shall be removed or replaced. Board members also noted that the applicant should discuss how the elevations have been altered over time with the Plans Review Subcommittee.

Board members mentioned that there may be a conflict between the exterior and interior stairs to the cellar. A floor plan was requested to notate the location of the interior stairs to the cellar. French doors on the east elevation shall not be visible from the street or from adjoining properties. There is an existing perimeter (patio) wall three to four feet in height that was request to be raised to a height of six feet to obscure the proposed

French doors. Board members expressed additional concerns about the proportions of the west elevation windows. While the existing windows were added without prior historic review, the windows were accepted as presented, as they were modified to meet safety code for bedroom egress. It was also suggested that bougainvillea plantings are not appropriate and should be replaced by Velvet Mesquites or bird-of-paradise bushes.

Fragomeni-Nuttall formulated a motion to approve with several recommendations: to provide shingle sheathing on the roof; to provide the rounded edges to the stucco treatment; to recommend a front patio be constructed with stucco walls two to three feet in height; to eliminate the niche and lintel on the front elevation and replace with a window; to approve the shed as presented with shingle sheathing; to approve the east elevation French doors if the east perimeter wall is raised to a height of six feet; to provide additional information about drainage and finish floor elevations; to notate the location of the interior stairs to the cellar; and to cover the block walls around the exterior cellar stairs with stucco. Co-Chair Hill clarified that the west elevation windows are approved as accepted to meet safety codes; that the stucco be an earth-tone color similar to lime plaster; that motor vehicle parking be in the rear of the property; that plants such as Velvet Mesquites and bird-of-paradise bushes are provided on the Fort Lowell plant list; and that a conceptual grading plan with finish floor elevations be submitted as a minor review.

Fragomeni-Nuttall made a motion to approve the project with several conditions: to cover the roof with shingle sheathing; to provide rounded edges to the stucco treatment; to stucco the residence with a soft earth-tone color similar to lime plaster; to place the heat pump in its proposed location on the rear roof of the residence; to construct the adobe courtyard wall two to three feet in height as proposed, adjoining it to the existing adobe wall with a similar stucco treatment to the residence; that an overhang is not required for the front porch; to eliminate the niche and lintel proposed on the front elevation; to add a non-operable, closed window in lieu of the niche and lintel; to provide low matching stucco walls to the cellar entrance; to provide a floor plan clearly notating the location of the interior stairs to the cellar; to cover the roof of the shed with shingle sheathing as well; to approve the east elevation French doors if the east perimeter wall is raised to a height of six feet; to accept all the west elevation windows as proposed; to provide earth-tone gravel for the proposed driveway; to indicate motor vehicle parking in the rear of the property; and to provide Velvet Mesquites or other native plants such as bird-of-paradise bushes in lieu of bougainvillea. Additionally, Fragomeni-Nuttall stated in her motion that a conceptual grading plan and finish floor elevations be reviewed as a minor review. The motion was seconded by Bell which was passed with a vote of 5-0.

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

Co-Chair Hill postponed this item to meet with each board member individually.

**5. Call to the Audience**

None.

**6. Board Member Nominations**

Co-Chair Hill made a motion to nominate Briggs Clinco to the Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board which was seconded by Fragomeni-Nuttall. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

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

None.

**8. Adjournment**

Fragomeni-Nuttall made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Bell. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0. Co-Chair Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:29 PM.