



Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board  
Tuesday, October 25, 2022, at 7:00PM  
Virtual Meeting

**Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report**

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

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

City Staff present: Jodie Brown (PDSD), Wyatt Berger (PDSD), Greg Jackson (Parks and Recreation).

Guests present: Caelin Norgord, Brian Johnson, Jordan Lynde, Scott Liebelt, David Pietz, and Alan Scott.

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 7:10 PM.

**2. Approval of Minutes/LAR: July 26, 2022, and August 23, 2022**

A motion to approve the July 26, 2022, minutes as corrected was made by Jech and seconded by Maywood. The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Corrections to Item 3a on the August 23, 2022, minutes were requested. Further clarification regarding the demolition of the art studio addition is required.

**3. Reviews**

**a. HPZ 22-079, 5259 E Fort Lowell Road (T22CM06756)**

Construction of a new single-family home and retention of existing ruins on the site.

Full Review/Vacant Parcel/Estimated time: 30 minutes

The project was presented by the property owner and homebuilder, Caelin Norgord.

Board members had several questions and comments about the project.

Can you look through the clerestory windows on the front façade?

- No, the clerestory windows are approximately 12 feet in height.

Is a swimming pool proposed within the rear courtyard of the residence?

- Yes, but the pool is not shown on the submitted plans.

What do you mean when you say you are proposing barn doors at the entrance of the front courtyard?

- Large, wood doors that can either slide or swing open.

Are those windows at the entrance of the front courtyard?

- No, just openings.

What are the two lines depicted on the floor plan in front of the entry?

- The lines indicate a covered porch with no beams and a corrugated metal roof proposed.

What is the arrow by the entry on the floor plan showing?

- The arrow indicates the location of a large, sliding glass door that looks out onto the courtyard and adobe schoolhouse ruins.

-

The board expected during the meeting to see examples of details, including colors and textures, as well as a landscape plan of the site. A site utilization plan, which shows vehicle ingress and egress, driveway dimensions, grading, drainage, and existing and proposed landscaping, should be submitted to ensure development will not impact the adobe schoolhouse ruins and abutting properties. A preservation plan demonstrating how the adobe schoolhouse ruins will be protected in place is also needed.

The elevations and hardline drawings provided are inconsistent with the project narrative. The tree that is falling into Fort Lowell Road needs to be remediated. Any inconsistencies surrounding the correct address of 5259 East Fort Lowell Road also need to be addressed in the project narrative resubmittal.

Fragomeni made a motion to continue the case with the following provided for the second meeting: a preservation plan for the adobe schoolhouse ruin; a grading and drainage plan; a landscape plan showing the location of existing, removed, and new trees; and details of the exterior walls, doors, windows, and fencing. Maywood seconded the motion.

Co-Chair Hill asked to modify the motion and noted that the current review materials are not a full project submittal. Bell also explained that all the materials submitted to PDSD staff need to be made available to the board.

Co-Chair Hill modified the motion to continue the case with the following provided to the staff for the second meeting; a landscape plan showing NPPO, how drainage affects the adobe schoolhouse ruins and adjacent properties, the locations of perimeter walls, monument walls, and gates, and the location of a pool fence if visible from the street; a grading plan; a preservation plan of the adobe schoolhouse ruin outlining the treatment of the adobe ruins as well as the

removal of any ruins; details of the windows and doors, specifically details of the barn door, details of the sliding glass door, and details of the covered porch; and a site plan showing overall site circulation.

Fragomeni and Maywood both approved of the motion modification presented by Hill. The motion was approved with a vote of 5-0.

**b. HPZ 22-090, 2900 N Craycroft Road (T22CM0828)**

Construction of new playground equipment and shade structures.

Full Review/Contributing Resource

The project was presented by Greg Jackson, Brian Johnson, Jordan Lynde, and Scott Liebelt.

Board members had several questions and comments about the project?

Is the footprint of the playground being expanded?

- No, the proposed scope of work is within the existing playground footprint.

Are board members reviewing only the shade structures or the entire playground?

- Reviewing the entire playground.

Are the colors and details presented of only the awnings, or of the awnings with the equipment?

- Both the awnings and the equipment.

Is the existing ramada being removed?

- No.

What is the surface material under the proposed equipment?

- The surface is an engineered wood fiber that has been shredded for children's safety and for ADA accessibility.

Are the swings ADA accessible?

- Yes, two accessible swings with harnesses are proposed.

Why the posts supporting the awnings black?

- Black posts into some of the posts of other nearby play structures. Posts are typically painted in neutral colors.

Will black posts be hotter than other neutral colors?

- No, rounded posts do not absorb much heat, and black posts are more visible for children.

Why is the equipment for children 2-5 years old and for children 5-12 years old so close to each other?

- There is plenty of separation between the two groups. Age groups should be somewhat close together for parents to watch their children in different age groups.

Why is there no historic consideration of the park in the design?

- Not in the budget to build a custom playground, and there are limitations because of current equipment guidelines.

Board members appreciated the relationship between the aqua-colored shade structures and the nearby confluence of two washes. Bright colors and primary colors should generally be avoided.

A motion was made by Jech to recommend the project for approval as presented. The motion was seconded by Fragomeni. The motion was approved with a vote of 5-0.

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

The chair was not prepared to provide an update on this item, and it was trailed to the following meeting.

**5. Call to the Audience**

None.

**6. Staff Updates**

Staff notified the board that there are no updates on the potential dissolution of all historic advisory boards. Staff also informed the board that Wyatt Berger will continue to attend future meetings and provide future agenda.

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

Staff will reach out to board members if a special meeting for HPZ 22-079 is requested by the applicant.

**8. Adjournment**

Co-Chair Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:01 PM.